EXPERT WORKSHOP TO PROVIDE
 CONSOLIDATED PRACTICAL GUIDANCE
 AND A TOOLKIT FOR MARINE SPATIAL
 PLANNING
Montreal, Canada, 9-11 September 2014

REPORT OF THE EXPERT WORKSHOP TO PROVIDE CONSOLIDATED PRACTICAL GUIDANCE AND A TOOLKIT FOR MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING

INTRODUCTION

1.   At its eleventh meeting, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in its decision XI/18, requested the Executive Secretary to collaborate with Parties, other Governments, United Nations specialized agencies, regional organizations, including Large Marine Ecosystem programmes, other relevant organizations and indigenous and local communities to convene an expert workshop to provide consolidated practical guidance and a toolkit for marine spatial planning (MSP), building upon existing guidance, in order to complement and further enhance the existing cross-sectoral efforts of Parties and other Governments on the application of the ecosystem approach to the implementation of integrated marine and coastal management, the identification of ecologically or biologically significant marine areas and the design and establishment of conservation and management measures, as appropriate.

2.   At the eighteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA), MSP was recognized as a useful tool for applying the ecosystem approach to marine and coastal management, and the challenges associated with its implementation were highlighted.

3.   Pursuant to the above request in decision XI/18, the Executive Secretary convened, with financial support from the European Commission, the Expert Workshop to Provide Consolidated Practical Guidance and a Toolkit for MSP at the offices of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Montreal, Canada, from 9 to 11 September 2014.

4.   The workshop was attended by experts from Albania, Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Cameroon, China, Colombia, European Union, Germany, Iceland, Mexico, Mozambique, Palau, Peru, Philippines, Seychelles, United States of America, UNEP Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (UNEP/DEPI), Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the Global Environment Facility (GEFSTAP), United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), Duke University, Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative (GOBI), ICCA (Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Areas and Territories) Consortium, International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), World Ocean Council, World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and an observer from Brazil. The full list of participants is provided in annex I.

ITEM 1.   OPENING OF THE MEETING

5.   The Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. Braulio F. de Souza Dias, welcomed participants and thanked them for participating in the workshop. He also thanked the European

Commission for its financial support of the workshop, as well as the United Nations Environment Programme, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the Global Environment Facility, and the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre for their collaboration. Mr. Dias noted that oceans provided critical ecosystem services that underpinned planetary well-being, provided opportunities for sustainable economic growth and supported the well-being of communities. He pointed out, however, that the expansion of new economic activities and continued dependence on activities such as fishing, oil and gas exploitation, and shipping could put pressure on marine ecosystems and lead to spatial conflicts among stakeholders in an increasingly crowded marine environment. He highlighted MSP as a valuable tool to manage activities in the oceans in the context of the ecosystem approach, and noted its value in efficiently allocating marine space among various activities while respecting the need for conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity. Noting also that guidance on MSP had emerged from various sources, he expressed the need to provide Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity with guidance on utilizing MSP to improve sustainable development of marine resources in support of efforts to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Citing decision XI/18 of the Conference of the Parties, he noted that the current workshop would provide an important opportunity to develop clear, coherent and adaptable guidance to support the application of MSP.

ITEM 2. ELECTION OF THE CO-CHAIRS, ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

6.   After a brief explanation by the Secretariat on procedures for electing the workshop co-chairs, Mr. Nicholas Bax (Australia) and Ms. Elva Escobar Briones (Mexico) were elected as co-chairs, based on proposals by the experts from Germany and Australia, respectively.

7.   Participants then considered the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/MCB/EM/2014/4/1) and the proposed organization of work, as contained in annex II to the annotations to the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/MCB/EM/2014/4/1/Add.1) and adopted them without any amendments.

8.   The workshop was organized in plenary sessions and breakout group sessions. Each breakout group selected its own facilitator. The co-chairs nominated the following rapporteurs for the plenary sessions, taking into consideration the expertise and experience of the workshop participants and in consultation with the Secretariat:

(a)   Agenda item 3 (Review of existing guidance on MSP, and identification of gaps in existing guidance and toolkits): Ms. Hannah Thomas (UNEP-WCMC);

(b)   Agenda item 4 (Development of proposals to fill gaps in existing guidance and toolkits on MSP, and preparation of consolidated practical guidance and a toolkit on MSP):

(i)   Facilitating cross-sectoral coordination and decision-making in the development and implementation of MSP: Mr. Stephen Olsen (GEF/STAP);

(ii)   Integrating the various interests, needs and perspectives of stakeholders throughout the planning and implementation processes: Mr. Ole Vestergaard (UNEP/DEPI);

(iii)   Utilizing the best available scientific information, including scientific assessment and monitoring, in planning and decision-making: Mr. David Johnson (GOBI);

(iv)   Linking spatial mapping of species, habitats and ecosystems as well as human activities, uses and pressures, to planning and decision-making: Mr. Nicholas Bax (Australia) and Mr. Jesse Cleary (Duke University);

(v)   Addressing capacity gaps and resource needs to ensure effective implementation and sustainability of MSP: Mr. Gunnar Finke (Germany).

ITEM 3. REVIEW OF EXISTING GUIDANCE ON MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING, AND IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS IN EXISTING GUIDANCE AND TOOLKITS

9.   On behalf of the Secretariat, Ms. Jihyun Lee highlighted the relevant paragraphs of decision XI/18 of the Conference of the Parties that addressed MSP and described the objectives and the expected outputs of the workshop. She explained that the workshop was tasked with providing consolidated, practical guidance and a toolkit for MSP. She emphasized that the workshop should consider the range of experiences related to MSP around the world, and that it should consider the wide range of capacities across different regions in applying MSP. She provided background on the wider context of the work on marine and coastal biodiversity under the Convention on Biological Diversity, citing various decisions of the Conference of the Parties related to ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs), addressing major threats to marine biodiversity and facilitating the implementation of management tools. Ms. Lee briefly outlined the EBSA process and noted that the series of nine workshops thus far conducted by the Secretariat and relevant regional EBSA processes had now covered over 265 million square kilometres of the ocean. She noted that these workshops had produced a wealth of scientific and technical information that can be used as a basis to support the implementation of MSP. She also introduced the Sustainable Ocean Initiative, a global platform to build partnerships and enhance capacity to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets related to marine and coastal biodiversity, which could serve to facilitate capacity-building on the implementation of guidance emerging from this workshop.

10.   Ms. Lee also introduced the following background information documents made available by the Secretariat to support the workshop discussions:

        (a)   CBD Technical Series 68: Marine Spatial Planning in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity;

        (b)   Compilation of information to support the discussions of the Expert Workshop to Provide Consolidated Practical Guidance and a Toolkit for Marine Spatial Planning (UNEP/CBD/MCB/EM/2014/4/INF/1);

        (c)   Using scientific information related to ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) to implement marine spatial planning and ecosystem based management (UNEP/CBD/MCB/EM/2014/4/INF/2);

        (d)   Marine spatial planning in practice—transitioning from planning to implementation (UNEP/CBD/MCB/EM/2014/4; UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/INF/23).

11.   The workshop participants shared, their global, regional and national MSP experiences, through theme presentations and open discussion, with a focus on reviewing existing guidance on MSP and identifying gaps in existing guidance and toolkits. The discussions focused on the following issues:

        (a)   Experiences in implementing MSP at various spatial scales and in different contexts and major lessons learned from these experiences;

        (b)   Planning tools and decision support systems to facilitate the implementation of MSP;

        (c)   Major barriers and challenges to the effective implementation of MSP, including stakeholder participation, governance and capacity gaps;

        (d)   Existing guidance to support the development and implementation of MSP and major gaps and limitations in existing guidance in addressing identified barriers and challenges to the implementation of MSP.

12.   Mr. Nicholas Bax (Australia) delivered a theme presentation providing background on the use of MSP and describing links between MSP and other relevant areas of work under the Convention, such as the scientific assessment of ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs).

13.   Mr. Ole Vestergaard (UNEP/DEPI) and Ms. Hannah Thomas (UNEP-WCMC) provided a theme presentation reviewing the outcomes of the "MSP in Practice" initiative, describing the results of an

expert meeting held in Cambridge, England, United Kingdom, from 6 to 8 May 2014 and subsequent analysis carried out through this initiative.

