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Background

Several projects:

BMBF: Coastal Futures
EU: KnowSeas, BaltSeaPlan, BONUS BALTSPACE

ICES:

WGMPCZM
WKQAMSP
WKCES
Why are social and cultural aspects important in MSP?
Why are social and cultural aspects relevant?

• The sea is a place of multiple meanings…
• The sea is a personal and social construct…
• Intangible values are relevant for people
Attachments between people and the sea or:
What the sea means to local residents

• “The wide horizon influences the soul and physical health. Makes me feel good, away from hectic life.”

• “The sea is life. It is shipping, boats and infinity. It is creation, and unpredictable, but also a calming sense of comfort.”

• “The murmur of the water, the sun glittering on the water, storms and waves crashing on the shore.”

• “Salty air, recuperation, nature, fish, tourism, untamed force of nature.”

(North Sea coast of Schleswig-Holstein, survey by Kira Gee, see Gee 2010, 2013)
A space of human perceptions…

What do you see?

- Less CO$_2$?
- Nature destruction?
- Bright Future?
- Spoilt view?
- Less Tourists?
- Colliding ships?
- Killed Birds?
- Money?
- Jobs?
... and emotions!!

And what do you feel?

- Just awful!
- A miracle of technology
- Disaster!
- The end of the world!
- Great!
- Not nice, but necessary
- A future for my kids
- Nice!
Why are social and cultural aspects important in MSP?

• people have an attachment to the sea and to areas they live in

• people have perceptions and emotions on what happens in their area

• people are sensitive to changes in their environment

• people are sensitive to missing transparency and processes perceived as unjust and unfair
Risks when ignoring social and cultural aspects

• missing acceptance for content of the PLAN

• failure in PROCESS
  • e.g. seen as unfair -> missing transparency of why specific decisions were taken and/or unclear roles

mistrust
ignorance
resistance against implementation
A brief look into the MSP process
Justice in the process

Definition of MSP:

“a public process of analysing and allocating the spatial and temporal distribution of human activities in marine areas to achieve ecological, economic and social objectives that have been specified through a political process. “

UNESCO-IOC
What to achieve in MSP along EU MSP Directive?

Economic considerations formulated as objectives (expected outputs according to EU MSP Directive)

- Growth of maritime economies / sectors
- Development of marine areas
- Use of marine resources

Environmental considerations

- Good Environmental Status (EU MSFD)
- Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)
- Protection of NATURA 2000 areas (Birds and Habitats Directives)
Policy risk analysis

based on Cormier et al., 2015, ICES Cooperative Research Report 327
But what about social and cultural considerations?
MSP as an institutional process

Source: Kannen, 2014
Towards socio-cultural impact assessment

Impact Assessment

- Sustainable growth of maritime economies
  - Policy and regulatory certainty and cohesion
- Sustainable development of marine areas
  - Planning of development activities along socio-economic, socio-cultural and ecological criteria
- Sustainable use of marine resources
  - Spatial and temporal apportionment within criteria based limitations
- Good Environmental Status
  - Conservation areas and mitigation measures for activities New Barrier

MSP: Maritime Spatial Planning

MSP Framework Directive

Socio-cultural impacts
- Advice process and criteria to identify Culturally Significant Areas

Socio-economic impacts
- Advice process to identify distribution of wealth, benefits and costs among communities and societal groups

Societal impacts
- Advice process to identify impacts on societal structure and composition and power shifts among societal groups
Embedding social and cultural aspects in MSP process design
Including social and cultural aspects in MSP processes

Option:
Use a Quality Management Approach to MSP


http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Cooperative%20Research%20Report%20%28CRR%29/crr327/Marine%20Spatial%20Planning%20Quality%20Management%20System%20CRR%20327.pdf

based on WKQAMSP in 2012
Recognising social and cultural aspects in process stages

Establish external context

Establish internal context -> process design
  • stakeholder involvement plus social impact assessment
Stakeholder Involvement

Choke points:

• be clear on mandate and roles

• be open for different views, allow people to be heard and take them serious

• appropriate language

• minutes publicly available
Social Impact Assessment

• is in essence a scientific and technical advisory process, similar to an EIA / SEA

• expected to provide neutral information for the decision making body / competent authority

• requires involvement of experts with social science training

• strictly separate advisory process from stakeholder involvement even though there may /should be interactions

• results and reports publicly available
Recognising socio-cultural issues in risk identification
Recognising socio-cultural issues in risk analysis
Recognising socio-cultural issues in risk treatment

Maritime Spatial Plan
Towards criteria for socio-cultural aspects
ICES WKCES proposal: Culturally Significant Areas

“An area containing a culturally significant feature, or a feature in its own right.”

-> Identifying places of cultural importance
-> Need to establish a baseline of cultural features of importance

What is valued by people and where is it?
When is it relevant and to whom is it important?
What qualities are needed to sustain it?
Mapping culturally significant areas

- Some cultural ecosystem services or cultural features are easier to map than others.
- The significance of the service is not related to the ease with which a service can be mapped.
- Short term variability, seasonality, spatial interdependencies, scales (societal vs community significance)
ICES WKCES criteria for determining cultural significance

- Cultural uniqueness
- Broad cultural/community reliance
- Importance of the feature to the resilience of the social-ecological system
- Degree of tradition
- Dramatic cultural change

ICES Expert Group Report WKCES2013:
Identifying places of cultural importance

| Cultural Uniqueness (Do we have many or few?) | Extent to which the feature/place/activity is unique within the region or to which the same or similar features exist in the same region | 1) Each instance of it is irreplaceable and distinct (e.g. burial ground, sacred site, historical or archaeological site);  
2) It belongs to a culture that is distinct/cultural diversity (unique historical sub-cultures, indigenous cultures in most places);  
3) It is unique in a global context though abundant locally (e.g., special type of landscape), or unique in a local context though abundant globally (e.g. a city park or recreation area) |
Towards risk treatment / definition of planning / management measures / decision making
Towards risk evaluation

Criteria for rating the risk from impacting on cultural significant areas: A scale of five from Extreme to Negligible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>A permanent or long-term damage to a cultural ecosystem service that would undermine the cultural integrity of the community. The result of which would create long term loss of trust accompanied by a significant unwillingness to cooperate on marine planning issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>An impact to a cultural ecosystem service that would require extensive additional management measures to mitigate the consequences to the cultural integrity of the community. The result of which would create significant loss of trust and strong resistance to collaborate. Agreements would not be achievable and negative impacts on other marine planning activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Including social and cultural aspects in MSP

→ is time consuming, in particular if no baseline exists

→ requires field work and / or extensive participatory approaches, e.g. focus groups

→ requires funding for experts (social scientists) to do the assessment
Including social and cultural aspects in MSP

→ does not prescribe that social and cultural aspects are valued higher in decision making than economic or ecological considerations

→ provides an additional layer of information in the decision making process

→ supports fairness and transparency

→ may support community engagement in the process

may increase support for implementation of the plan and reduce resistance
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