

*Marine Spatial Planning and
Transnational Partnership Working
in the Irish Sea*

Outputs from the Spring 2011 Stakeholder Events



IRISH SEA REGION

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	3
Participants at Event 1, Liverpool	4
Participants at Event 2, Dublin	5
Background	6
Aims and Content of the Two Events	7
Summary of Outputs from stakeholder Discussions	11
Next Steps	15
Stakeholder Roundtable Discussion Analysis Tables	
Annex 1: Motivations for Transnational partnership working in the Irish Sea	17
Annex 2: What are the merits of different transnational partnership working options?	26
Annex 3: What might be the objectives for future TPW in the Irish sea?	36
Annex 4: What might be the key areas for collaborative action?	38
Annex 5: Can existing partnerships deliver this agenda?	41

INTRODUCTION

Over the course of spring 2011, the University of Liverpool, in collaboration with the North West Coastal Forum and the United Kingdom's National Oceanography Centre, organised two events aimed at exploring stakeholder views on the future development of transnational partnership working to support co-ordinated marine spatial planning in the Irish Sea region. The work was funded by the United Kingdom's Economic and Social Research Council and was guided by a Steering Group which included representatives of marine planning agencies from the six jurisdictions that border the Irish Sea. This report provides an overview of:

- the background to the initiative;
- the aims and content of the two events which were held in Liverpool and Dublin;
- the outputs to emerge from stakeholder discussions; and
- a proposed plan of action to foster improved transnational partnership working in the Irish Sea.

The organisers would like to offer thanks to all those listed below for their participation in the events and for their constructive contributions to the discussions which are distilled here. The level of interest in the initiative has been very encouraging and the Steering Group will reconvene in autumn 2011 to move things forward to the next stage.

Liverpool

Summer 2011

Participants in Event 1: Merseyside Maritime Museum, Liverpool 10 February 2011

Dr. Stephen Atkins	North Western Sea Fisheries Committee	Bob Lowe	Welsh Yachting Association
Dr Iwan Ball	WWF Cymru	Chris Lumb	Natural England
Dr. Rhoda Ballinger	University of Cardiff	Denise Maloney	Irish Sea Fisheries Board
Graham Bench	Cheshire West and Chester Council	Cllr. Herbert Manley	Cheshire West and Chester Council
Dr Helen Bloomfield	University of Liverpool	Tom Matthews	Department of the Environment, Northern Ireland
Colin Brown	HM Coastguard Liverpool	Jonathan Mayo	
Prof. Cynthia Burek	NW Geodiversity Partnership	Lynne McGowan	University of Liverpool
George Burke	Dept Environment, Heritage & Local Government	Cheryl Nicholson	North West Wildlife Trusts
Hermien Busschbach	DG Mare	Holly Niner	JNCC
Liz Charter	Isle of Man Government	Linda O'Dwyer	Coastwatch
John Clark	RSPB	Stephen O'Sullivan	Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland
Garrett Connell	NOW Ireland	Rocky Pairunan	University of Liverpool
Councillor Peter Coyle	Dublin Regional Authority	Jim Paton	HM Coastguard Holyhead
Ben Diamond	Northern Ireland Marine Task Force	Patricia Potter	Dublin Regional Authority
Dr Wendy Dodds	WWF Cymru	Clare Reed	RSPB Marine NW
Julie Drew	RWE	Louise Rich	Centrica Renewables Energy
Frances Edwards	Heriot Watt University	Nicola Riley	Environment Agency
Dr. Geraint Ellis	Queen's University Belfast	Heather Ritchie	University of Ulster
John Entwistle	Wirral Council	Caroline Salthouse	North West Coastal Forum
Peter Evans	Sea Watch Foundation	Eleanor Stone	Manx Wildlife Trust
Rhona Fairgrieve	Scotland Coastal Forum	Gerry Sutton	University College Cork
Deirdre Ferguson	Belfast City Council	Ginny Swaile	MMO/Natural England
Dr Walter Foley	Dublin Regional Authority	Pam Taylor	Solway Firth Partnership
Tonia Forsyth	Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum	Davy Thomson	Maritime & Coastguard Agency
Bob Foster	Friends of Mere Sands Wood	Prof. Lynda Warren	Wales Coast and Maritime Partnership
Chris Frid	University of Liverpool	John Watson	Centrica Energy Hydrocarbon Resources Ltd
Joanne Frost	E.ON Climate & Renewables	Dr Greg Whitfield	Irish Sea Conservation Zones
Dr. Wilfried Görmar	Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning, Germany	Danny Williams	University of Liverpool
Mark Gray	Sea Fish Industry Authority	Dr Kate Willshaw	Cumbria Wildlife Trust
Meg Green	Friends of the Estuary (Lytham)	Tom Workman	Liverpool Sailing Club
Jim Green	Friends of the Estuary (Lytham)	Katherine Yates	University of Ulster
Andrew Hall	Sefton Council		
Kate Hawkins	Manx Natural Heritage		
Beth Henshall	Wildlife Trusts Wales		
Sarah Horsfall	SeaFish		
Safaa Hossein	Liverpool University		
John Howarth	National Oceanographic Centre		
Dr Lara Howe	Cefas		
Susan Kidd	Crown Estate		
Sue Kidd	Liverpool University		
Helen Kirk	National Trust NI		
Cllr. Dermot Lacey	Dublin Bay Task Force		
Alasdair Lindop	North West Coastal Forum		
Dr Bryan Lipscombe	Wirral Council		
John Little	North West Development Agency		

