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Aims of this session with Baltic SCOPE

Share and discuss with panelists and audience:

• Findings on outcomes, obstacles & enablers in transboundary marine spatial planning collaboration
• Upscale findings beyond Baltic Scope and the Baltic Sea Region
Procedure

Presentations
1. Results, Obstacles & Enablers – Lessons Learned from BSC (Nordregio)
2. Evaluation framework for Transboundary MSP (SYKE)

Interactive panel rounds (after each presentation):
• Panelists’ input (planning experts & researcher)
• Plenary discussion of panelists & audience

During session: Collect your ideas on post-its: red/green/yellow.
End of session: Share post-its on posters on the way out.

Johanna Egerup
Senior Adviser at Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SwAM)
Obstacles and enablers in transboundary planning (Baltic SCOPE)

Baltic SCOPE
Towards coherence and cross-border solutions in Baltic Maritime Spatial Plans

Andrea Morf
Senior Research Fellow at Nordregio

#BalticMSP
**The Project**

Aim: closer alignment of national planning

**Partners:**
- **MSP authorities:** DE, DK, EE, LV, PL, SE
- **Regional organisations:** HELCOM, VASAB
- **Research:** NORDREGIO, SYKE

- **Platform:** communication, knowledge-development & sharing
- **2-way knowledge building & learning**
  - National → Transboundary level
  - Transboundary → National level

- **2 Case study areas**
  - **Southwest Baltic:** existing MSP/no plans
  - **Central Baltic:** MSP under way

**Not planned to involve all levels**

**Focus on:**
- **National level**
- **Topics in outer EEZ relevant for all countries**
Approach: 2 Complementary Cases

1. **Identification** of case-specific **hot topics**
2. **Refining & developing** case-specific **solutions**
3. **Solutions** & necessary planning steps on **general level**
4. **Filtering solutions** back to **national processes**
5. **Overall recommendations** => X-case, pan-Baltic, EU, global

**Emerging:** 2 different, complementary approaches (deliberation among planners & sector experts)

---

**South West Baltic Case**
Zooming in on specific areas & sub-areas – also grey zones
- Work in bi-/trilateral meetings
- Development of conflict matrix & solution proposals per area
- Proposal **safety buffer-zones for shipping** (DK) on request of others

**Central Baltic Case**
Pan-Baltic perspective – no geographic zooming in
- Overall process-oriented
- Thematic
- General identification of conflict & synergies between sectors.
  - **Topic papers**
  - **Ecosystem Approach Tables**
  - **“Green Map”** for Baltic
Results, Obstacles & Enablers

Baltic SCOPE Lessons Learned

Towards coherence and cross-border solutions in Baltic Maritime Spatial Plans

Michael Kull and Andrea Morf
Senior Research Fellows at Nordregio

Prepared by Team NORDREGIO also including Alberto Giaccometti & John Moodie
Methods and Data Collection

Science Input for Lessons Learned

1. Participant Observation 2015-17
   - Fly on the wall = observation @ planner- & thematic partner meetings & stakeholder events.
   - Analytical framework: base territorial governance concept (e.g. Schmitt & van Well 2016).

2. Lessons Learned Participant Survey: September-October 2016
   - Link planners’ & other experts’ views with interpretations from observation
   - Verification, ownership
   - Open answers: valuable illustrations => coming here!

3. Focus Group Interviews: Nov 2016 => Tomorrow!
   In-depth feedback on survey & overall perceptions on project.
   1) Central Baltic Case
   2) South West Baltic Case
   3) Case leaders & project managers.

Integration of policies & sectors

Adaptation to changing contexts

Realisation of place-based specificities and impacts

Co-ordination of actors & institutions

Survey Questionnaire & Analytical Framework

Stakeholder participation

http://www2.lernplattform.schule.at/
Territorial Governance dimensions & project partners’ (PPs) perceptions

1. Maritime Specificities & Jurisdictional Boundaries
PPs dealing with differences in legislation, planning systems & multi-level governance

2. Cross-sector Integration & Synergies
PPs dealing with energy, environment, fisheries & shipping

3. Stakeholder Participation & Engagement
PPs dealing with (institutional) stakeholders in international & national events

4. Coordination & Collaboration of Institutional Actors
PPs coordinating & collaborating
WHO ARE THE SCOPERS?
How do they think?
Survey Question: When working in the project, I did so mainly...