14.   Mr. Stephen Olsen (GEF/STAP) delivered a theme presentation on adaptive and collaborative approaches to MSP.

15.   Workshop participants shared their national experiences related to MSP through open discussion and presentations. The following workshop participants provided brief presentations on their national experiences relevant to MSP:

- Ms. Charlotte Herman (Belgium)

- Ms. Andrea Ramírez (Colombia)

- Mr. Vincent Hilomen (Philippines)

- Mr. Allen Vosrie Cedras (Seychelles)

- Ms. Betsy Nicholson (United States) (*remote presentation*)

16.   Summaries of the presentations under this agenda item are provided in annex II.

17.   Participants then discussed existing guidance on MSP, and shared their views on gaps in existing guidance and toolkits. The results of this plenary discussion are contained in annex III.

ITEM 4.   DEVELOPMENT OF PROPOSALS TO FILL GAPS IN EXISTING GUIDANCE AND TOOLKITS ON MSP, AND PREPARATION OF CONSOLIDATED PRACTICAL GUIDANCE AND A TOOLKIT ON MSP

18.   The participants shared their views and suggestions, building upon presentations and plenary discussion under the previous agenda item 3, on the development of proposals to fill gaps in existing guidance and toolkits on MSP, and preparation of consolidated practical guidance and a toolkit on MSP. The discussion focused on the following issues:

        (a)   Facilitating cross-sectoral coordination and decision-making in the development and implementation of MSP;

        (b)   Integrating the various interests, needs and perspectives of stakeholders throughout the planning and implementation process;

        (c)   Utilizing the best available scientific information, including scientific assessment and monitoring, in planning and decision-making;

        (d)   Linking spatial mapping of species, habitats and ecosystems, as well as human activities, uses and pressures, to planning and decision-making;

        (e)   Addressing capacity gaps and resource needs to ensure effective implementation and sustainability of MSP.

19.   Discussions under this agenda item were held in plenary and breakout groups to facilitate focused discussion on the topics. The rapporteurs for the respective topics under this agenda item synthesized the points raised in the plenary and breakout group discussions. The results of the plenary and breakout group discussion on this agenda item are contained in annex IV.

ITEM 5.   OTHER MATTERS

20.   Under this agenda item, participants noted that this workshop identified several areas that would benefit from further input from Parties and relevant organizations, and discussed various ways to move forward on developing concrete and practical guidance for MSP, as well as facilitating the use of available guidance and tools. These included:

(a)   Further consolidation of guidance on MSP, building upon the workshop results, through online communication (e.g., emails, webinars), expert workshops, compilation of case studies, informal interaction among experts and/or expert peer-review;

(b)   Communication with Parties and relevant organizations on the results of the workshop;

(c)   Development of linkages with other work on marine and coastal biodiversity under the Convention or other relevant international/regional agreements and programmes;

(d)   Exploration of opportunities to test guidance and facilitate capacity development opportunities, including through regional workshops being convened by the CBD Secretariat, as well as on-the-ground implementation.

21.   The workshop noted the value of continued collaboration among the CBD Secretariat and various partners, including UNEP-DEPI, GEF/STAP, UNEP-WCMC and many other relevant organizations, in implementing the above-noted steps and maintaining the momentum generated on this issue at the workshop through expert contributions by the workshop participants.

ITEM 6.   ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

22.   Participants considered and adopted the workshop report on the basis of a draft report prepared and presented by the co-chairs with some changes.

23.   Participants agreed that any additional references would be provided to the CBD Secretariat by workshop participants within two days of the closing of the workshop.

ITEM 7.   CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

24.   The co-chairs thanked all of the participants for their valuable contributions, the rapporteurs for their excellent support in preparing the draft report, the European Commission for their financial support of the workshop and the staff of the Secretariat for their hard work in servicing the meeting.

25.   The workshop was closed at 5:56 p.m. on Thursday, 11 September 2014.

Annex I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CBD Parties

Albania
1. Ms. Elvana Ramaj
Head of Biodiversity Unit
Directorate of Biodiversity and Protected Areas
Ministry of Environment
Rruga e Durresit, No 27
Tirana, Albania
Email: elvana.ramaj@moe.gov.al

Australia
2. Mr. Nicholas John Bax
Director
NERP Marine Biodiversity Hub
Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research
Organization
CSIRO Marine Laboratories, GPO Box 1538,
Hobart 7001 TAS, Australia
Email: nic.bax@csiro.au

Barbados
3. Ms. Caroline Bissada-Gooding
Marine Biologist
Coastal Zone Management Unit
Ministry of Environment and Drainage
Bay Street
St. Michael, Barbados
Email: cbissada-gooding@coastal.gov.bb

Belgium
4. Ms. Charlotte Herman
Legal Counsel and Expert
Federal Public Service Health, Food Chain
Safety and Environment
Marine Environment Unit
Belgium
Victor Hortaplein 40, bte 10
1060 Brussels, Belgium
Email: charlotte.herman@milieu.belgie.be

Cameroon
5. Mr. Collins Bruno Mboufack
Ecologic Monitoring Service
Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and
Sustainable Development
Yaoundé, Cameroon
Email: mboufack@yahoo.fr

China
6. Mr. Zhengguang Huang
Senior Engineer
South China Institute of Environmental Sciences
7 West Street Yuancun
Guangzhou, Guangdong Province, China
Email: huangzhengguang@scies.org

Colombia
7. Ms. Andrea Ramírez
Ministry of Environment and Sustainable
Development
Calle 37 # 8-40
Bogotá, Colombia
Email: aramirez@minambiente.gov.co

European Union
8. Mr. Sylvain Gambert
Policy Officer
Directorate General for Marine Affairs and
Fisheries
European Commission
Rue Joseph II, 99
Brussels B-1049 Belgium
Email: sylvain.gambert@ec.europa.eu

Germany
9. Mr. Gunnar Finke
Advisor "Blue Solutions"
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5 Postfach 5180
Eschborn D-65760, Germany
Email: gunnar.finke@giz.de

Iceland
10. Ms. Ester Anna Ármannsdóttir
National Planning Agency of Iceland
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
Skuggasund 1, 150 Reykjavík, Iceland
Email: ester@skipulagstofnun.is

Mexico
11. Ms. Elva Escobar Briones
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Instituto de Ciencias del Mar y Limnología
Laboratorio de Biodiversidad y Macroecología
04510 Ciudad de México, D.F.
México
Email: escobri@cmarl.unam.mx

Mozambique
12. Ms. Flora Celeste Arminda Ventura Mole
Head of Department
Ministry of the Coordination of Environmental
Affairs
Av. Acordos de Lusaka 2115
Maputo 2020, Mozambique
Email: floramole2002@yahoo.com

Palau
13. Mr. Lincoln Rehm
Researcher
Palau International Coral Reef Center
Koror, Palau
Email: lincolnrehm@gmail.com

Peru
14. Mr. Oscar Lazo Calle
Specialist in Marine and Coastal Management
Ministry of Environment of Peru
Ave. Javier Prado Oeste 1440 San Isidro
Lima 41, Peru
Email: olazo@minam.gob.pe

Philippines
15. Mr. Vincent Hilomen
Executive Director for Priority Programs
Department of Environment and Natural
Resources
Biodiversity Management Bureau
Quezon Avenue, Diliman
Quezon City, Philippines
Email: whilomen@yahoo.com,
whilomen@up.edu.ph

Seychelles
16. Mr. Allen Vosrie Cedras
Inner Island Manager
Seychelles National Parks Authority
Email: av.cedras@gmail.com

Other Governments

United States of America
17. Ms. Betsy Nicholson *(remote participant)*
Northeast Lead
Coastal Services Center
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Room 5128
Washington, DC 20230
United States of America
Email: Betsy.Nicholson@noaa.gov

Organizations

**UNEP Division of Environmental Policy
Implementation (UNEP/DEPI)**
18. Mr. Ole Vestergaard
UNEP Division of Environmental Policy
Implementation
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri
P.O. Box 30552, 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Email: Ole.Vestergaard@unep.org

**Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the
Global Environment Facility (GEF/STAP)**
19. Mr. Thomas Hammond
Secretary
GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel
(STAP), UNEP
STAP Secretariat
900 17th Street, NW, Suite 506
Washington, DC 20006
United States of America
Email: thomas.hammond@unep.org

20. Mr. Stephen Olsen
Consultant
GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel
(STAP), UNEP
702 South Rd.
Wakefield, RI 02879
United States of America
Email: sbo@crc.uri.edu

**UNEP World Conservation Monitoring
Centre (UNEP-WCMC)**
21. Ms. Hannah Thomas
UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre
219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 ODL
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland
Email: Hannah.thomas@unep-wcmc.org

Duke University
22. Mr. Jesse Cleary
Research Analyst
Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab,
Nicholas School of the Environment
Duke University
Corner of Science Drive and Towerview Road
Box 90360
Durham, North Carolina 27708
United States of America
Email: jesse.cleary@duke.edu

Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative (GOBI)
23. Mr. David Johnson
Coordinator
Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative Secretariat
Belbins Valley
Belbins, Ramsey, Hampshire S051 0PE
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland
Email:
david.johnson@seascapeconsultants.co.uk

ICCA Consortium
24. Ms. Vivienne Solis-Rivera
ICCA Consortium
CoopeSolidar R.L.
Apartado Postal 2459-2050
San José, Costa Rica
Email: vsolis@coopesolidar.org

**International Union for Conservation of
Nature (IUCN)**
25. Ms. Carole Martínez
Programme Coordinator
Regional Seas - EU Outermost Regions &
Overseas Countries & Territories
International Union for Conservation of Nature
Rue Mauverney 28
Gland CH-1196 1196
Switzerland
Email: carole.martinez@iucn.org

The Nature Conservancy (TNC)
26. Ms. Dominique Benzaken
International Marine Policy Senior Advisor
The Nature Conservancy
4245 North Fairfax Drive Suite 100
Arlington, VA 22203-1606
United States of America
Email: dbenzaken@tnc.org

World Ocean Council
27. Ms. Leslie-Ann McGee
Programs Director
World Ocean Council
Kingston, MA 02364
United States of America
Email: La.McGee@oceancouncil.org

World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)
28. Mr. Jochen Lamp
Head of Baltic Sea Office
WWF
Knieperwall 1
18439 Stralsund
Germany
Email: jochen.lamp@wwf.de

Observer

Brazil
29. Mr. Luis Guadagnin
Secretary
Permanent Delegation of Brazil to the International Civil Aviation Organization
Montreal, Canada
Email: luis.guadagnin@itamaraty.gov.br

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

30.   Ms. Jihyun Lee
Environmental Affairs Officer
Marine and Coastal Biodiversity
Science, Assessment and Monitoring Division
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
E-mail: jihyun.lee@cbd.int

31. Mr. Joseph Appiott
Associate Programme Officer
Marine and Coastal Biodiversity
Science, Assessment and Monitoring Division
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
E-mail: joseph.appiott@cbd.int

32. Ms. Jacqueline Grekin
Programme Assistant
Marine and Coastal Biodiversity
Science, Assessment and Monitoring Division
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
E-mail: jacqueline.grekin@cbd.int

33. Ms. Johany Martínez Quinto
Programme Assistant
Marine and Coastal Biodiversity
Science, Assessment and Monitoring Division
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
E-mail: johany.martinez@cbd.int

34. Mr. Yongnak Choi
Intern
Marine and Coastal Biodiversity
Science, Assessment and Monitoring Division
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
Email: yongnak.choi.intern@cbd.int

Annex II

SUMMARY OF THEME PRESENTATIONS

Background on MSP and Connections to Relevant CBD Work (by Nicholas Bax, Australia)

Mr. Bax began by highlighting a historical context for managing marine resources in the face of multiple uses. He noted that many existing international approaches to ocean and coastal management lacked important components, including an initial scoping of goals, clear objectives, identification of gaps and effective monitoring. Addressing issues in marine and coastal spaces was complicated because of the intersection of biodiversity, ecosystem values and human use, and was becoming more complex due to population growth.

Mr. Bax presented the results of a recent study presenting a framework for the use of scientific information related to ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) in applying MSP and ecosystem-based management. He noted that many approaches to managing marine resources tended to over-complicate MSP, especially at its initiation. The study, which was co-authored by Mr. Bax, suggested that, rather than searching for an optimal solution, MSP should be a gradual and iterative progress measured against clear objectives. Drawing on existing approaches, he proposed five essential steps for effective management—(1) scoping, (2) information gathering, (3) assessing impacts, (4) management actions, and (5) monitoring and evaluation—which supported early implementation of MSP, using available data, and can increase in the level of sophistication with increasing amounts of available information. The study conceptually applied to the use of scientific information related to EBSAs, which was gathered through the CBD progress of regional workshops to facilitate the description of EBSAs. Mr. Bax presented a framework to overlay human pressures on the values described by scientific information related to EBSAs, which could constitute the first cycle of an MSP process, supporting the potential development and implementation of a variety of management options, as appropriate. Future MSP cycles could then focus on expanded governance, increased engagement of multiple marine sectors, the use of improved information and targeted monitoring and evaluation. He concluded that scientific information related to EBSAs provided a sound basis for developing the scientific advice to support national and international management of the world's oceans by identifying significant marine areas and the criteria for which they were valued by different types of stakeholders.

MSP in Practice: Transitioning from Planning to Implementation (by Ole Vestergaard, UNEP-DEPI, and Hannah Thomas, UNEP-WCMC)

Mr. Vestergaard and Ms. Thomas presented the MSP in Practice Initiative, a collaboration between UNEP and GEF/STAP, in close collaboration with UNEP-WCMC, the CBD Secretariat, the German Federal Enterprise for International Cooperation (GIZ/Germany) and The Nature Conservancy, which aimed to collect, review and share practical experiences in MSP in order to understand which approaches were most effective in different contexts and settings. The initiative addressed decision X/18 of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD on MSP and the work of UNEP on marine and coastal ecosystem-based management and capacity-building support to Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans towards implementing their Strategic Direction 2013-2016.

Mr. Vestergaard and Ms. Thomas noted that MSP processes could be varied in their approaches, but that many faced challenges when moving into implementation. The MSP in Practice Initiative aimed to gather practical experiences from MSP development and implementation in different global regions to understand why some processes were successful while others had shortcomings. The Initiative asked the following questions:

- What are the challenges or constraints that managers experience in MSP implementation?
- Which elements of the planning phase are most critical to ensuring effective implementation?

- Are those critical planning elements specific to certain environmental, socio-political and governance contexts?
- To what extent might a participatory process contribute to successful implementation and outcomes?; and
- Are there lessons that we can learn and share about important barriers or enabling factors that can assist planning or implementation in the future?

Mr. Vestergaard and Ms. Thomas presented the methodology and results from the MSP in Practice Initiative. This included the collation of practical experiences from different MSP processes through a global online survey, followed by a technical workshop held from 6 to 8 May 2014 at UNEP-WCMC in Cambridge, UK, where national MSP practitioners and experts were invited to share their experiences. The responses to the global survey were presented in an information document prepared for the eighteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.[1] A total of 80 MSP processes were analysed, at least 30 of which had already reached implementation. The main results from the analysis of the first two questions posed by the initiative were introduced. The three main challenges that were reported by practitioners were governance issues, insufficient funds, and data and knowledge issues. The three main enabling factors were strong stakeholder engagement, good data and tools, and government support. It did not appear as if the challenges or the enabling factors were specific to either developed or developing countries. The initiative generated the following key questions:

- How do the enabling factors and needs of MSP processes vary by context and can we use a "typology" approach that classifies MSP processes to help us understand this?
- How could we document enabling factors in the context of a given MSP setting?
- How might a better understanding of the context-specific aspects of MSP help tailor future MSP initiatives and build future capacity?

Mr. Vestergaard and Ms. Thomas highlighted the following recommendations for further work, based on the results of the initiative: Understand the drivers of success; disseminate MSP experiences; better understand MSP outcomes; and build capacity for increased success.

Adaptive and Collaborative Approaches to MSP (by Stephen Olsen, GEF/STAP)

In his presentation, Mr. Olsen emphasized that the principle challenges of MSP lay in the realm of governance. He explained that the practice of MSP was as much a socio-political process as a scientific-technical process. As an expression of the ecosystem approach, MSP addressed the linkages between social and environmental systems. The major challenges of implementing a successful MSP usually lay in the social domain, as the process involved bringing about changes in the ways that user groups and institutions functioned and behaved. The emphasis placed by the ecosystem approach on integrating across both environmental and social issues and outcomes had become widely recognized as necessary and was a departure from traditional sector-by-sector management.

He noted that, when applied at significant spatial scales, MSP was a complex and protracted process that typically required three to five years of planning and negotiation among stakeholders before the transition could be made into the implementation phase. There were a number of guides and handbooks that presented methodologies designed to guide MSP practitioners through this process. These guides all emphasize that MSP was a repeating cyclical process involving anywhere from four to ten distinct steps.

Mr. Olsen pointed out that even a well-executed MSP process did not necessarily produce the desired outcomes. He noted that this was a reality across all forms of ecosystem governance since the complexity

---

[1] UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/INF/23.

of the issues and the forces of change produced a dynamic and rapidly changing context in which to institute a planning process that produced changes in how user groups and institutions functioned in a marine area. Mr. Olsen introduced the "Orders of Outcomes" framework,[2] which aimed to support the transition from MSP development to MSP implementation by disaggregating the ultimate goal of sustainable forms of marine development into a sequence of tangible outcomes. The hypothesis was that certain enabling conditions must be in place if the transition to effective MSP implementation was to be realized.

