Update on MCH and MSP – what is going on in the European sea basins?

Susanne Altvater
s.Pro – sustainable projects GmbH
Valetta Convention (1992)

Articles in brief:

1. Broad definition of “archaeological heritage”;
2. Maintenance of an inventory of archaeology heritage, including creation of “archaeological reserves” for the preservation of material evidence;
3. Application of appropriate procedures for intrusive archaeological investigation;
4. Provision of resources to acquire and conserve sites and monuments including archive and find repositories;
5. Integration of archaeology into the planning regime;
6. Private or public sectors to meet costs of preliminary archaeological operations and collection and dissemination of information;
7. Preliminary publication of excavation results (similar provision also made in Article 8);
8. Develop public awareness of the value of archaeological heritage; and
# 24 years later... Finalised MSPs or in preparation: Country Info

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Authorities in charge</th>
<th>Maritime spatial plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>N L x 80</td>
<td>(N N N) @ x 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(N N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(N N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>N S S S</td>
<td>(N N N) @+ @+ @+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>N N N N</td>
<td>(N N N) @ @ @ @ @ @ @ x 9 @ x 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>N S x 17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>N S S S</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>N S</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>N N N</td>
<td>@ @ @ @ @ @</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Authors in charge</th>
<th>Maritime spatial plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>N L x 80</td>
<td>(N N N) @ x 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(N N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(N N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>N S S S</td>
<td>(N N N) @+ @+ @+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>N N N N</td>
<td>(N N N) @ @ @ @ @ @ @ x 9 @ x 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>N S x 17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>N S S S</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>N S</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>N N N</td>
<td>@ @ @ @ @ @</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **N**: National authority
- **S**: Sub-national authority
- **N**: MSP prepared by national authorities
- **S**: MSP prepared by sub-national authorities
- **N**: MSP prepared by local authorities
- **MSP finalised (adopted or not)**
- **MSP in preparation**
- **{}**: Lower level plans form part of higher level plans
- **Assumed**
- **+**: Denotes different region
- *****: Plan not adopted
Current approaches to integrate MCH into MSP (all EU sea basins)

- **BE**: The MSP for the Belgian Part of the North Sea was adopted in March 2014 and considers *UCH as use, no designated areas*; Shipwrecks are protected under a new law for underwater cultural heritage (Law of 4 April 2014 on the protection of underwater cultural heritage).

- **NL**: Policy document on the North Sea 2016-2021 *with designated uses*, i.a. UCH: The conservation of underwater cultural heritage is assessed when making spatial planning decisions on activities.

- **UK**: England: 2 regional plans completed (East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans), *UCH: specific sector*. Scotland: 1 national plan (National Marine Plan), *UCH: specific sector* to be taken into account

- **DE**: EEZs for North Sea and Baltic Sea; *UCH is taken into account as sector* with spatially relevent specifications but has *no designated areas*; SEA taking UCH into account

- **DE – The Mecklenburg-Vorpommern** Spatial Development Programme: *UCH has to be taken into account* during spatial relevant planning
Current approaches to integrate MCH into MSP (all EU sea basins)

- **FI:** MSP legislation came into force on the 1st of October 2016; drafting of maritime spatial plans has started. There is one specific Regional land use plan for the Kymenlaakso Region maritime area: contains *UCH as specific sector* (see presentation from Frank Hering)

- **LT:** In MSP plan *measures are included on how to protect UCH*

- **GR:** No legally binding national MSP plan in Greece. MSP is addressed in national spatial planning documents covering specific sectors; *not UCH*. Some of the many ancient, byzantine and war wrecks are under archaeological protection laws.

- **HR** (Croatia): No overall binding MSP plan. One legally binding plan, focusing on mariculture, with links to MSP is available: Zadar county integrated sea use and management plans (*one objective: protection of UCH*)
How strong are MSP approaches to protect and incorporate UCH?

• Not all MS with MSPs include UCH

• Those MSPs which take UCH into account:
  ➢ Measures very broad, overall
  ➢ No strategic approach how to incorporate UCH
  ➢ Very few designated areas
  ➢ Rare or no use of synergies
  ➢ SEA as only available tool to take UCH into account
Can we learn from practices?