“If the MSP should make any sense, we have to think pan-Baltic, at least in the pre-phase of MSP before 2021”

EMERGING PAN-BALTIC / REGIONAL MIND-SET!!!
1. Maritime Specificities & Jurisdictional Boundaries

Multilevel Governance & BS Learning
Project Partners and different stages in their national MSP process. A challenge for collaboration in the project?

“Different viewpoints in discussions often resulted from different stages in the MSP process. Countries were concerned with different challenges. Thus focussing certain topics was not that easy.”

“Could also been seen as an enabler. Learning from each other. Foresee possible mistakes and maybe also avoid them”

“Of course it was a challenge! Some are highly advanced and some don't know exactly what lies ahead. Less advanced countries can learn from the experience of the more advanced.”

“This enriched the project.”

“Understanding different planning systems: This can only be guaranteed by personal involvement and direct communication, but not by browsing national MSP home page”
Information exchange among PP worked out well

**OBSTACLES / CHALLENGES**

- **Country differences:**
  - Stage of national MSP
  - Needs
  - Rules for data exchange
  - Perceptions on need for data exchange
  - Language & Terminology

- **Dispersed knowledge** within PP countries

- **Sectoral stakeholders:**
  - Multitude
  - Motivation & engagement

**ENABLERS & RESULTS**

- **Awareness:**
  - “Without efficient information, we can’t talk about cross-border issues”

- **Information Exchange & Learning:**
  - All PP contribute to topic papers = national interests & sectoral status quo
  - Physical meetings
  - Bi-/Trilateral meetings as exchange opportunities (SWB)

- **Quality of sectoral experts**

- **Support by regional & research organisations**
  - HELCOM & AIS data
  - Nordregio & Assessment Reports & Maps
Through Baltic Scope, I have gained a deeper understanding of project partners’ national planning systems.

**OBSTACLES / CHALLENGES**
- **Country Differences:**
  - legal conditions,
  - experience
  - traditions,
  - stages of national MSP process
- Lack of human resources
- Change of partners

**ENABLERS & RESULTS**
- No obstacles, just opportunities :)  
- Stimulating Learning:
  - Face-to-face discussions, personal involvement & direct communication
  - Repetition
  - Concrete examples through workshops
  - Work with topic papers
  - Search for better solutions
  - Understanding nuances
  - Inspiring each other to reach better coherence of MSP content (e.g. DE initiative for updates regarding fisheries in their MSP-plans)

“Plenty of new info & experience. What a great exercise from this perspective!”
2. Cross-sector Integration & Synergies

Cross-sector synergies successfully promoted?

Synergies between which sectors strengthened?

Topic Paper approach = one enabler
Baltic Scope successfully promoted cross-sector Synergies

“This was perhaps the most innovative element of the project.”

“...cross-sectoral discussions were most interesting of all and was appreciated by stakeholders”

“I think we created some potential synergies, which can be an eye opener for the planners in MSP”
Synergies between specific sectors were strengthened due to Baltic SCOPE
3. Stakeholder Participation & Engagement

All relevant sectors represented?

Joint identification of synergies, conflicts & solutions?

Mainly national (authority) stakeholders so far

http://www.hpocenter.com/article/stakeholders-orientation/
All relevant sectors represented in the project?

“The main MSP-interests were represented”

“Some were missed in SWB transboundary workshop”

Recommendation:
Joint stakeholder involvement strategy for sufficient representation & engagement

“Different stages of MSP developments in CS countries = stakeholders were not equally motivated”

“More sectoral national experts could have been involved = absence of some sectorial representatives affected the outcome (e.g. workshop fisheries in Jurmala)”

“…neither tourism/regional development nor defence or oil-industry were represented in the project”

“…offshore wind sector…”

Baltic SCOPE
Towards coherence and cross-border solutions in baltic Maritime Spatial Plans
4. Coordination & Collaboration of Institutional Actors

Individual & Institutional Learning

Creation of stronger links among partners

Two different case approaches & coming to solutions

A strengthened pan-Baltic approach to MSP
Transboundary Transformations: individual & institutional learning in Baltic SCOPE...

