1. Introduction: this workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Introduction: Engaging local actors</th>
<th>Susanne &amp; Andrea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Baltic Experiences: Collaborative MSP in the Gulf of Bothnia</td>
<td>Stefan Husa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engaging local actors in the Gulf of Guayaquil (Ecuador/Peru)</td>
<td>Michele Quesada da Silva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sharing experiences Panel &amp; interactive plenary</td>
<td>Panel: Stefan Husa, Tomas Andersson, Michele Quesada da Silva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Finding Ways Forward</td>
<td>Moderators &amp; rapporteurs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Susanne Gustafsson
CEO, spatial planner, always curious. Owner and founder of PlanBotnia AB in Mackmyra, Sweden

Andrea Morf
Senior Research Fellow, Nordregio & Scientific Coordinator at the Swedish Institute for the Marine Environment
Aims

• Present and discuss experiences of stakeholder involvement from the Baltic and beyond
• Why and how can stakeholders be included in coastal and marine planning and management? => What is in it and for whom?
• Needs & ways forward: knowledge, method- and capacity development
• Using several interactive methods
Screen.io: Introduction to interaction

Word cloud

In one word/expression: What is needed to efficiently and successfully turn MSP more bottom-up?

Link: mdi.screen.io/mspforumw2

The word cloud will run until the end of the workshop
Involving Stakeholders

WHY participation => who/when/how

Bottom-up +
Top-down +
Centre-out
2. Collaborative MSP in the Gulf of Bothnia

Stefan Husa
Government of Åland
The speakers have named important challenges and enablers for engaging stakeholders bottom-up in MSP

1. Anything missing? - Add your own!
2. Which are most important? Vote by ”likes”!

Link: mdi.screen.io/mspforumw2
The adding and voting continues will be picked up later.
3. When top-down meets bottom-up: engaging local actors in the Gulf of Guayaquil (Ecuador-Peru) towards cross-border marine governance

Michele Quesada da Silva, IOC-UNESCO
Screen.io: challenges & enablers from presentations

The speakers have named important challenges and enablers for engaging stakeholders bottom-up in MSP

1. Anything missing? - Add your own!
2. Which are most important? Vote by ”likes”!

Link: mdi.screen.io/mspforumw2
The adding and voting continues will be picked up later.
4. Sharing experiences
Panel and plenary discussion

Important challenges and enablers from the cases
Your own views & insights?
1 further interactive method:
Traffic lights: make ready your green/yellow/red cards!

An interactive group method to start discussions and explore opinions.
Topic 1. How to include local knowledge? For what purposes is it most valuable?

Traffic light Q: What do you think? Do you agree? Yes/No/Well maybe if... use your cards!

“Local knowledge is crucial for regional and national level planning”
Topic 2. How to deal with participants expectations and balance informal inclusion with transparency

Traffic light Q: What do you think? Do you agree? Yes/No/Well maybe if... use your cards!

“Expectations from participants to influence MSP are problematic”
Topic 3. How to work around limitations in mandate and resources

Traffic light Q: What do you think? Do you agree?
Yes/No/Well maybe if... use your cards!

“There are good examples of how to work around limitations in mandate and resources in MSP”
5. Needs and ways forward to work with local coastal actors in MSP

1. Challenges: What is most important to address? Why?
2. Enablers: What are the really good/needed enablers?

3. Word cloud results:
What is needed to efficiently and successfully turn MSP more bottom-up?

Link: mdi.screen.io/mspforumw2

The discussion on stakeholder participation continues...!
Maritime Spatial Planning Forum

Global Meets Regional

Thanks!

Find more: @Nordregio stand
Collaborative MSP in the Gulf of Bothnia

Stefan Husa
Government of Åland

More information available at https://arcg.is/1mfmDD
Who are we and what do we do?

- Pan Baltic Scope – Better Maritime Spatial Plans, together
- FIAXSE Activity, Maritime Spatial Planning in the Gulf of Bothnia
  - Three Planning systems and three processes

**Partners:** Government of Åland (lead), Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management, Regional Council of Satakunta, and Nordregio
How do we work together?

• Identify the differences and similarities
• Which sectors overlap - where do we need to collaborate?
  • Who uses the sea?

Coast to Coast in the Gulf of Bothnia
• Public meetings – Stakeholders meetings across the Gulf

Stakeholder collision to support collaboration
• Including local-level stakeholders in the MSP process
Build a network – National, Regional, and Local

• Who should we involve, how, when, and why?

• The Gulf of Bothnia - are they cross-border, or cross-level?
  • National-level stakeholders
  • Regional-level stakeholders
  • Local-level stakeholders

• Stakeholder collision
  • Local-level stakeholders – How do we include them, and do they trust us?
Let them show us!

Subcase 1
Let them show us! Subcase 2
Who should we include?

What is most important for MSP in the Gulf of Bothnia? Max 3 things

What is the best way for improving MSP?

- Stakeholder involvement
- More, better, detailed data
- Sharing data
- Map tool: Visualisation
- Map tool: Analysis
- Illustrating: Videos, infographics
- Research
Who should we include?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Level</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Åland</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipalties</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Enterprises</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local fish organizations</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Harbor &amp; Island development organizations</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fishers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kalastusseurat/vesialueiden osakaskunnat</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gävleborg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Vattenlag/fiskelag/vattenägare</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fishers</td>
<td>Partly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västerbotten County Administrative Board</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Council of Central Ostrobothnia</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrbotten County Administrative Board</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council of Oulu Region</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sweden University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Council of Lapland</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västernorrlands Museum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SeaGIS 2.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permitting administrations</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvarken Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ELY Centre - Southwest Finland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wpd Offshore Stockholm AB</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kalatalouden Kuskuusliton member organizations:</td>
<td>Yes (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Län i Botteniska viken</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kalatalou</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>salvation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kvarken Council</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Turku, Centre for Maritime Studies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rannikkoamakunnat</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who should we include?

