



SPICOSA

**STAKEHOLDERS ENGAGEMENT
IN PRACTICE**

**LESSONS LEARNED FROM
SPICOSA**



**AN INTEGRATED PROJECT
UNDER THE EU'S 6TH FRAMEWORK
PROGRAMME FOR RESEARCH**



NEWS SPECIAL 2010 ISSUE 2



SPICOSA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL – SPICOSA Challenges of Science & Policy Integration	3
<i>by Lorraine McFadden</i>	
SPICOSA Progress & Findings	
Social learning within the SPICOSA Project: provisional reflections	4
How has SPICOSA contributed Towards ICZM? - Lessons Learned	5
Study Site Applications experiences	
Himmerfjärden, Sweden	6
Limfjord, Denmark	7
Guadiana, Portugal	8
Taranto Mar Piccolo, Italy	9
Izmit Bay, Turkey	10
European platforms for stakeholders	
EU Maritime Day and the Venice Platform	11
<i>Interview with Albert Salman, Director General Coastal & Marine Union (EUCC)</i>	
Team & Announcements	12

COLOPHON

SPICOSA NEWS is a newsletter produced by the SPICOSA consortium. It targets professionals dealing in one way or another with coastal science, planning, and management and has been published every four months, being the current issue the last one.

Electronic news alerts will however continue till January 2011. This and previous issues are available at www.spicosa.eu

Editors: Carolina Perez, Maria Ferreira and Erik Devilee

Design & Layout: Erik Devilee

Photos: André Mascarenhas, Himmerfjärden, Joana Mira Veiga, Latvian Institute of Aquatic Ecology, Limfjord, Oder delta, Taranto Mar Piccolo, Thau Lagoon and Venice Lagoon

© SPICOSA / Ifremer, September 2010

Sole responsibility of this publication lies with the authors; the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information herein.

Printed in 100% recycled paper (EU Eco-label), with vegetable oils ink, at an EMAS certified company.

Funding acknowledgements are given to IFREMER and the 6th Framework Programme for Research (FP6) of the European Commission.



SIXTH FRAMEWORK
PROGRAMME



SPICOSA



SPICOSA: Challenges of Science and Policy Integration

The standpoint in SPICOSA is that research on sustainability is about the co-evolution of human societies with their bio-physical environment and that humans have a unique position in terms of capacity to influence this co-evolution. In the SPICOSA System Approach Framework (SAF) the policy issue, that is the coastal zone problem that initiates a SAF, is perceived to be an ecosystem dysfunction. Equally, those managing the coastal environment might also chose to adopt an approach that centres on a coastal zone problem which is expressly societal and/or cultural in nature. The key point is that systems thinking is all about dynamic systems: our analysis of each part of the coastal system must therefore be focused on interrelated, dynamic change. This highlights an important take-home message from the SPICOSA project, the fact that as with ecological reality, 'society reality' is itself pure dynamics. As Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) scientists we need to be better at facilitating this idea within science-policy research and its application for coastal management.

Colleagues and I involved in the social assessment within the SPICOSA Project have focused on a number of approaches for improving the inclusion of social relationships in a SAF for ICZM, as well as the complex links between these dynamics and the ecological and economic components of the SAF protocol. Within this range of tools, there has been guidance on both stakeholder and issue mapping promoting learning between stakeholders (including scientists), with suggestions for organising and analysing this information to plan and inform a collaborative process in the best possible way. Another related focus was the importance of deliberation within a science and policy integration process for coastal management. Institutional mapping has been explored, underscoring the importance of understanding and exploring networks of institutions and organisations within ICZM, identifying both the rules that govern the interactions between them (e.g. laws, social relationships) and the 'players' that follow these rules, break them or "stretch" them.

This special issue has contributions from a range of these perspectives on exploring social relationships in developing an integrated approach to coastal management. Sally Priest and I introduce recent research on social learning, based on exploring the hypothesis that the nature of the relationships between stakeholders may be as important for gaining new insights for ICZM as the actual information being exchanged. Jeanette Reis highlights the importance of stakeholder analysis and conceptual modelling for supporting ICZM practice. This is followed by a series of discussions on practical stakeholder engagement within a number of SPICOSA study sites. These discussions highlight some interesting lessons in terms of identifying factors which can either facilitate or act as a barrier to integrating stakeholder knowledge and interests within scientific process of the SAF approach.