Presentations on national experiences relevant to MSP

A New Experience in the USA: Regional Ocean Planning for New England Waters (by Betsy Nicholson, United States of America) (remote presentation)

Ms. Nicholson delivered a presentation describing a framework in the United States to implement coastal and Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning (CMSP) at a multi-state, regional scale in response to the development of a national ocean policy, developed in 2010. This policy directed federal agencies to establish regional planning bodies in nine regions, comprising federal, state, and tribal bodies as well as fishery management councils, charged with developing a coastal and marine spatial plan for the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) through an ecosystem- and science-based, participatory and transparent process. The northeast region of the United States was the first to establish a regional planning body, which benefitted from existing partnerships between federal and state governments in the region, the existing state-level ocean plans, private and public funds to initiate the process, a legal basis, and the need for comprehensive planning for new and expanded uses (including offshore wind, offshore aquaculture, and sand and gravel mining). The regional ocean plan, which would be finalized by the end of 2016, was focused on three goals: (1) healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems; (2) effective decision-making; and (3) compatibility among ocean uses. Stakeholders had been engaged in the development of the plan both formally and informally, including through public meetings, topical workshops, technical working groups, state- and regional-level forums and participatory mapping with ocean users.

Challenges faced in this process included: (1) resistance from some stakeholders to the means by which the political mandate to undertake the process was developed (i.e., Executive Order); (2) challenges due to the northeast being the first region to test regional MSP in the United States; (3) different preferences related to the nature of stakeholder consultations, and 4) uncertainty regarding to how the data tools would be used in the future implementation of the plan. Opportunities identified through this process included: (1) the fact that a pragmatic culture enabled focused effort on emerging ocean uses, (2) the development of a new planning role for tribes brought broader ecosystem perspective and improved relationships, (3) the precedent for data access and interoperability, due to the development of the plan provided a powerful ocean data portal tool and easier access to federal data in the future, and (4) heightened expectations for transparency beyond the planning phase due to the nature of public outreach and stakeholder engagement during the process.

MSP in Belgium - Lessons Learned (by Charlotte Herman, Belgium)

Ms. Herman explained that Belgium had integrated all marine spatial allocation decisions into one overall plan, in order to implement successful MSP. Belgium's plan had been structured on the basis of spatial analysis, a long-term vision, short-term objectives and measures, and actions. A key factor of the process was its strong legal basis, which was critical in determining, for example, which authorities made the decisions, what information they used, and with whom they consulted. A clear procedure for spatial planning was essential so that all stakeholders involved knew and understood their role. Also, the plan itself had been established by royal decree, which created the legal certainty essential for future planning, as it attracted investors and overcame uncertainties faced by stakeholders in the past. She explained that

---

[2] Olsen, S. 2003. Ocean & Coastal Management 46, 347–361.

Belgium had organized a process that would enable their marine spatial plan to be a living and flexible document in order to support long-term goals.

Ms. Herman noted the importance of stakeholder consultation on the basis of key principles, such as equality of stakeholders and transparency, as stakeholders brought in valuable information, and consultation helped to build support for implementation. Stakeholder consultation helped to identify challenges and opportunities, and created a framework for dialogue and information-sharing to support the planning process. She also highlighted the need to incorporate all relevant data in the overall planning process. Belgium's marine spatial plan would be evaluated every six years, with potential additional evaluations within these six year time frames.

Colombia's MSP Experience (by Andrea Ramírez, Colombia)

Ms. Ramírez described Colombia's experience with MSP. Colombia's National Environmental Policy for Marine, Coastal and Insular Areas (PNAOCI), adopted in 2000, delimited the Colombian coastal zone and defined 12 environmental MSP units (two marine and 10 coastal) under the Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) framework. In the past 14 years, the country had advanced in developing MSP through ICZM plans, the identification and establishment of a national marine protected areas network, the zoning of coastal areas and the preparation of guidelines to meet national needs.

She reviewed some of the lessons learned over the past 14 years through Colombia's experience, such as the need for local engagement and ownership of the processes and concepts, and the importance of creating governance structures and a legal framework. She also described challenges faced, such as the need to articulate ICZM and MSP outcomes to other spatial planning processes, e.g., freshwater catchments, strategic ecosystem management plans, marine protected areas, land use and sectoral planning), the need to standardize zoning categories among all planning processes, the need for information on deep-water areas, the need to engage economic sectors, the limited availability of financial resources for the development and implementation of the plan, the need for political commitment and consultation with local communities, and the need to consider climate change and other drivers of change.

She described how Colombia was moving forward to address these challenges and adopt national guidelines that complied with the new legal framework, leading to the development and implementation of the MSP process for the 12 environmental MSP units.

MSP in the Philippines (by Mr. Vincent Hilomen, Philippines)

Mr. Hilomen noted that the use of MSP tools was widespread in the Philippines. He provided an overview of how the Philippines used MSP as a set of tools to help develop plans for sustainable use zones in a coastal area. These tools were anchored in science-based concepts and principles such as the ecosystem approach and integrated coastal management. The tools considered key elements such as the distribution and status of the various coastal resources, vulnerability of these resources to various types of pressures and drivers, the social and economic factors in the area, as well as the objectives, vision and future plans of the stakeholders. The process for MSP in the Philippines included consultation with all relevant stakeholders, including indigenous and local communities. This process was used by various local government entities in developing their comprehensive land-use plans, which guided development. He described how the effects of climate change were considered in the planning process in the Philippines to take into account sea-level rise, increases in sea surface temperatures, intensified weather disturbances and ocean acidification.

To date, MSP in the Philippines had resulted in the establishment of a large number of marine protected areas (MPAs), as well as networks of MPAs and seascapes. MSP had also served to reduce the pressures and drivers on the country's marine resources, supporting their sustainability.

Seychelles MSP Initiative (by Allen Cedras, Seychelles)

In his presentation, Mr. Cedras described the Seychelles Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) Initiative, which was focused on planning and management to support the health and sustainable, long-term use of the Seychelles Exclusive Economic Zone, a marine area covering 1,374,000 km^2 and encompassing the Seychelles archipelago of 115 islands. The MSP Initiative was a government-led process, with planning and facilitation managed in a partnership between The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the Government of Seychelles (GOS) and the Global Environmental Facility of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP – GEF) Programme Coordinating Unit (GOS/UNDP/GEF). Mr. Cedras highlighted that the Seychelles MSP Initiative took an integrated, multi-sectoral approach. It included input from the country's major marine sectors, such as fishing, tourism, conservation and petroleum development, in order to develop a holistic climate-smart multi-use design, integrating the challenges presented by climate change into planning and management efforts.

He described how the Initiative's multi-use design would serve as the basis for guiding the strategies and decisions of the Seychelles Conservation & Climate Adaptation Trust (SeyCCAT), established as part of the Debt-for-Climate-Change-Adaptation swap, which was being led by the Government of Seychelles. Phase I of the Initiative (February 2014 – June 2015) would produce zoning design options, zoning tools and draft management strategies, including a draft zoning map, as a basis for further development and implementation of the national multi-use plan.

Annex III

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP DISCUSSION ON THE REVIEW OF EXISTING GUIDANCE ON MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING, AND IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS IN EXISTING GUIDANCE AND TOOLKITS

1.   Under agenda item 3, the workshop discussed existing guidance on MSP, and potential gaps in existing guidance and toolkits.

2.   The workshop noted that MSP related closely to the work under the Convention on Biological Diversity. The fundamental principles of MSP were strongly integrated into the programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity under the Convention, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, which focussed on the ecosystem approach, the precautionary approach, area-based management and cross-sectoral approaches, including other relevant international and regional agreements. In particular, scientific information related to ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) compiled through the CBD's regional EBSA workshop process, could support the formulation of management objectives.

3.   Although MSP was a relatively new term in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity, workshop participants noted that it had been utilized through related approaches such as integrated coastal and marine area management (IMCAM), marine and coastal protected areas, and the application of the ecosystem approach, and that there was a wide range of experience and lessons from which to learn. Workshop participants recognized that the tools needed to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets already existed,[3] and noted the considerable amount of information and guidance available related to MSP, as described in the following materials provided as background information to the workshop:

- CBD Technical Series 68: Marine Spatial Planning in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity

- Compilation of information to support the discussions of the Expert Workshop to Provide Consolidated Practical Guidance and a Toolkit for Marine Spatial Planning (UNEP/CBD/MCB/EM/2014/4/INF/1)

- Using scientific information related to ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) to implement marine spatial planning and ecosystem based management (UNEP/CBD/MCB/EM/2014/4/INF/2)

- Marine spatial planning in practice—transitioning from planning to implementation (UNEP/CBD/MCB/EM/2014/4; UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/INF/23)

4.   Many workshop participants noted that much of the guidance on MSP tended to describe MSP (or MSP within the framework of integrated coastal and marine area management) as a series of steps. This included guidance from the GESAMP 5 step framework,[4] the PEMSEA 4-step process for integrated

---

[3] SBSTTA 17 Recommendation XVII/1.