Participants in Event 2: O'Callaghan Alexander Hotel, Dublin, 23rd & 24th June 2011

Iwan Ball	WWF Wales
Tom Bryan-Brown	Manx Fish Producers
Steve Conlon	Irish Sea Federation
Emer Connolly	Department of Environment, Ireland
Ben Diamond	Northern Ireland Marine Task Force
Frances Edwards	Heriot-Watt University
Helen Elphick	Crown Estates
Wendy Geary	Marine Scotland
Martin Hall	Isle of Man Government
Lara Howe	Cefas
Jenny Kamp	CCW
Sue Kidd	University of Liverpool
Helen Kirk	National Trust NI
Brian Klaus	Department of Environment Heritage & Local Government, Ireland
John Linden	Department of the Environment, NI
Alasdair Lindop	North West Coastal Forum
Chris Lumb	Natural England
Tom Mathews	Department of the Environment, NI
Lynne McGowan	University of Liverpool
John O'Hara	Dublin City Council
Michael O'Toole	Marine Institute Ireland
Patricia Potter	Dublin Regional Authority
Clare Reed	RSPB
Heather Ritchie	University of Ulster
Emma Rowan	Isle of Man Government
Caroline Salthouse	North West Coastal Forum
Maria Scarlett	Centrica
Alan Storer	Welsh Assembly Government
Pam Taylor	Solway Firth Coastal Partnership
Sarah Twomey	CMRC University of Cork
Manfred Vollmer	Wadden Sea Forum
Ewan Walker	Mainstream Renewable Power
Lorraine Walsh	Department of Environment, Ireland
Lynda Warren	Wales Coastal & Maritime Partnership
John Watson	Centrica
Jim Wilson	Trinity College Dublin
Martyn Youell	Marine Management Organisation

BACKGROUND

The Irish Sea is a precious resource that has shaped the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of its surrounding communities since the earliest times. However, we are entering a new era where rapidly expanding understanding of the Irish Sea environment is paralleled by unprecedented levels of human use. For example, alongside traditional maritime industries such as fishing and tourism, the Irish Sea is now seen as a prime location for important new industries, not least those related to renewable energy generation. It is against this backdrop that enhanced marine planning arrangements are being introduced in all six Irish Sea jurisdictions and interest in strengthening transnational partnership working to support this activity has developed.

Two initiatives have helped to build a body of stakeholders committed to improving ties across the Irish Sea and these have set the scene for the events that are reported here. These were:

- A research council funded Transdisciplinary Seminar Series led by the University of Liverpool which brought together academics and practitioners with maritime interests to consider new approaches to managing ecosystem services in the marine environment. Participants included representatives from all six Irish Sea jurisdictions. A key finding of the series was that new and enhanced forms of transnational partnership working are needed to underpin effective planning of the sea.
- An Irish Sea Region INTERREG bid led by the North West Development Agency and with national, regional and local government and academic partners from England, Wales, Ireland, Northern Ireland and the Isle of Man. This aimed to undertake a range of marine spatial planning capacity building activities and establish an Irish Sea Platform which would support partnership working in the region. Development of the bid coincided with the progress of the UK Marine Bill through parliament and attracted significant levels of interest and support. However, once the Bill became law, those involved felt that it was timely to step back and consider afresh what activities might best support and complement the new pattern of marine spatial planning responsibilities.