Within the Policy Interface work, we are looking in-depth at a number of carefully selected study sites, reviewing the opportunities and challenges faced by the scientific teams when seeking to develop the social component of the SAF. A number of the provisional lessons emerging from this study provide further insights into the findings being introduced in this special issue, particularly in relation to integration across science and policy interfaces. An important lesson regards the time given to preparation for a science-policy integration process. As reflected in both the review of lessons learned for ICZM (Reis) and on Social Learning (McFadden & Priest), the time and effort given to defining the problem to be explored by the team is absolutely crucial for the development of the social component. This includes the need for exploring compound policy issues, which facilitate the development of linkages as the SAF process proceeds. Such a solid foundation is critical to allow flexibility in developing the policy issue throughout the SAF process. A second emerging theme from the in-depth analysis focuses on constraints: there are real challenges related to trans-disciplinary research but also imagined constraints with regard to integrating social components in SAF-type models. The imagined constraints may in part be related to 'trained incapacity', for example the theoretical training of social scientists creating barriers towards integrating social processes within simulation modelling. An important lesson is that time and resources must be spent early in the process in order to reduce the impacts of such constraints on the process of integration at later stages. One critical issue emerging from our review, which has not been reflected on in this special issue is the challenge of capturing political processes within a SAF approach. A clear emerging lesson is that the narrative – that is the story – of the process can be as important to learning as the results of the process itself.

Understanding the social context of the creation and use of knowledge is important to achieve the aim of improved dialogue between science and policy. The 'real world' complexities of decision-making in coastal environments are defined by the pre-judgements, perceptions, cultural and institutional factors that condition knowledge. Exploring this social context is therefore critical to facilitating the creation of more useful knowledge for science and policy integration. This 'meaningful context' of knowledge is central to building more sustainable pathways for managing coastal environments and communities.

By Lorraine McFadden, FHRC Middlesex University



Social learning within the SPICOSA Project: provisional reflections

Social Learning reflects specifically on the interdependence of learners on each other, when discussing, examining, interpreting and organising information and experiences, as these are transferred into personal knowledge. It is not only about learning facts or technical skills. Indeed, a key hypothesis of social learning is that the nature of the relationships between stakeholders may be as important for gaining new insights for ICZM, than the actual content of the communications. This research investigates how working in groups within the SAF process has changed and shaped ideas, actions and attitudes of both scientists and other stakeholders engaged by the project. The methodology focused on conducting a series of surveys and in-depth interviews. The survey asked respondents to examine three types of interactions: within study site scientific teams, between study site scientific teams in cluster groups (i.e. working groups) and interactions between scientists and external stakeholders. A second phase of research is currently on-going, with both a revised questionnaire survey and follow-up in-depth review visits. This second phase will facilitate the assessment of opportunities and barriers to social learning over a longer period of the research process and a longer period of stakeholder engagement.

The present reflections will focus on highlighting some direct, practical applications that have emerged from preliminary analysis:

- Cluster meetings of small working groups of study sites were considered to be the most beneficial environment for social learning for study sites scientists

Discussions held in such working-group meetings specifically focused on problem-solving and many of the scientists reported this was a very valuable experience within the project. It enabled new processes and skills to be learnt and the exchange of best practices. These meetings had a significant impact on actions undertaken by the study sites. Somewhat more negatively, it was expressed that there was an element of 'competition' both within, and between, clusters. This may have had a positive impact upon both motivation and meeting deadlines. However, the results suggest some evidence of resulting time-pressure to select Policy Issues out of step with the engagement process within study sites.

- Stakeholders were more likely to disengage from the SAF process if they were in an existing stakeholder group

This is a potentially surprising result as one might assume that a stakeholder who had already engaged previously might be more likely to engage in the future. One of the contributing factors to this finding was that the selection of a Policy Issue had a significant impact upon the engagement or disengagement of stakeholders. In such instances, it was often the relatively simple case that the Policy Issue selected was not of relevance to those stakeholders who disengaged from the process. Despite the simplicity of this contributing factor, the implications for a SAF process are important. Careful consideration needs to be given to the stakeholder context of potential policy issues.