[4] GESAMP (Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection) (1996). The contributions of science to integrated coastal management. Reports and studies No. 61. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.

coastal management,[5] the GEF Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan 5-step guidance[6] and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission 10-step MSP guide.[7]

5.   The workshop discussions were enriched by the information documents and background materials made available to the workshop participants, including the outputs of the MSP in Practice Initiative. Workshop participants used these resources to consider their own MSP experiences and how existing guidance could be improved to meet specific needs.

6.   Workshop participants also recognized the challenges and barriers faced by indigenous and local communities in accessing marine resources, scientific information and planning tools, and noted the need to ensure their full and effective participation and access to appropriate information in MSP processes.

Barriers and challenges faced in the MSP process, particularly in moving from planning to implementation[8]

7.   Under this agenda item, participants discussed the barriers and challenges in the MSP process and suggested the following means to address identified barriers and challenges, particularly in moving from planning to implementation:

        (a)   *Political support and legal frameworks for MSP implementation* – Many MSP processes fail to be implemented due to a lack of political willingness to adopt an MSP plan and support its implementation and enforcement;

        (b)   *Availability/accessibility of data/information or knowledge* – While the best available data/information should be used, it is important to recognize that a large amount of biophysical, socioeconomic and cultural data/information is not a necessary prerequisite to implement MSP. In addition, there will always be a time lag between the collection of data and the action taken on the decisions on which they are based. An adaptive management cycle can ensure that the most relevant and/or up-to-date information can be incorporated into decision-making. In addition to scientific information, traditional or local knowledge and socioeconomic information play important roles. Proxy data can be also very useful in data-poor regions;

        (c)   *Understanding governance mechanisms* – It is important to understand governance mechanisms in MSP. It is also necessary to find a balance between top-down and bottom-up governance approaches. In some countries, the top-down approach could pose some challenges in gaining support from certain stakeholders. In other countries, however, it was found that putting MSP into law and establishing formal procedural steps for MSP created momentum and provided transparent guidance for what all authorities should be doing;

        (d)   *Robust stakeholder education and engagement* – Understanding stakeholders' interests and their vision for the future use of the common space is fundamental to the MSP process. Consulting with and engaging stakeholders, particularly indigenous and local communities, in MSP decision-making

---

[5] IWICM (The International Workshop on Integrated Coastal Management in Tropical Developing Countries: Lessons Learned from Successes and Failures). (1996). Enhancing the success of integrated coastal management: Good practices in the formulation, design and implementation of integrated coastal management initiatives. MPP-EAS Technical Report No. 2, 32p. GEF/UNDP/IMO Regional Programme for the Prevention and Management of Marine Pollution in the East Asian Seas and the Coastal Management Center, Quezon City, Philippines.

[6] GEF (Global Environment Facility). (2005). The GEF IW TDA/SAP Process: A Proposed Best Practice Approach. GEF International Waters Programme.

[7] IOC (2005). A handbook for measuring the progress and outcomes of integrated coastal and ocean management – Preliminary version. IOC Manuals and Guides 46. International Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris.

[8] CBD workshop discussions referred repeatedly to five phases of MSP: preparation, planning, adoption, implementation and evaluation. These reflect a generic five stage management cycle, as described in UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/INF/23.

can sometimes entail significant resources, but has been reported by MSP practitioners as one of the most important enabling factors for success.[9] In this regard, socio-ecological understanding is key to ensuring the engagement of all relevant stakeholders;

(e)   *Clearly articulated markers for progress* – Including clear baselines, measurable indicators and setting clear goals within management plans is necessary to assess progress and adapt to changing environments. In addition to environmental indicators, it is important to identify the relevant socioeconomic, cultural and governance indicators that can measure the broad range of benefits that MSP can provide;

(f)   *Participation of relevant ministries/government agencies* – Given the multi-sectoral nature of MSP, clear channels of communication need to be established to support collaboration among the relevant ministries/government agencies. In many countries, MSP processes are led by the ministry dealing with environmental issues, potentially giving certain stakeholders the perception that the MSP process is inherently focused on conservation. As MSP supports the ecosystem approach to sustainable resource use, guidance on how to integrate environmental and sustainable development goals within institutional frameworks and communication channels is extremely important;

(g)   *Integration of MSP with other relevant processes* – MSP is an overarching tool for reconciling spatial conflicts, and should align with processes such as development planning, the establishment and management of MPA networks, integrated coastal and marine area management, coastal land use planning, freshwater management and existing regulatory frameworks. It is also an important tool for the consideration of sustainable development, livelihoods and cultural values;

(h)   *Understanding of competing interests and conflicting uses* – As MSP is designed to be a tool for reconciling the overlap of marine use areas, identifying present and future competing interests is a core part of the MSP process. Developing a strong stakeholder engagement structure within a well-designed and transparent decision-making process can assist in supporting conflict resolution. Efforts should be made to ensure that all stakeholder groups have the opportunity to contribute to the process;

(i)   *Capacity for implementation and enforcement* – MSP experiences demonstrate that significant time and effort are often expended during the planning phase, and that financial and human resources and capacity for the implementation phase are often insufficient.

Gaps and areas in need of improvement in existing guidance and the toolkits for MSP

8.   Under this agenda item, participants identified the following issues as gaps and areas in need of improvement in existing MSP guidance and toolkits:

(a)   *Guidance on successful plan initiation and adoption* – Gaining political and stakeholder support and commitment is an essential part of any MSP initiative; it is also the most challenging part. Understanding who has the power to influence MSP adoption and how to engage them will help in identifying the incentives – environmental, economic, political and social – that are needed to facilitate successful implementation;

(b)   *Identifying MSP outcomes* – Practical experience from different countries, regions and contexts demonstrates that there is often an "implementation gap", where the MSP plan itself does not necessarily lead to the changes in stakeholder behaviour that would be required to deliver the overall goals of the MSP process. Experience in the application of ecosystem-based adaptation emphasizes the value of applying an "orders of outcomes" framework,[10] which identifies outcomes that can be used as

---

[9] UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/INF/23.

[10] UNEP/GPA (2006). Ecosystem-based management: Markers for assessing progress. UNEP/GPA, The Hague.

markers for progress towards behavioural change. Focusing on "outcomes" is also easily understood by policy makers and stakeholders, and can facilitate support for overall MSP planning and implementation;

(c)   *Governance, environmental and socioeconomic baselines*[11] – Governance issues have been reported as a major challenge to MSP processes around the world.[12] There is experience in establishing baselines from which to measure environmental change. There is, however, a lack of guidance on how to establish governance and socioeconomic baselines to ensure that progress in decision-making capacity and livelihood improvements can be measured, and also that potential problems can be identified and addressed in the initial phase of the MSP process. There is a need for guidance on developing governance baselines;

(d)   *Role of context in MSP* – Comparisons or evaluations of MSP processes can prove difficult when there are great differences between the geographical, cultural, social, political and environmental conditions in which MSP initiatives are implemented. Classifying MSP processes by meaningful elements such as spatial scale, cultural and social context, available funding and environmental conditions can be a very useful way to understand the context-specific drivers for change and the likelihood of success;

(e)   *Peer-to-peer learning through dissemination of case studies* – Learning from other relevant and context-specific examples is an effective way to understand, and therefore overcome, the challenges that might be faced in similar processes. As such, the dissemination of information from case studies, as well as direct exchange of experience between MSP practitioners, is encouraged;

(f)   *Cyclical nature of the MSP process* – Rather than being a linear process of steps, MSP is a cyclical and adaptive process. As such, progress can be made by repeatedly going through the stages of the cycle. This serves to build momentum for MSP and also supports stakeholder engagement, measuring achievements of goals and refinement of activities to tackle issues as they become progressively more complex and as the need for certainty and information increases;

(g)   *Developing unambiguous goals* – Existing guidance emphasizes the need for clear, measurable goals. However, further guidance is needed on this. Experience in MSP has also demonstrated the need for quantitative measurements of progress. Clear goals are essential for developing direction and assessing success. However, reaching consensus on goals in the short-term and for the full range of stakeholders may be extremely challenging. It may often be necessary to have an institution with the executive decision-making power to ensure that clear goals are established[13] and with the ability to play a key role in supporting and enabling implementation of decisions at the ground-level;

(h)   *Incorporating traditional knowledge and engaging indigenous and local communities in MSP* – In many MSP processes, indigenous and local communities are often consulted during the final stages of the process, which limits their full engagement in MSP development and implementation. Numerous experiences have demonstrated how indigenous and local communities can be more fully engaged in MSP, including through formal legislative frameworks and mapping of resources as well as recreational, commercial and cultural activities;

(i)   *Addressing sustainable use, climate change and disaster response* – MSP is a powerful tool for reconciling spatial conflicts and facilitating sustainable resource use. However, experience in

---

[11] A "governance baseline" can be defined as a common narrative that traces how human activities and environmental conditions have changed over time, and considers projections of trends and their drivers at several scales over a defined period. Further information can be found at: Olsen, S.B.; Page, G.G. & Ochoa, E. (2009): The Analysis of Governance Responses to Ecosystem Change: A Handbook for Assembling a Baseline. LOICZ Reports & Studies No. 34. GKSS Research Center, Geesthacht, 87 pages).