As a result, the ESRC was approached for funding to host two events which would provide an opportunity for stakeholders to come together to reflect on the best way forward. The objectives of the events were as follows:

- To disseminate the partnership working findings of the ESRC/NERC Trans-disciplinary Seminar Series to a broad range of stakeholders with an interest in marine spatial planning for the Irish Sea;
- To explore how transnational partnership working might assist national level marine spatial planning activity in the Irish Sea;

- To draw upon wider European experience of transnational partnership working related to marine spatial planning in order to inform discussion about possible new arrangements in the Irish Sea context;
- To review existing transnational partnership initiatives in the Irish Sea in order to consider how these relate to the future needs of marine spatial planning and to identify potential gaps; and
- To develop an agreed plan of action to foster improved transnational partnership working in support of national level marine spatial planning and a joined up approach to action in the Irish Sea.

AIMS AND CONTENT OF THE TWO EVENTS

Following the successful application, detailed planning of the events was guided by a Steering Group comprising representatives from the following organisations:

- Countryside Council for Wales
- Department of Environment, Northern Ireland
- Dublin Regional Authority
- Isle of Man Government
- Marine Management Organisation, England
- Marine Scotland
- National Oceanography Centre, UK
- Natural England
- North West Coastal Forum
- Scottish Coastal Forum
- University of Liverpool
- Welsh Assembly Government Marine Team

The first event was held in the Merseyside Maritime Museum in Liverpool on 11 February 2011. It drew together over 70 stakeholders representing a broad cross-section of interests in the Irish Sea. It aimed to provide an overview of the new marine planning arrangements and to explore stakeholder views on the future development of transnational partnership working to support marine spatial planning in the Irish Sea region. The event included two stakeholder discussion sessions. One was concerned with determining the different motivations that stakeholders have for engaging in partnership working activity. The second reviewed the merits of different partnership working options drawing upon examples from elsewhere. The programme for the event is shown below.

**Marine Spatial Planning and
Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea
Merseyside Maritime Museum, Liverpool
Thursday 10 February 2011**

Morning Session

What can we gain from Irish Sea Transnational Partnership Working?

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 10.30 | Welcome and introduction to the purpose and format of the day
Sue Kidd University of Liverpool |
| 10.35 | 6 nation overview of Irish Sea marine spatial planning developments |
| 10.50 | Panel discussion with national marine spatial planning representatives |
| 11.10 | The case for transnational partnership working: a view from DG Mare
Hermien Busschbach, DG Mare |
| 11.30 | Reflections on experience in the Baltic Sea Region
Dr. Wilfried Görmar, Federal Office for Building & Regional Planning, Germany |
| 11.50 | Stakeholder Round Table Discussions (with refreshments):
Motivations for Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea |
| 12.40 | Feedback and Discussion |
| 13.00 | Lunch |

Afternoon Session

What are the merits of different transnational partnership working options?

- | | |
|-------|--|
| 14.00 | Possible transnational partnership working options or the Irish Sea Region |
| 14.20 | Stakeholder Round Table Discussions (with refreshments):
The benefits and challenges of different options |
| 15.20 | Feedback and Discussion |
| 15.50 | Next Steps |
| 16.00 | Close |

The second, two-day event was held in the O'Callaghan Alexander Hotel in Dublin on 23/24 June 2011. This drew together 37 delegates again representing a spread of interests in the Irish Sea. The workshop aimed to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to reflect on the findings of the Liverpool event, learn more about existing and proposed transnational partnership arrangements in the Irish Sea region and think about future transnational partnership working possibilities. As the programme below indicates, the event included four discussions sessions. Drawing upon the understanding of stakeholder motivations developed at the event in Liverpool, the first session considered what the objectives of future transnational partnership working in the Irish Sea might be. The second session defined key areas for collaborative action, while the third assessed the extent to which existing partnership arrangements could deliver this agenda. In the final session stakeholders worked together to identify a series of recommended next steps.

**Marine Spatial Planning and
Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea:
O'Callaghan Alexander Hotel, Dublin
23/24 June 2011**

Day 1

What Can Transnational Partnership Working Achieve?