- Limitations on the internal and external facilitation of the process means that social learning opportunities are not maximised

In cases where external facilitators had been employed within the initial phases of stakeholder engagement this has had a positive impact on the outcomes of that engagement process and also on social learning. From an internal perspective, resource constraints meant that not all study site scientists were able to travel to cluster or project meetings. The expression of this was some degree of isolation from the SPICOSA research process with more limited opportunities to interact with other study sites and respondents felt this had a strong impact on the potential for social learning. One practical lesson from this is the need to better use technologies such as Skype and video-conferencing, which may go some way towards increasing opportunities for collaborative processes throughout all elements of a SAF process. Maximising opportunities for study sites to communicate and interact should have a positive impact on social learning and should be factored in when allocating resources at the beginning of a project.

There is an important theoretical foundation for better understanding the complex interactions of stakeholders and scientists engaged in managing the coastal environment and also within research projects themselves. The hypothesis is that collaborative decision-making and engagement within stakeholder groups can provide more useful insights - and result in 'better' choices - than those generated from any single group member or similarly, from reviewing the preferences of many group members, without having first facilitated a clear process of group discussion and review. This research explores the idea of a successful social learning process from practical as well as theoretical perspectives and in doing so it is hoped that the findings will promote learning for ICZM at higher and more rewarding achievement levels. For additional information please contact L.McFadden@mdx.ac.uk



How has SPICOSA contributed Towards ICZM? - Lessons Learned

During Spring 2010 four of the eighteen SPICOSA study sites participated in a lessons learned review. Scheldt (NL, BE), Barcelona (ES), Guadiana (PT, ES) and Cork (IRL) answered a series of questions about how the SPICOSA Systems Approach Framework (SAF) and its supporting activities contributed towards Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) in a local context.

The geographical extent of the study sites varies significantly (the smallest study site is 5km² - Barcelona- and the largest is 22,000km² - Scheldt-) but the policy issue addressed, water quality, is comparable in Scheldt, Barcelona and Guadiana while Cork in Ireland tackles recreation planning.

One of the first questions in the review addressed the current status of ICZM. Three of the study sites had a pre-existing ICZM group, although all agreed that there is no single authority responsible and that different organisations have varying remits at varying hierarchies. There is a lack of clarity about which organisations are responsible for which activities, and this is particularly amplified at cross-border study sites.

Some of the key review findings that relate directly to the eight principles of ICZM are as follows:

- there is a better understanding of marine and terrestrial interaction after undertaking the SAF
- SAF activities have improved understanding about sustainability
- long term environmental cycles have been used in three sites, but all acknowledged that it is difficult to incorporate long term economic cycles
- Co-operation has improved at all study sites

In addition, three study sites reported that SPICOSA activities directly contributed towards improvement of ecosystem health as requirement of the Water Framework Directive and/or the Bathing Waters Directive. Two of those sites also contributed to water resource management via the Water Framework Directive as well as to pollution control and prevention via the Urban Waste Water Directive. While other study site reported that SPICOSA activities contributed towards the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive and the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive.

Interestingly, all study sites reported that stakeholder analysis and conceptual modelling were particularly relevant aspects of the SPICOSA SAF for supporting effective ICZM practice. The study sites also reported that the SPICOSA project had identified opportunities for further collaboration.

If the SAF process were to be repeated, it was suggested that more careful consideration of the issue to be assessed and a full appraisal of data requirements should take place prior to site selection. It was also considered beneficial to develop a common glossary at the start of the project and to omit modelling in the first cycle, but include it in the second.

In conclusion, it may be said that the SPICOSA SAF has contributed towards ICZM to varying degrees at each of the study sites reviewed, although there are lessons to be learned in relation to the mechanisms for delivery.