[12] UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/INF/23.

[13] UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/INF/23.

MSP has demonstrated the urgent need to address multiple, challenging objectives, such as rehabilitation and reconstruction of disaster-stricken areas, sea-level rise and coastal zone erosion, in addition to sustainable resource use. There is a lack of guidance on how to incorporate elements of these challenges into MSP in an effective way;

(j)   *Sustainable finance* – Innovative financing mechanisms and the valuation of ecosystem services, as well as enhanced awareness of socioeconomic values, can be a powerful incentive for engaging politicians and decision-makers. There are some positive examples of using innovative financing mechanisms, including through the use of a debt swap approach to sustainably finance coastal adaptation. There is a need to understand how innovative financing mechanisms and ecosystem services valuation could support the achievement of environmental and socioeconomic goals through MSP;

(k)   *Public and sector engagement on the benefits of MSP* – Developing support for MSP in the public and among resource-use sectors is an important driver of MSP success. Messages that clearly communicate what MSP is, what it can achieve and how people and sectors will benefit from it are helpful in ensuring support for MSP within civil society, government and the private sector. Information should be accessible and understandable to each social and cultural context. Raising public awareness requires specific capacities and tools that are often not sufficiently considered in existing guidance documents;

(l)   *Dissemination of the results and benefits of MSP* – Practitioners involved in various aspects of MSP may not be aware of the guidance available, its full extent, or the guidance specific to their particular situation. Increasing the accessibility of locally relevant MSP guidance through existing and new communication channels is needed to improve its uptake and adoption;

(m)   *Monitoring and evaluation* – Developing appropriate indicators for the outcomes of each phase of MSP will help demonstrate measurable progress and support adaptive approaches. Management strategies in marine spatial plans should include a set of indicators, which should be directly related to the plan objectives, goals and vision.

Annex IV

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP DISCUSSION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROPOSALS TO FILL GAPS IN EXISTING GUIDANCE AND TOOLKITS ON MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING, AND PREPARATION OF CONSOLIDATED PRACTICAL GUIDANCE AND A TOOLKIT ON MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING

1.   Under agenda item 4, workshop participants discussed the development of proposals to fill gaps in existing guidance and toolkits on MSP, and preparation of consolidated practical guidance and a toolkit on MSP. Discussions under this agenda item were held in both plenary and breakout group discussions.

2.   As noted in the discussion under agenda item 3, step-by-step guidance was available on MSP, integrated coastal management and/or other land use management plans, but existing guidance did not often reflect the differences in scale and scope of MSP efforts and was inadequate for first-generation MSP efforts, particularly for initiatives that did not have significant long-term funding and technical assistance.

3.   In this regard, there is a need for guidance that:

(a)   Offers practical advice on how to initiate an MSP process, and how to sustain an effort through implementation;

(b)   Recognizes that an incremental approach to MSP can reduce barriers to initiation;

(c)   Recognizes the difficulties of gaining formal approval for an MSP planning process, and supports an early emphasis on accessing the necessary funding and authority for implementation;

(d)   Recognizes that cross-sectoral participation needs to be emphasized at an early stage;

(e)   Addresses the challenges of successful MSP implementation, including sustaining changes in the behaviour of users and institutions;

(f)   Addresses adequate recognition of the governance structure of indigenous and local communities and traditional knowledge applications to MSP.

4.   Participants noted the following considerations that should be taken into account in preparing consolidated practical guidance to support Parties in the development and implementation of MSP.

Facilitating cross-sectoral coordination and decision-making in the development and implementation of MSP (see Appendix to this annex)

Guidance on the sequence of outcomes that measure the progress of a successful MSP initiative

5.   In contrast to the existing guidance addressing the process of MSP, there is little guidance on how to identify and track anticipated outcomes associated with each phase that will indicate that an MSP initiative is having an impact.

6.   The Orders of Outcomes framework[14,15,16] provides indicators for assessing MSP outcomes as an initiative that progresses through the assembly of the enabling conditions (1st Order), through implementation (2nd Order) to the generation of desired changes in social and environmental conditions (3rd Order). The 4th Order assesses whether 3rd Order changes have contributed to the ultimate goal of sustainable development.

---

[14] Olsen, S. (2003). Frameworks and indicators for assessing progress in integrated coastal management initiatives. Ocean & Coastal Management, 46, 347-361.

[15] UNEP/GPA (2006). Ecosystem-based management: Markers for assessing progress. UNEP/GPA, The Hague

[16] Olsen, S.B.; Page, G.G. & Ochoa, E. (2009): The Analysis of Governance Responses to Ecosystem Change: A Handbook for Assembling a Baseline. LOICZ Reports & Studies No. 34. GKSS Research Center, Geesthacht, 87 pages.

7.   Existing monitoring and evaluation protocols for initiatives that have adopted the ecosystem approach focus primarily upon 3rd Order outcomes. Tracking 1st and 2nd Order outcomes is necessary to provide earlier feedback on progress, since 3rd Order outcomes take many years, and often decades, to appear. This approach could be further developed in the form of a common framework of MSP outcomes and the development of indicators for MSP implementation.

Guidance on enhancing cross-sectoral engagement

8.   Existing guidance emphasizes the importance of the technical aspects of the MSP process, including compiling background information on the environmental context, the distribution and interactions among environmental process and features, and the distribution and impacts of human activities. Practical guidance should address the social, political and economic dimensions of MSP and also develop an approach for mapping and assessing qualitative and quantitative socioeconomic data and processes.

9.   Although existing guidance emphasizes the importance of cross-sectoral engagement in obtaining governmental approval and involving those agencies and sectors that will play important roles in MSP implementation, there is a lack of guidance on how such cross-sectoral engagement is to be achieved, especially for first-generation MSP initiatives where sectoral agencies of government and business institutions operate independently, and where there are limited comparable examples of integrated planning.

10.   In this regard, practical guidance should focus on how to:

        (a)   Define and address the political and economic dimensions across sectors, including how to gain political support;

        (b)   Identify the cultural dimensions, and enhance collaboration with different cultures and recognize their needs;

        (c)   Identify, in the initial stages of the planning phase, which governmental institutions and stakeholders are anticipated to play significant roles in gaining formal approval for MSP and in its implementation;

        (d)   Identify how to structure cross-sectoral integration around the issues that are of concern to stakeholders and how to resolve stakeholder conflicts;

        (e)   Identify how to engage different stakeholders in the issue analysis and planning process, including identifying barriers to enforcement and achieving voluntary compliance;

        (f)   Emphasize the need to demonstrate fairness, transparency and inclusiveness, including by addressing important ethical issues, to assist in building trust;

        (g)   Emphasize the value of a long-term historical perspective on how current conditions and current issues evolved in a given area in order to build a common narrative among the institutions and stakeholders in an MSP initiative to provide context for defining goals and objectives and to assist in building trust;

        (h)   Integrate consideration of likely future changes in socioeconomic and environmental conditions into the MSP process as part of an adaptive management approach.

Guidance on different spatial and temporal scales, capacity and complexity

11.   Although available guidance stresses that MSP must be tailored to the features and the issues specific to a given area, further efforts are needed to provide specific guidance on how to respond to the differences in spatial and temporal scales, differences in existing capacity to implement the ecosystem approach, and the complexity of the issues to be addressed.