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 13.30 | Introduction to the Workshop
Sue Kidd, University of Liverpool |
| 13.40 | What can we learn from international experience?
Martyn Youell, Marine Management Organisation, England. |
| 14.00 | Ideas from the Wadden Sea
Manfred Vollmer, Wadden Sea Forum |
| 14.20 | OSPAR: action to protect the marine environment
David Johnson, OSPAR |
| 14.40 | The British Irish Council: The role of working groups
Martin Hall, Isle of Man Government |
| 15.00 | Refreshments |
| 15.30 | The Solway Firth Partnership: action at the local scale
Pam Taylor, Project Manager |
| 15.45 | The Irish Sea Marine Conservation Zones Project Stakeholder Group
Sue Kidd/Greg Whitfield ISZ Project |
| 16.00 | Irish Sea Platform Proposal
Patricia Potter, Dublin Regional Authority |
| 16.15 | Panel Discussion |

Day 2

What might be the objectives of future Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea?

- 9.00 Summary of findings for Workshop 1 and reflection on Day 1
Sue Kidd, University of Liverpool
- 9.15 Reflections on Marine Asset Planning in UK Waters
Helen Elphick, Crown Estates
- 9.30 Reflections on Renewable Energy Development in the Irish Sea
Maria Scarlett, Centrica
- 9.45 Stakeholder Round Table Discussions
- 10.15 Feedback and Discussion
- 10.30 *Refreshments*

What might be key areas for collaborative action?

- 10.45 Stakeholder Round Table Discussions
- 11.15 Feedback and Discussion

Can existing transnational partnership arrangements in the Irish Sea deliver this agenda?

- 11.30 Stakeholder Round Table Discussions
- 12.00 Feedback and Discussion

What are the recommended next steps?

- 12.15 Plenary Discussion
- 12.45 *Lunch*
- 13.30 Close

SUMMARY OF OUTPUTS FROM STAKEHOLDER DISCUSSIONS

This section provides a summary of the outputs from each of the stakeholder discussion sessions. Further details are included in the appendices to the report. Taken together they paint a helpful picture of stakeholder ambitions for transnational partnership working in the Irish Sea and set out some very practical steps that can be taken to encourage a joined up approach to marine spatial planning in the region.

Discussion 1 Motivations for Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea

'TPW is intrinsic to effective MSP for the Irish Sea – you simply can't have MSP without it.'

The first discussion session focused on identifying the motivations that different stakeholders have for participating in transnational partnership working related to marine spatial planning in the Irish Sea. Many of the motivations identified were shared by different stakeholder interests and the following listing highlights the key motivations identified.

Transnational partnership working can support marine spatial planning in the Irish Sea by:

1. Facilitating knowledge exchange, improved dialogue, shared understanding, and capacity building.
2. Facilitating an approach which is consistent with the transnational scale of natural processes.
3. Increasing understanding of cross-boundary issues and impacts.
4. Facilitating sharing of information and data.
5. Encouraging an integrated, multi-use approach to this intensively used shared resource.
6. Facilitating a coordinated approach to international/ EU obligations.
7. Improving efficiency, avoiding duplication of effort and costs, and opening up access to new funding opportunities.
8. Providing a broad-based forum for stakeholder engagement and enabling stakeholders to bring agendas to a wide audience.
9. Facilitating a joined up approach which recognises that stakeholder interests cross administrative boundaries.
10. Helping to develop a coordinated approach to major cross-boundary development issues.
11. Building cooperation and developing areas of joint working and common practice.
12. Developing a better appreciation of the shared maritime Celtic heritage, culture and perspective.
13. Providing a forum to strengthen regional sea, national and local maritime governance and identity.

(Motivations are listed broadly in order of frequency of reference in the notes from the stakeholder roundtable discussions. See supporting analysis in Annex 1.)

Discussion 2: The Benefits and Challenges of Different Transnational Partnership Working Options

‘Whatever system is established, it is essential that there is some statutory authority to ensure that things get done...otherwise it will be just a talking shop’

To help stakeholders consider the possible form of future transnational partnership working arrangements in the Irish Sea, key features from a range of initiatives in other European Sea contexts were compared (see Table A in Annex 2). Drawing upon this analysis a range of possible options for the Irish Sea were identified (see Table B in Annex 2) and these were used as a prompt for discussions. Stakeholders were asked to identify the benefits and challenges associated with the different options and to come to a view as to what might be the most suitable for the Irish Sea. From the discussions a tentative proposal regarding the future form of transnational partnership working in the Irish Sea can be put forward.