For more information, please contact Jeanette Reis, School of Earth and Ocean Science, Cardiff University, UK.
Email: reisj@cardiff.ac.uk

By Jeanette Reis, Cardiff University



Himmerfjärden, Sweden

Involvement of stakeholders and the public should ensure that the many different interest and claims on the coastal zone are reflected in management, and lead to agreed policies becoming more socially accepted.

At Himmerfjärden, a coastal bay in the northern Baltic proper, southwest of Stockholm, an initial stakeholder meeting identified eutrophication and how to manage nitrogen loadings, as the main policy issue, and recruited a representative stakeholder reference group. Hence, we built a coupled ecological and socio-economic model for evaluating policy options for nitrogen management in the study area. The stakeholder group has met and discussed the research and its results about twice a year. Participants in the reference group received questionnaires at two stages of the research and semi-structured interviews were also made with several of them. Thus, this material is the main base for the evaluation of the SAF approach for stakeholder involvement at the Himmerfjärden.

Application of the SPICOSA SAF resulted in successful stakeholder involvement, with participation of the desired range of local stakeholders, but lacked participation from national agencies. The stakeholders found participation a rewarding and useful experience, with both knowledge and social gains, indicating a successful process of social learning. The success of the SAF application in this study may have depended critically on a relatively good coherence of knowledge perceptions among the stakeholder group and the research team already from the outset, and on the availability of a large data base. Had the stakeholders shown interest only in an issue less well covered by the research team's expertise and data, e.g. fishery modelling, the process would have been more difficult. The SAF application clearly strengthened the social capital in the area and created a platform for continued collaboration, also after the end of the SPICOSA.

Using the SAF approach to develop a simulation model had both advantages and draw-backs. The process gave the stakeholders a broader understanding of what modelling can be used for, and showed how simple models can help in explaining and understanding complex systems. The stakeholders also influenced the research focus, mainly by discussing policy options for private sewers, agriculture and the STP, e.g. a pipeline option for the STP discharge. The regular meetings with the stakeholders also focussed the modelling work on producing a simple, yet useful model. However, there were some indications that the simplifications needed for modelling could lead to important related policy issues and policy options being neglected, suggesting caution in applying the model. In addition, the current model is not user-friendly enough to be operated by all potential users.

We found that the issue of scale, institutional, spatial and temporal, is important in the SAF process. It was easy to engage local stakeholders, but water quality issues will involve also national and regional institutions, such as the Water Districts and the Swedish Environment Protection Agency. Although institutional representatives of the national level were invited to participate at the start, they were not interested until results were available. It might have been easier to involve them, had the different phases and steps of the project research cycle agreed better with the policy cycle for WFD implementation.

In conclusion, we found that the stakeholder involvement influenced the research so as to better mirror their interests, and that participation in the reference group modified social learning and perceptions of coastal issues by the members.

By Ragnar Elmgren, Stockholm University and Frida Franzén, ENVECO





Limfjord, Denmark

The stakeholder group for the Limfjord Study Site consisted of previously established smaller groups and additionally invited stakeholders, all of whom were encouraged to pass on stakeholder meeting invitations. The stakeholder group consisted of the Study Site science team researchers, national, regional and local managers, and end-users that represented a broad range of sectors such as environment, commercial and recreational finfish fisheries, mussel fishery and line culture, tourism, traffic and harbour services, and agriculture.

To encourage participation, the meetings were held in the early evenings and food and beverage were provided, according to Danish customs. Although stakeholder meetings were hosted by the SPICOSA science team, they were moderated by an independent party. Over the four-year project period, the Limfjord science team and stakeholders met six times. The meeting format was planned to include bilateral information sessions, between the science team and the remainder of the stakeholder group, and working group sessions, with 6-8 persons in each group, to encourage stakeholders to express their opinions and engage in discussions. The meeting format proved popular among stakeholders, giving them a strong sense of engagement and ownership for the work in progress. Especially the workshops provided an opportunity for all stakeholders to express their opinion and participate. Several stakeholders expressed their satisfaction based on primarily a feeling of their opinions being heard and considered valuable. The meetings were instrumental in engaging stakeholders to prioritise policy issues to be addressed, provide information for setting the boundaries of the virtual system, suggest model adjustments relative to the real world, identify scenarios for model simulation and discuss simulation results of different management scenarios.