...provided me with new knowledge, tools & methods to deal with transboundary issues in MSP

...encouraged my organisation to integrate transboundary perspectives into national planning processes
Two different case approaches & suitability to reach solutions

CB: Thematic, process-oriented focus

SWB: Area & sub-area focus working in bi-/trilateral meetings

**POSITIVES & ENABLERS**
- No specific:
  - geographic hot spots
  - topics that need cross-border conflict resolution
- Good general thematic discussions
- Easy to identify & approach stakeholders sector/topic wise

**EXPERIENCED CHALLENGES**
- Stakeholders: without specific issue = difficult to understand what is needed from them; why participate?
- Topics/sectors: not all included = conflicts/synergies missing
- Missing geographic focus: may have benefited LV & EE

**POSITIVES & ENABLERS**
- Coming together & discuss certain concrete & specific topics (e.g. grey zone issue)
- Identifying "national" interests in sub areas;
- Deepening discussions = understanding of problems

**EXPERIENCED CHALLENGES**
- Some areas already planned = smaller range of solutions
- More time & commitment needed
- More difficult to assess overall progress if case leader not personally participating in each meeting
The informal network set up by the project is of very high value when it comes to the communication between different national planning authorities.

“The most important benefit was that sector institutions met with each other & discussed interests of other sectors at the sea & MSP as a subject first time!”

“Baltic SCOPE = a great platform to exchange knowledge & to learn from each other. Project = people, ties between people have established.”

created stronger links between the planning authorities taking part in the project.
Raising to Remaining & Upcoming Challenges

“It's hard work and still a long way to go but we are in the process.”

Photo Source: http://forosobreexorcismo.blogspot.fi/2015/10/un-combate-exorcistico.html
Concrete solutions identified to solve cross-border conflicts?
Regional and local authorities played a sufficient role in the project. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with this statement.

"They played a role in national processes mainly, depends on who is in charge of doing MSP project, state or regions or municipalities for territorial waters"

“Difficult to involve local actors”
Political actors should have been more actively engaged in the project.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with this statement.

“Depends on the national MSP process, when national process is active, political stakeholders are naturally involved in discussions, like in LV.”

“A lot depends on them, so we should try to involve them into the process.”

“It (MSP) would need more publicity among politics.”

“They were not the identified target group for participating”

“MSP both political but also an opportunity for planners to influence politicians in the right direction.”
Summary & Outlook: Lessons Learned

INDIVIDUAL & INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING

Planners
- Gained mutual understanding of national planning systems.
- Gained new knowledge, tools & methods to deal with transb. MSP

Partner organisations
- Encouraged to integrate transb. perspectives into national planning

PROJECT-LEVEL RESULTS

Successful
- Information exchange among project partners
- Coordination between partner institutions
- Promotion of cross-sector synergies and addressing of conflicts

Strengthened
- Links between MSP authorities (individual, organisation)

=> “Pan-Baltic approach” to MSP ...

MOVING BEYOND THE PROJECT

- Sub-national authorities/politicians could become more prominent
- Other stakeholders & different generations’ perspectives
Baltic SCOPE
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Thanx!
Let’s discuss!

Picture Source: http://www.uloc.de/cgi-bin/wiki.pl?Screenshots/2f15_Wahrsagerin
http://www2.lernplattform.schule.at/
Discussion 1: Results, Obstacles & Enablers

• Do the results, obstacles and enablers identified in Baltic Scope capture your experience (from your and your colleagues’ practice / research)?
• Based on the presentation: What are the most important obstacles and enablers?
• Do you have any recommendations on how to improve MSP practice, theory & research?