12.   Thus, practical guidance should focus on:

        (a)   Understanding the context and scope of MSP initiatives and learning from MSP initiatives with similar characteristics;

        (b)   Identifying how different institutional and governance structures influence engagement over the range of scale and scope of MSP initiatives;

        (c)   Stressing that MSP initiatives should be undertaken in an iterative manner where initial efforts complete the sequence of MSP development, endorsement and implementation in a series of iterations that begin by addressing relatively simple issues and proceed to tackling the more difficult issues, noting that such an incremental approach supports enhanced capacity and, if successful, builds constituencies and governmental commitment for MSP practices;

        (d)   Using case studies, including examples of failures as well as successes, to demonstrate how to proceed, and including the perspectives and contributions of stakeholders from as many sectors as possible;

        (e)   Providing methodologies that enable initiatives to track their progress using common sets of indicators as a means for self-monitoring and collective learning;

        (f)   Providing practical methodologies to work with indigenous and local communities where uses overlap with their rights and access to marine resources;

        (g)   Providing guidance on the use of existing training programs and facilities, including curricula adapted to specific stages of the MSP process.

Integrating Various Interests, Needs and Perspectives of Stakeholders throughout the Planning and Implementation Process

Guidance on understanding stakeholder perceptions, roles and needs

13.   It is important to identify and understand stakeholder roles and interests, and their dependence on ecosystem services and the benefits they provide, to enable their effective engagement in planning and implementation. Simple mapping techniques can be used to visualize the roles of decision-makers and stakeholders. Stakeholder mapping can include characterization of different uses of ecosystem services, authorities, rights and equity aspects, and include information on stakeholder inter-connection in national or local economies. Understanding the relationship between direct and indirect stakeholders is important (e.g., women and children in fish-processing, boat owners vs. crew, suppliers), as is understanding the aspirations and needs of specific stakeholders, such as indigenous groups.

14.   Stakeholder baselines may be developed, which describe past and future anticipated use of ecosystem services, expectations of future roles, traditional use of resources and access to ecosystem services.

Guidance on organizing effective stakeholder input

15.   It is important to create realistic perceptions among stakeholders of their roles and influence in the decision-making process. It is also necessary to provide clarity and transparency in political decisions. It may be useful to consider when stakeholder input is particularly essential and when it may be less important in order to avoid process "fatigue" among stakeholders. Larger-scale processes often entail less direct stakeholder input and influence. In some areas, the planning process can be largely initiated and driven by users and local stakeholders with limited initial government engagement. It is important to ensure transparency about who makes decisions at different planning stages, and how and when stakeholders can provide input at relevant stages.

16.   Certain tasks during the planning process can be delegated to a subset of experts or planners charged with undertaking specific studies or background analyses. Guidance on undertaking such tasks should be clearly defined at the outset of the planning process, including outlining methods and data to be used in technical analyses, and outlining when stakeholders should be consulted. Stakeholder trust and buy-in into the MSP planning process may be enhanced using common data collection protocols, ethical codes for the use of traditional knowledge and information, and standardized approaches for monitoring and assessment of ecosystem health or valuation of ecosystem services (including non-use services, such as cultural, social and aesthetic values).

17.   It is critical to learn from past experiences, good practices and mistakes. It is useful to ensure that diverse inputs and experiences from previous planning and management activities are incorporated in MSP processes.

18.   Behaviour or perceptions among stakeholders of their roles can be shifted due to external, unforeseen drivers and new users.

Guidance on effective stakeholder communication

19.   Stakeholder communication strategies are useful in ensuring consultative planning. This can outline the use of non-technical terms or customization of language towards specific audiences and purposes. Communication should be tailored and disseminated using different relevant media targeted at specific stakeholders. Moreover, it is important to consider carefully sociological and cultural aspects in stakeholder communication, being sensitive to local customs, norms and traditions.

Utilizing the Best Available Scientific Information and Linking Spatial Mapping to Planning and Decision-making

Guidance based on different stages of the MSP process

20.   Participants noted a clear distinction between the needs of countries based on different stages of their MSP process. Those countries just embarking on MSP have significantly different data concerns than those with maturing MSP processes. Examples of challenges identified include:

(a) In the initial stages of the MSP process:
- Deciding what data is needed and how is it selected
- Determining who should be in charge of MSP information (e.g., should it be held centrally or by individual sectors?)
- Gathering historical, socioeconomic and cultural data
- Securing funding

(b) As the MSP process progresses:
- Establishing a protocol on how to agree on common datasets combining information held by different stakeholders
- Establishing a clearing-house mechanism to validate national baseline data
- Acquiring resources to maintain long-term datasets
- Dealing with a large amount of information, establishing priorities and being selective about which information to use
- Incorporating information on new and emerging issues such as resilience to climate change
- Deciding which tools are best for individual situations

(c) Moving to MSP implementation:
- Recognizing that data for MSP implementation are different from those needed for planning

- Defining agreed-upon targets
- Recognizing variability in data quality among different sectors and providing support for those sectors with data shortcomings
- Establishing transparency of government data standards
- Maintaining financial and human resources

21.   Participants also recognized the value of an MSP community of practice that can provide examples from case studies and toolkit solutions for many of these challenges, with opportunities to transfer knowledge from maturing MSP processes to situations where MSP is less well-established. Many examples were presented at the workshop.

Guidance on availability of scientific information

22.   Not all types of data are available spatially. This is generally due to the fact that scientific information is often collected without planning in mind. Furthermore, little is known of the scientific basis for cumulative impacts, although some progress is being made to improve understanding of cumulative impacts.

23.   Established marine spatial plans have used datasets that were already in place, while some MSP processes required data generation at the outset. They have drawn from scientific assessment and monitoring efforts to determine environmental parameters (e.g., sediment transport) that can underpin location requirements (e.g., suitability of sand and gravel quality and availability). Visualization of this scientific information, using GIS layers, is a powerful planning tool.

24.   Several practical data management issues need to be addressed to ensure efficient use of existing scientific data. Data discovery helps maximize the utility of existing data. Well-developed metadata is required to drive this discovery process, in addition to addressing data comparability, appropriate scale of use and describing the context of the data that is collected.

25.   In general, biophysical data is more accessible than socioeconomic data in a spatial format, and can be available as long-term time series and associated metadata. Planners can take advantage of this data and supplement it with data produced by industry (e.g., environmental impact assessments). MSP data should include both state and process data. Collaboration with industry and non-governmental organizations during the planning process can help fill data gaps. Open access to such information is an incentive to promote stakeholder dialogue and build trust. Data providers need to know where, how and in what form the data they supply will be used. Exchange must also be facilitated to connect data from different areas.

26.   MSP can benefit from strict data protocols. Further discussion is needed on the most appropriate information systems, data repositories, custodianship and incentives to share scientific information. Scientific information collected by projects of limited duration is not always passed on or subsequently made available. Reasonable levels of generalization can be acceptable for MSP, but spatial accuracy is essential.

27.   In the light of the need for MSP to be pragmatic, guidance should recognize that scientific information needs to be presented in a form that is useful to decision-makers. There will also be circumstances where scientific information is limited due to lack of capacity for data collection or as a result of poor data stewardship. Solutions include the use of proxies and analogue data as well as modelling projections.

Guidance on ensuring use of the best available scientific information

28.   Quality assurance of information for MSP is achieved through expert validation. In some cases, national processes have been established to ensure data quality. For example, some countries have established an advisory committee to validate data quality. In other cases, where no rigorous system is in place, Parties rely on normal peer-review processes. Grey literature is also useful in many cases. It should be recognized that public information is not always up to date and that MSP cannot always rely on comprehensive scientific information.

29.   Parties in the early stages of MSP require guidance to consider the full implications of cost-effective, high-quality data collection. Transboundary projects, which share data with neighbouring countries, require specific arrangements to ensure data quality, reliability and compatibility.

Guidance on integrating biological data and human use data

30.   Equity in allocation of effort among sectors is required in data development and presentation. A component of this equity in data creation and integration involves data transparency. Transparency regarding the use of data can enhance support from various stakeholders in integration of different datasets and can build consensus about shared data utility.

31.   Multi-sectoral data development and participatory mapping can improve transparency from the outset of the MSP process. An important issue in data integration is that data complexity should match the stage of the MSP process to date. More complex data types could be deconstructed and presented via component building blocks. Such a staged approach builds support and trust in using and integrating complex data.

32.   There is a need to balance the full richness of data needed for MSP and those data relevant to a specific management action. The integration approach for disparate data types should also match the maturity and complexity of the MSP process and use appropriate formats, scale and representation for intended audiences. At its core, this involves the simple display or overlay of spatial data on human uses, established boundaries and biological data in a common mapping framework. Given that a full set of data on human and ecological facets of a given marine area will comprise a lengthy list of datasets, some aggregation or distillation can reduce the list to a core set of data layers needed to address specific issues.