During model formulation, fishers expressed their regret that finfish had not yet been included in the ESE model. This was due to a lack of accurate functional knowledge on the causal relationship between nutrient loadings and fish abundance. Finfish fishers accepted this explanation, attended several meetings and received information regularly on the progress of the work. They did not participate in the final meeting, but remained positive towards the SAF approach and expressed a wish for future inclusion of finfish in the ESE model. Agriculture was represented only at the second stakeholder meeting as this group did not feel the Limfjord marine system concerned them directly.

For the output meeting, a user-friendly version of the model was developed. Two separate meetings were held; one with environmental managers and another with the remaining stakeholders. In both meetings, stakeholders expressed a positive reaction to the user-friendliness of the model and its ability to provide a credible overview of the system they were familiar with. For example, the simulation results from the fisheries model suggested higher sustainability in implementing lower quotas, and reflected the corporate mussel fishers' own solution during the modelled period from 1985-2006 of lower quotas (45 tonnes week⁻¹) than quotas set by national management (85 tonnes week⁻¹). Today, mussel fishing quotas have been set even lower (25 tonnes week⁻¹) due to decreased marketing opportunities caused by international competition. At the same time the scenario results provided them with cognition of a higher complexity of the system than hitherto. For line mussel culture, the results were more contradictory. However, a supplementary survey showed that the fixed size of each farm unit licence was too small, and line mussel farmers would benefit from larger-scale economy reflecting sub-optimal use of expertise and labour in this production.

The user-friendly model encouraged stakeholders to run their own simulations during the Output Step Stakeholder meeting. While evaluating scenario results, nature conservation representatives radically changed their opinions with regard to management solutions from a complete mussel fishery ban to a more holistic approach due to the new understanding of the potential competition between harvestable mussels and those available to foraging birds. The changes in stakeholder perceptions initiated an open dialogue between traditionally conflicting stakeholders, where a better understanding of each other's needs was expressed. Further, it led to constructive discussions and new collaborations on emerging policy issues of common, cross-sectorial interest.

The regional environmental managers were highly interested in details concerning data and relationships within the model components, and thus, were eager to discuss these in detail, and suggested improvements and potential issues to be included in the future. They felt the model gave a transparent and credible view of the highly complex system. In particular, the inclusion of economic components was found to be novel and useful for evaluating possible management solutions. The managers supported the SAF approach and suggested the model be developed as a tool for municipal manager's responsibilities for implementing EU directives and national legislation.

*By Josianne G. Støttrup and Grete E. Dinesen.
Section for Coastal Ecology, DTU AquaCharlottenlund.*

Taranto Mar Piccolo, Italy

Five stakeholders meetings have so far been organised for the purpose of gathering all of the players involved in the management of the Taranto Mar Piccolo study site (i.e. politicians, scientists, mussel farmers) and of promoting discussion and knowledge exchange.

The first two meetings were of introductory character presenting SPICOSA and the opportunities for stakeholders to play a key role in the SAF. While the third meeting, limited to the "Participant Group" (i.e. politicians, scientists) and representatives of mussel farmers, addressed the definition of the policy issue: "How to include mussel culture in a management plan for the sustainable use of the Mar Piccolo resources?". At this occasion, participants agreed on the simulation model scenarios to be constructed. Early 2010 a fourth meeting was held. As a result the SSA team presented preliminary results and mussel farmers expressed their appreciation for the possibility to constitute the "Apulian Mussel Culture District" in Taranto. This could favour the mussel production, which has been one of the main goals of the Mar Piccolo model. Moreover, participants recognized the need for all parties involved to work together in order to:

- organize an environmental data base available to all environmental management operators, where data on the chemical and biological variables are updated in continuum,
- resolve various sanitary and hygienic issues based the ecological knowledge of the studied environment.

In July 2010, another meeting followed during which the representative of the local General Federation of Italian Merchants and Shopkeepers stressed the need to rationalize Mar Piccolo resources with specific regulations that accurately define the farmed areas of Mar Piccolo, and establish a limit to the amount of mussels that can be produced, according to the carrying capacity of the Mar Piccolo. The need for vocational education and training in fish farming and related activities was also highlighted.