To be continued......
Engaging local-level "Fish" Stakeholders in Åland and Satakunta

Meaningful recreational areas can vary depending on the season. Still, these areas could, for example, be areas where the respondent likes to take a boat ride, enjoy nature values, go swimming in the summer, ice-skating in the winter, and more.

Hotspot areas can be identified for the Satakunta region, whereas the Åland areas are more spread out throughout the entire archipelago areas.

More information available at https://arcg.is/1mfmDD
Challenges and Enablers

Enablers:

• Cross-border collaboration requires an understanding of each other's plans as well as needs because, in the end, we all share the same sea

• Learning from others by using their methods, mistakes, challenges, experiences to make better plans and consider the other policies and processes that are available

• Online connections can allow long-distance partners to attend or even present at meetings

Challenges:

• Planning in different phases and with different mandates can increase the problems when one is trying to make coherent cross-border plans. Is it a competition in the end where the first plan sets the rules for the others?

• Time is of the essence, with a shorter timeframe to work with plans and projects, you can engage and inform fewer people than initially expected. Therefore, a 2-year project has its limitations

• It is difficult to explain and motivate why stakeholders and sectors should attend a "new" collaboration network when they already have their old ways that work. What is in it for them to join this new network?
Thank you!

More information available at https://arcg.is/1mfmDD
When top-down meets bottom-up: engaging local actors in the Gulf of Guayaquil (Ecuador-Peru) towards cross-border marine governance

Michele Quesada da Silva, IOC-UNESCO
Why bottom-up?

Inevitably, as adaptation decision-making becomes more geographically distant and more top-down, it is likely to become less effective.

Another issue, currently being widely acknowledged by climate scientists, is that while mitigation of climate change is best tackled globally, adaptation is better tackled locally, given the great diversity of situations represented by the juxtaposition of affected people and environments.

So, one lesson we can take from ancient stories about people’s responses to sea-level rise – at least the responses that worked – is that residents who understand their local context best are best positioned to design and drive adaptive solutions.
Why top-down?

International Agreements

National Policies

Judicial

Legislative

Executive
When top-down meets bottom-up

Knowledge exchange

Dialogue

Information flow
MSPglobal Initiative

**CONTEXT**

Joint Roadmap to accelerate MSP processes worldwide, adopted by the European Commission's Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (DG MARE) and the IOC-UNESCO... on Transboundary MSP

Stakeholders

... on Transboundary MSP

Pilot Cases
Both countries have strategic plans for coastal and marine areas, but they do not have MSP plans.
Fishing grounds are the main shared resources between Ecuador and Peru.

**MSPglobal objectives**

- To contribute to the preplanning phase of both countries
- To support the development of binational recommendations on cross-border MSP issues
Stakeholder Mapping

- **Starting Point**
- **Snowball**
  - Sister Projects & Key Stakeholder Platforms
  - Nomination by Member States
- **Strategic Vision**
  - Visits to Pilot Areas
  - Event Participants
- **Stakeholder Database**
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Strategy for Public Participation

- Global
- Cross-border
- National
- Local
Outcomes
Activities

Conferences

Workshops

Trainings

Support

Outcome

MSP Guidelines

Binational Recommendations

Technical Reports
(CURRENT & FUTURE CONDITIONS)

Support

Outcome

Global

Cross-border

National

Local

Ocean Literacy

#MSPforum Global Meets Regional 19-21 November 2019 Riga, Latvia
National Trainings (w/local actors too)

➢ **Theory**
- MSP and Blue Economy concept
- Data and information for MSP
- **Stakeholder participation in MSP**

➢ **Practice**
- MSP Challenge board game

➢ **National Perspective**
- MSP status
- Blue Economy panel
- **Recommendations for the national MSP process**

- To give a big picture of the whole MSP process
- To stimulate participation
VÍSÓN
CORTO PLAZO
LARGO PLAZO

OBJETIVOS

ACCIONES

ACTORES

INDICADORES

ECONÓMICO
SOCIAL

GOLAND
Yo soy... marine spatial planning... global

CONTRIBUCIÓN
Stakeholder Meetings

- Dialogue
- Knowledge exchange
- Information flow
Where are we now?

- **Conferences**
  - Inputs
  - Expert Meetings
- **Workshops**
  - Support
  - Regional Stakeholder Meetings
- **Trainings**
  - Support
  - National Stakeholder Meetings
  - Local Stakeholder Meetings
- **MSP Guidelines**
  - Global
- **Binational Recommendations**
  - Cross-border
- **Technical Reports**
  - Current & Future Conditions

**NEXT STEP**
Challenges & Enablers

**Challenges**

I. Communication (distance)
II. Representativeness
III. Manage expectations
IV. Uncertainty about how the “top” will consider the “bottom”
V. Political crisis

**Enablers**

I. Strengthened network
II. Snowball strategy
III. Transparency about objectives and expected outcomes
IV. During trainings, governmental actors seem to embed the principle of wide participation
V. Globally, citizens are calling for more participation
¡Muchas gracias!
Merci!
Thank you!
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