• Pilot plans
• Guidance/Handbook
• Tools tested in projects
• Study
Baltic Sea
Lithuanian Model Case-PartiSEApate

• Underwater cultural heritage was discussed as a premature issue in the Lithuanian MSP process.
• Problem: Wrecks covered with sand; could be destroyed by offshore industrial projects
• How to protect these wrecks in the littoral zone?
• Designation of the littoral zone as vulnerable area within MSP regarding UCH as sector?
Latvia: Report on national and regional strategies with relevance for the maritime space

• Task: To take responsibility for preservation of the cultural environment in particular areas at the coast

• Consequences for MSP: Areas for UCH can be designated; possibly new restrictions for other marine space users

-> Only theory, no real impact on practice and MSP process yet.
Poland: Permission system for exploration and sustainable use of UCH

"Study of Conditions of Spatial Development of Polish Sea Areas“, MIG

Conclusion:

- Licensing access to wrecks and recording departures for wreck exploration not sufficient
- Lack of basic requirements of safety of activities
- No protection against treasure hunting

Possible solution: open access to some wrecks in supervised archaeological parks helps better screening and monitoring.
North Sea/Atlantic
UK: National Marine History Records

Maritime records (total):
46,000
Wrecks: 33,000
Casualties, position to be verified:
27,400
Wrecks position known: 5,200
Designated Historic Shipwrecks  
(England): 46 (UK total = 61)
British aircraft: 1,100
Fishermen’s fastenings: 7,400
Isolated finds etc: 1,300

[Map of UK with marked locations]

www.pastscape.org.uk
Information on England’s
UK: Protection of Wreck Act (1973): Designated Wreck Sites
UK High Level Marine Objectives (2008)

• "society getting more benefits from the use of the marine environment than previously, whilst its rich natural and cultural heritage are better protected."

• "We will be responding to this in our actions so that the integrity of marine ecosystems and UCH is conserved."
UK: Marine Licensing and Cultural Heritage

- The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) carries out licensing and enforcement functions
- Licensing includes removal of objects from wrecks
- Excavations and surface recovery from designated wreck sites is licensable
- Diver investigation trails are exempt on designated wreck sites
UK: Offshore Activities

- Crown Estate leases seabed for offshore renewable power generation projects
- Dep. of Energy and Climate Change has conducted SEA
- Developers prepare non-statutory Zone Appraisal Plans
UK: Marine development guidelines

• Historic Environment Guidance for the Offshore Renewable Energy Sector: EIA methodologies, Cumulative effects, Geotechnical survey
• Model Clauses for Archaeological Written Schemes of Investigation
• Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries
The Netherlands: Synergies with windfarm planning

• Wreck locations preserved within park: protection through ban on ship-passages

• Large infrastructural works with low social acceptance: positive publicity through UCH
Mediterranean Sea
Greece and Cyprus: Practice example: ΘΑΛ-ΧΩΡ (THAL-CHOR)

• Development of a methodology for drafting maritime spatial plans
• Pilot implementation in selected areas
• One sector considered: UCH
Adriatic and Ionian Sea: ADRIPLAN Data Portal

Geodata portal with free access for searching and sharing knowledge related to MSP in the project area.

- **Key questions**: What are the most relevant spatial data to be considered at macro-regional scale (i.e. Adriatic and Ionian Region) to support MSP implementation, also considering a cross-border perspective?
- **UCH related data included**
Adriatic and Ionian Sea: ADRIPLAN Cumulative impact tool

• Main methodological tool used in ADRIPLAN to evaluate the potential impact of maritime activities on the environment, quantifying the pressures generated by the uses on the environmental components (in the current and future scenarios).
• Could be relevant for UCH protection
Possible reasons for weak incorporation of UCH into MSP – Data and uncertainty

• Marine plans are *spatial*, intended to indicate the most appropriate and inappropriate areas for development.

• Archaeology tends to be represented as *spots* = small, relatively few in number, protected (?) and therefore to be avoided.

• Historic environment is much broader than spot maps -> considerable uncertainties as to the *presence, character and importance of features*

• Marine archaeological mapping and GIS portals are suffering due to a *lack of common platforms* and due to short-term character of many mapping projects
Recommendations from a MSP perspective

• Make data available widely and provide opportunities for people to add their own data

• Increase seabed surveying with an archaeological component in advance of planmaking

• Map heritage assets starting with an informed coexistence approach rather than exclusion

• Map how development should proceed and show areas with potential

• For protection of historical sites like wreck cemeteries, zoning would be an appropriate planning tool; test other tools

• *Marine planners need archaeologists for advice: archaeologists need to be prepared to provide such advice, not only difficulties*