All of the above indications are helping refining the simulation model which will be presented during Autumn 2010.

The awareness and interest of stakeholders in the SPICOSA project has undoubtedly increased over the last 4 years, particularly during the last meetings when they were finally able to appreciate the applicability of the model in improving management of local marine resources and the sustainability of Mar Piccolo. The exposure and dialogue with city officials, regional environmental agencies, and stakeholders is proving to be a beneficial experience. Some setbacks were the fact that sustainable development is a relatively new concept for the local political class and secondly, that government officials are constantly changing. This government instability has interfered with the progress of the model since each new input requires a revisiting of the model.

New and refreshing approaches have been introduced, as the Spicosa Group "Friends of Mar Piccolo" in the social network Facebook to maximise and increase the participation of Taranto locals. The Facebook tool serves as an additional means to investigate the Taranto mussel farming situation and, therefore, to include in Extend several social aspects. Facebook represents today an important communication and sharing instrument to which a large number of people is registered, including politicians. In addition to scanning the public opinion, the Taranto group is also performing an interpretative analysis of fish farmers. In this respect, the MP Facebook group allows to pass on information such as the next meeting date while sharing opinions and exchanging ideas. The aim is to reach the politicians who also have a Facebook profile as well as the citizens at large. This group enables the IAMC-CNR researchers to i.e. conduct surveys on the public perception of mussel-tourism. Through the bulletin board and private messages, users are being interviewed about their willingness to pay for high quality mussels, their willingness to pay for the opportunity to taste high quality mussels in little gazebos along Mar Piccolo coasts, and their willingness to pay for the facilities of the park that was included in the model. This type of questioning allows evaluating if certain activities are potentially profitable.

In order to raise awareness on the project and the Mar Piccolo coastal system, the Taranto group intends to realize and regularly post video-letters that explain each step of the SPICOSA project with a user friendly format and layman's language. At the end of our experiment, we will collect all the answers and compare the Facebook results with those from the traditional survey also in relation to the different types of stakeholders involved.

Hopefully, by the end of this experiment there will be more people that will have heard of SPICOSA and more importantly will have actively participated in the healing process of Mar Piccolo.



By Giovanna Bellio, Antonella Petrocelli, Patricia Sclafani, Carmela Caroppo



Guadiana, Portugal

Stakeholder involvement began in the early stage of SAF implementation (Design Step). It was based on the identification of the most representative policy issues, to be addressed later, through a questionnaire survey of individual and institutional partners. For the Output Step, a more active participation was planned. Namely, the broad stakeholder list was analyzed to identify a balanced subgroup of stakeholders representing the main points of view around the defined policy issue. Ten bilateral meetings were arranged, involving a total of 30 people (1 to 6 people per meeting with each institution) representing regional water authorities, nature protection authorities, municipalities, non-governmental organizations and public and private companies. The meetings comprised two main stages: building a common ground on ICZM and presenting the SSA's work thus far.

On the first stage, after presenting some facts stressing the need for ICZM and what is envisioned in EU and national strategies, a SWOT analysis regarding the path towards ICZM was performed, fed by stakeholders. This provided interesting insights, some of them common across different stakeholder groups, namely: the richness and economic importance of the region's coastal zone, which contributes to increased awareness by everyone on the need for a careful management (as strengths); the overlapping of jurisdictions and excessive bureaucracy, accompanied by weak communication between institutions (as weaknesses); the existence of common legislation and criteria (including the important role of the EU) and of a central institution to strategically coordinate efforts (as opportunities); and the lack of adequate management models with a strategic vision as well as climate change and associated extreme events (as threats).