Panel discussants: Anni Konsap, Jan Schmidtbauer Crona, Wesley Flannery
Baltic SCOPE monitoring & evaluation framework
Identification of enablers and obstacles

Riku Varjopuro
Head of unit at the Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE)
Environmental Policy Centre, Interactive Governance Unit
Evaluation of MSP
Findings on transboundary MSP processes

- Different legal and institutional settings
- Different timing in countries
- Different meaning of MSP in countries
- Different practices of MSP in countries

→ To overcome international barriers

- Challenge of attribution or contribution
  - How do you know that your plan has caused the change you observe? (or lack of change)
  - MSP operates in an environment that is affected by various human actions, different policies and many natural processes
    - Various causes and uncertainties
    - Time lags
BalticSCOPE evaluation framework

• Five topics, 13 criteria and 65 indicators (+ suggestions for evidence)

• Preparation of the plan
  – Legal and governance framework for transboundary collaboration in MSP
  – Identification of the transboundary issues and areas
  – Definition of the transboundary objectives
  – Planning alternatives
  – Data and knowledge

• Outputs of transboundary agreements
  – Cross-border agreements on transboundary issues
  – Cross-border implementation

• Outcomes
  – Implementation of the transboundary solutions in national MSP
  – Establishment of transnational processes

• Follow-up and evaluation
  – Follow-up of the plans
  – Review of the plans

• Cross-cutting themes
  – Participation
  – Communication
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Conclusion

• Various challenges and uncertainties
• Evaluation framework to suggest possible indicators and criteria
• Evaluation framework has to be adjusted to the context
• Methodological suggestion: theory-based evaluation
  – Bottom-up, built for the purpose, context-specific
Suggestion: Theory-based evaluation

• Theory-based evaluation approach
  – Broad discussion and broad approach, e.g. intervention theory, program theory, intervention logic, (logical framework)
  – e.g. inherent in preparation of European Maritime and Fisheries Fund

• What ”theory” are we talking about here?
  – An understanding of how a spatial plan, policy or intervention will produce preferred changes (and side-effects) (theory of change)
  – ”Through which activities, actions and outputs my plan will reach the set objectives (and produce side-effects)?”
Theory-based evaluation

- Theory based evaluation can be described in five consecutive steps:
  1. Formulate a plausible theory of change
  2. Formulate and prioritise evaluation questions (criteria and indicators) around the theory of change
  3. Plan, design and execute the evaluation
  4. Measure constructs postulated in the theory of change
  5. Identify breakdowns, side effects, determine program effectiveness and explain cause-effect associations
Theory-based evaluation

• Theory based evaluation can be described in five consecutive steps:
  1. **Formulate a plausible theory of change**
  2. Formulate and prioritise evaluation questions (criteria and indicators) around the theory of change
  3. Plan, design and execute the evaluation
  4. Measure constructs postulated in the theory of change
  5. Identify breakdowns, side effects, determine program effectiveness and explain cause-effect associations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output of transboundary collaboration</th>
<th>Immediate outcome</th>
<th>Intermediate outcome</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on a transboundary planning solutions</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of the transboundary solution in or for national MSP process</td>
<td>A change in the national MSP</td>
<td>Improved coherence of planning of maritime activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a transboundary collaborative body</td>
<td>Naming of national (and sector/interest) representatives</td>
<td>Actual transboundary collaboration</td>
<td>Improved transboundary collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assumptions:
How do the outputs result in outcomes? What has to happen? What contextual factors influence?

Risks:
Risks that the link is weak or non-existing

Side-effects:
What are the intervention’s effects in a broader context?
Identifying Enablers & Obstacles

• *Ex ante*
  – Identification of the assumptions and risks of the theories of change produce knowledge of possible enablers & obstacles

• *Ex post*
  – An evaluation that goes beyond mere effectiveness evaluation should ask what have been the enablers and obstacles (breakdowns, cause-effect relations)

• Monitoring of processes
  – Monitoring framework needs to collect evidence on enablers and obstacles
THANK YOU!
Discussion 2: Evaluation framework for transboundary MSP

- What are your thoughts on evaluation in MSP: When evaluation, what & why?
- Do you see any value in focusing evaluation on transboundary MSP (process, plans)?
- The presentation suggests a bottom-up evaluation method as alternative to a ready-made evaluation framework: Where do you see the pros and cons of both alternatives?

Panel discussants: Anni Konsap, Jan Schmidtbauer Crona, Wesley Flannery
Comments

Anni Konsap
Advisor of the Planning Department, Estonian Ministry of Finance

Jan Schmidtbauer Crona
Senior Analyst, Swedish Agency of Marine and Water Management

Wesley Flannery
Lecturer, Queen's University Belfast
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Thank you for participating!
Don’t forget to post your post-its!
Discussion continues at the pillars of the Baltic Scope exhibit…