33.   It is also important to develop expertise in participatory mapping, capturing socio-cultural values and using maps as a conflict resolution tool (i.e., visualizing the consequences of various courses of action).

Guidance on linking with global and regional assessment and monitoring

34.   Global-scale assessments often produce aggregated data products that are not suitable for direct use in national MSP. Some Parties have committees charged with considering the national implications of global and regional assessments (e.g., IPCC reports). However, open global databases also have a clear value for MSP.

35.   Regional state of the environment reports and their national components are useful, but sectors are often reluctant to share their future planning projections. The renewable energy and conservation sectors often have established targets, but such targets are more elusive for other sectors. Data management, which is already challenging at the national level, becomes significantly more problematic when collating scientific information at the regional and global levels.

36.   There is an opportunity to use scientific information and traditional knowledge synthesized through the CBD's regional workshops to facilitate the description of EBSAs in informing MSP. There is a need to evaluate areas described as meeting the EBSA criteria in terms of their ecosystem values in order to inform trade-offs within the MSP process.

Guidance on incorporating traditional knowledge

37.   Traditional knowledge can contribute to MSP processes by providing information in its own right or validating and adding value to existing scientific information. Increased awareness of the value of traditional knowledge to the scientific process would assist MSP development. Full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities can be constrained by limited resources. Communication barriers and lack of awareness on the potential contribution of traditional knowledge may hinder the effective use of traditional knowledge.

38.   Best available scientific information should also include traditional knowledge. A distinction was made between vernacular knowledge and traditional knowledge of historical importance (e.g., sacred places, conservation strategies). Traditional knowledge may not always fit the traditional division between biological and human uses, but rather, represents a more holistic perspective on marine and coastal areas and resources. Valuing a plurality of knowledge systems by integrating traditional and local with scientific knowledge provides a better knowledge foundation for MSP.

39.   There are numerous examples highlighting the application of traditional knowledge. Respecting ownership of traditional knowledge is important to reassure stakeholders that their knowledge will be used in an appropriate manner.

Guidance on the use of sensitive information

40.   Access to scientific information can be restricted by commercial confidentiality, military/security issues, cultural issues or reluctance to share resource information. For example, university data is readily available but government data is restricted in some cases. The latter can sometimes be used "in-house" for MSP (e.g., to make a map) but raw data cannot always be released. In some cases, data sensitivities can also prove beneficial by highlighting where stakeholder conflicts may exist. There are also opportunities to link with industry for collection of new data across their footprint of activity.

41.   There is a need to demonstrate to policy makers that investment in access to data, together with associated scientific assessment and monitoring, is worthwhile. The importance of the social dimension of MSP, including the way it is communicated, must also be recognized.

42.   Support for MSP data needs should include sustainable funding for data portals and system integration among different portals, provision of opportunities for stakeholder verification and access to data, development of common data standards and clear objectives to prioritize data collection, use of conflict resolution trade-offs based on ecosystem service valuations, and clarity in terms of links between MSP and licensing for specific uses.

Addressing Capacity Gaps and Resource Needs to Ensure Effective Implementation and Sustainability of MSP

43.   Developing capacity and meeting resource needs to ensure effective implementation and sustainability of MSP is a complex and difficult task. Capacity development and provisioning of resources is a cross-cutting issue of relevance for every phase of the generic management cycle applied to MSP processes. Since MSP is as much a socio-political process as a scientific-technical process, capacity needs to be developed in equal terms for both of these realms. Assessing capacity gaps and financing needs is an essential element to guide investments according to priorities and the stage and complexity of the MSP initiative. In addition, such capacity and resource needs assessments are important components of efforts to understanding the context in which MSP is occurring. Improving the understanding of context-specific needs is necessary to help tailor capacity development measures in ways that increase the likelihood of successful MSP throughout the management cycle.

Guidance on addressing capacity gaps and resource needs

44.   To address capacity gaps and resource needs, focus should be given to the following:

(a)   Enhancing formal education systems (e.g., universities, research bodies) in order to create in-situ capacities at multiple levels and within a variety of disciplines to support MSP processes;

(b)   Learning from the past and capitalizing on both successful experiences and failures, including through the transferring of lessons learned in a systematic way so that comparability is possible;

(c)   Pursuing regional learning and peer-to-peer networks to strengthen learning;

(d)   Building on existing traditional management capacities and governance regimes and scaling-up micro-scale efforts to appropriate and ecologically-relevant scales;

(e)   Accessing and making use of the capacities of international and regional organizations mandated to support Parties in addressing capacity gaps at national levels;[17]

(f)   Facilitating enhanced coherence and exchange of best practices in training programmes relevant to MSP, including through the development of "training of trainers" programmes in order to enhance the capacities of individuals within different sectors and stakeholder groups;

(g)   Utilizing existing capacities to contribute to MSP in sectors with a higher level of capacity by demystifying MSP, and by showing the economic gains that are possible through the use of MSP;

(h)   Developing the communication skills of MSP planners and within resource-use sectors to communicate the outcomes, benefits and costs of MSP clearly and effectively;

(i)   Fostering champions in sectors where capacities are stronger to stimulate leadership and to build support for MSP within sectors with a lower level of capacity and other stakeholder groups;

(j)   Mapping, quantifying and valuing ecosystem services benefitting those sectors in order to build ownership for MSP, and facilitating the integration of biodiversity values and development outcomes in MSP process through the use of ecosystem valuation and linked payments for ecosystem schemes;

(k)   Promoting the development and availability of low-cost MSP tools using the best available information and communication technologies.

---

[17] Several participants underscored the importance of national or regional centres that provide guidance, training and extension services on coastal and marine governance issues. Such regional institutions can be particularly effective in providing guidance and support for MSP initiatives and promoting experience-sharing within a region.

Appendix to annex IV

GUIDANCE ELEMENTS, EXISTING RESOURCES/TOOLS AVAILABLE AND GAPS IN EXISTING TOOLS AND GUIDANCE IN SUPPORT OF GOVERNANCE, CROSS-SECTORAL COORDINATION AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT DURING MSP PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION[18]

Guidance elements	Resources/Tools available	Gaps in existing tools and guidance
Step 1: Visioning, initiation of process: Ensuring cross-sectoral integration, stakeholder engagement		
Make the case for MSP (including through national-level, informal consultations across sectors) Map out the institutional landscape, roles and mandate for MSP Map out ecosystems boundaries, scale and stakeholders Common acknowledgement among sectors that an issue/problem needs attention Obtain a mandate for MSP initiation Disseminate the objectives/intent of the planning process Clarify specific objectives Assess existing capacity and budget Establish cross-sectoral planning team and define the process	Local/national dialogues Public consultation Strategic planning Stakeholder mapping and analysis Awareness-raising tools	Common framework for case study analysis Guidance for pilot project design Guidance on tailoring governance principles to local settings Guidance on addressing/understanding sector-specific needs, rights and interests Awareness-raising for non-technical audiences and targeting local stakeholders

---

[18] This table is only indicative. It should be further developed through future work.

Step 2: Plan development, design, management measures		
Analyse existing legal frameworks/system related to specific issues and uses to be addressed by MSP Develop legal framework (distinguishing between legislation and rule-making) Engage stakeholders in framing goals and strategies Establish coordination body among stakeholders Define roles and responsibilities of key participants Apply conflict analysis and resolution mechanisms Fill data gaps analysis related to priority issues Assess ecosystem services related to management area (including social and cultural values) Incorporate indigenous and local communities in planning Build capacity for enforcement Address gender issues in initial planning Assess capacities for implementation and	Tools for describing legislative frameworks Examples/case studies on incorporation of indigenous and local communities	Guidance (including case studies) on drafting legislation Guidance, case studies on rule-making Guidance with examples on different types of coordination bodies (comparing pros and cons when dealing with different stakeholders, different contexts)

involve implementing agencies in associated planning/rule making		
Step 3: Plan adoption		
Acquire governmental approval, secure funding and authority for MSP implementation Build broad basis of support among affected stakeholders in support of governmental endorsement	Guidance on good operating principles, such as transparency, inclusion and accountability	Guidance on the political aspects of gaining governmental commitment
Step 4: Plan implementation		
Disseminate new management rules and their implications Enforce rules (balanced by voluntary compliance) Sustain broad-based ownership of plan Sustain stakeholder support and political commitment Recognize implementation is a long-term process and the need for sustained political and financial support	Communication tools	Guidance on implementation challenges and how to overcome them Guidance on how to sustain stakeholder commitment and support for funding

_____