A questionnaire was developed to gather stakeholder's feedback about the presentation of the SSA's work in a structured way. 96% of the respondents were highly or very highly satisfied with the meeting and also stated a high or very high interest in maintaining contact with the SSA team. All responding stakeholders attributed a high or very high degree of importance to communication with the scientific community in general and 91% chose the same degrees of importance to communication with other stakeholders, mainly through discussion forums. Despite the fact that only 54% of stakeholders considered the degree of innovation of the SAF high or very high and 59% considered that their change of perception about the estuary was very low or low, 73% declared a high or very high interest in using this approach to address other issues, whether in the Guadiana Estuary or in another area. The developed ExtendSim model (GUADEX) received a high or very high degree of clarity and utility by 72% and 61% of the respondents, respectively. Regarding the level of interest of the scenarios presented, whether for each stakeholder's work or for the management of the estuary, the majority of respondents voted it as fair or high. The degree of implication for decision making of the scenarios was also considered fair or high by the majority.

These bilateral meetings were considered as a good preparation for a rich stakeholder forum, focused on debating viewpoints from stakeholders with different managing responsibilities. The Guadiana Forum was held on the 30th of June in one of the estuary's neighbouring municipalities, involving ca. 50 participants. Our Output Package (GUADID v2) was delivered at the Forum in a USB Flash drive, containing a multimedia application based on Adobe® Flash® with all the information produced and knowledge gained with the SAF experience in the Guadiana Estuary. GUADID v2 includes the SPICOSA project's description, SAF implementation in the Guadiana Estuary, scenarios used and a simplified, interactive version of GUADEX. This package will also be published in the SSA's website.

By André Mascarenhas, CIMA - Universidade do Algarve



Izmit Bay, Turkey

End-users engagement was a must from the beginning of SPICOSA activities, in order to ensure they were informed and involved in each of the steps of the SAF application.

To this end two large meetings were organised in the last three years, as well as seven one to one meetings. To start with, the SPICOSA objectives and methodology were presented and discussed with the Metropolitan municipality and related departments, with whom a list of the relevant stakeholders which should be invited to the first stakeholders meeting was elaborated (sectors/institutions/persons) according to the main human activities in the region (such as urbanization, industrialization and marine activities).

The first stakeholders meeting was organised in Kocaeli province, gathering the Metropolitan municipality, the environmental directorate of the province, universities, the regional branches of NGO's and public and private organizations from the different sectors. The meeting intended to announce the project and to enhance participation of local and regional stakeholders. 31 participants from 16 organisations undertook to: a) reach agreement on Policy Issue(s) and associated scenarios, indicators, descriptions and criteria and b) identify what dysfunctions (impacts) in the natural system are implied by this Policy Issue and prioritize them in the case of multiple impacts. The duration of the meeting was one day. Pre-proposed impacts were discussed, voted and ranked by participants, mussel contamination getting the highest score.

Next, discussion was focused on policy issues related to the chosen impact. The Bay is one of the most polluted coastal areas in Turkey, proclaimed as a hot spot and sensitive area. Consequently the main issues discussed were fish kills (due to anoxia); biodiversity loss (due to anthropogenic pressures); harmful algal blooms; chemical contamination of biota (mussels) and decrease in beneficial loss (swimming, fishing, sailing and other sportive activities). For the system design the Eastern and Middle part was suggested as regional priority of the Bay. It was agreed that the priority impact could be changed during the next steps of the System Design depending on the model requests and restrictions. It was further suggested to focus in one or two sectors and technological developments in those fields. The outputs of the meeting and the "one to one" meetings were used for revising of system design and formulation steps, and this review system was used till the end of appraisal step. The number of participants to the first meeting and the level and results of the discussions were satisfactory but it was not the case for the distribution of organisations since the industries and local NGOs were not present. Efforts will be placed in getting their involvement for the final stakeholders meeting.

Recently the stakeholders met again and, the model results (especially socio-economical system results) were shared and scenarios discussed. The participants represented the Metropolitan Municipality (Environmental Protection and Control General Directorate), the General Directorate of Water and Wastewater Management and the Province Environmental Directorate of Kocaeli Governorate. Only the governmental sector was involved in order to make it easier to get free opinions and ideas. They encounter difficulties to understand the model but showed great interest on the scenarios. They further gave valuable additional information that will serve to revise them accordingly.

Ongoing projects with The Metropolitan municipality such as pollution monitoring of Bay facilitate our continuous and strong collaboration with stakeholder groups. After the SPICOSA approach experience all these groups are applying a more participatory coastal management. Once funding ends, annual meetings with the core group will continue, and practical and applicable aspects of the SAF will be useful for all new projects and cooperation.

The SPICOSA approach is bringing very positive results for the development of stakeholder based coastal management; especially for the understanding of the coastal system and the development of a common and simple language for such a complex system. Science and policy integration result on a more effective and sustainable coastal management and the SPICOSA approach demonstrate and illustrate this process to policy makers and planners.



*By Leyla Tolun,
TUBITAK Marmara
Research Center*

EU Maritime Day and the Venice Platform

SPICOSA E-news editors talked to Albert Salman, Director General Coastal & Marine Union (EUCC) about the current and emerging role of stakeholders platform and its relevancy for the SPICOSA community.

On 18-21 May 2010 the 3rd European Maritime Day Stakeholder Conference was held in Gijón, co-organised by the European Commission, the Spanish Presidency of the European Union and the Government of the Principality of Asturias. The 4th edition will be in Poland, around 20 May 2011. Albert Salman, director general of the Coastal & Marine Union (EUCC) actively attended all three events so far. We asked him how stakeholders can get connected.

Why it is important to be there?

This annual conference is the main opportunity for the maritime and coastal community to meet and to speak to the highest political representatives of Europe. There were political sessions and more than 50 workshops in Gijon, focussing on the main directions of the EU Integrated Maritime Policy (IMP).

What is the main focus of the conferences?

Bringing politicians, stakeholders and the research community together, exchanging ideas for innovation and sustainable growth of maritime sectors and coastal regions.

Can everybody directly speak to the European Commission?

There are many opportunities during several days. The Commission considers stakeholder participation key for a proper maritime governance framework. Therefore the debate should continue between the conferences, throughout the year. To this end, the idea of an all embracing Maritime Stakeholders Platform was proposed at the 2009 Maritime Day Conference in Rome. Stakeholder representatives agreed to set up a steering group ("Group of Ten"), based on the five pillars: industry, environmental NGOs, science, regional authorities and recreational "users" of the sea. The initiative is headed by EUCC's President Prof. Johan Vande Lanotte, former deputy Prime Minister of Belgium.

What is the main role of the Maritime Stakeholders Platform?

We hope the "Group of Ten" will organise the wider platform as a contribution to the implementation of the IMP, stimulating dialogue among the stakeholders and between them and public authorities. The Platform would be the primary interlocutor towards the Commission, setting priorities for the IMP in the different fields.

How is the SPICOSA community linked to the Stakeholders Platform?

SPICOSA is a founding member of the Venice Platform, which is directly represented in the "Group of Ten". The Venice Platform was established at Littoral 2008 by representatives from three pillars: environmental NGOs, science, and regional authorities. It is a contribution as well as a pioneer to the all embracing Maritime Platform as long as the latter is not yet in place.

What is the role of the Venice Platform in this context?

The Group of Ten and the Venice Platform are closely connected. The Group of Ten is restricted in size and membership, which provides a convenient setting to clarify mutual interests and to launch common initiatives. The Venice Platform is open to everyone, facilitating cooperation among stakeholders and scientists at the working level: sharing knowledge, exchange of experience on best practices, dissemination of information, organisation of meetings. Through EUCC's participation in the MARCOM+ FP7 project, the Venice Platform is also linked to the establishment of a marine, maritime and coastal science forum.

What is the work programme of the Venice Platform?

There was a Venice Platform meeting at the Gijon conference, starting a process towards a work programme. The suggestions raised by the audience will be considered by a group of people from different member organisations. These suggestions can be read in the report of the meeting in: <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfs/iwt/node/687>.

It is our intention to keep the SPICOSA as well as the coastal and marine stakeholders community informed about the developments.



2nd International Symposium on Integrated Coastal Zone Management

3rd - 7th July, 2011, Arendal, Norway

Hosted by The Institute Of Marine Research, Norway, SPICOSA partner!
More information available at: www.imr.no/iczm/

Set these dates in your diary – they will be another two important events where the SPICOSA community will gather and share knowledge gained throughout the project!

JOIN US!

SPICOSA TEAM