A Tentative Proposal Regarding the Form of Future Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea	
Area of coverage	The Irish Sea could be the primary area of interest in the short term, but there is a need to recognise there is a secondary, wider area of influence. There will be a need to fit into the bigger picture particularly in the longer term.
Foundation	High level international agreement and formal partnership arrangements are thought to be necessary to ensure effective TPW in support of MSP in the Irish Sea. Involvement of the British Irish Council, and those involved directly in MSP activities, possibly supported by an Irish Sea MSP secretariat/formally constituted stakeholder group could be one way forward. However, it is desirable that there is also a more informal mechanism which is inclusive of a wide range of stakeholders and is fluid and flexible to meet changing circumstances.
Mix of partners	A wide mix of partners could be involved including high level international representation, key national/local government agencies and wider stakeholder interests.
Focus of activities	TPW could focus upon the sustainable development and management of the Irish Sea. TPW could relate to marine planning and management and ICZM, but with the scope to embrace wider transnational perspectives as appropriate.
Main Meeting Cycle	There could be annual high level transnational meetings plus additional meetings as necessary.
Sub Groups	A Strategy Committee could be established plus task orientated working groups as required guided by an agreed set of ‘ground rules’.
Secretariat	A formal link to the British Irish Council could be beneficial plus national coordinators and a rotating secretariat plus student internships.

(See supporting analysis in Annex 2)

In addition to the above one of the discussion groups set out the following guidance related to the process of defining institutional/governance structures related to transnational partnership working.

In order to ensure transparency in developing and agreeing a suitable partnership approach, the aim should be to:

- Command the respect of stakeholders;
- Be appropriate and proportionate;
- Be supported by appropriate resources (human and financial);
- Be long-term and adaptive (a quick 'fix' would not be appropriate);
- Involve open two-way communication between governments and other stakeholders; and
- Provide a robust mandate for partnership.

Discussion 3: What might be the objectives for future TPW in the Irish Sea?

Drawing upon the list of motivations identified at the Liverpool meeting, the first discussion session at the Dublin workshop asked stakeholders to define what the objectives for future transnational partnership working in the Irish Sea might be. The discussions (analysed in annex 3) revealed a strong degree of agreement about the following objectives:

- To provide a broad based forum for all Irish Sea users and provide an opportunity for voices to be heard;
- To facilitate knowledge exchange and capacity building across all administrations and sectors about marine planning;
- To facilitate sharing of data and information;
- To encourage and maintain political support for transnational partnership working in support of marine planning in the Irish Sea; and
- To facilitate a more coordinated, efficient planning process for transnational issues/projects and good working relationships among Irish Sea partners.

Discussion 4: What might be the key areas for collaborative action?

With these objectives in mind, stakeholders were then asked to identify key areas for collaborative action. Interestingly here, as the analysis tables in Annex 4 show, most groups distinguished between short term and longer term actions and the key actions identified can be summarised as follows:

Short Term

- The terms of reference and identity of the new grouping needs to be defined;
- Development of a communications strategy designed to raise awareness of marine planning issues and developments and facilitate information exchange and networking among Irish Sea partners;
- Development of an Irish Sea website / information portal;
- Creation of an Irish Sea stakeholder data base; and
- Organisation and facilitation of an Irish Sea Forum or conference to allow sharing of information and dissemination of progress.

Longer Term

- Creation of a signpost or index of available data, information and existing initiatives across all administrations, with harmonised approach to standards and compatibility;
- Provision of training sessions related to marine licensing, planning etc; and
- Development of communication and networking opportunities offered by different social media.

Discussion 5: Can existing transnational partnerships deliver this agenda?

A key question that was explored at the Dublin meeting was whether existing partnership arrangements that relate to the Irish Sea could be built on to deliver the agenda that stakeholders had defined. Four partnerships had been identified as being relevant for consideration, The British Irish Council, OSPAR, PISCES (a European Commission funded LIFE project) and local coastal and maritime partnerships. All these groupings had some representation at the event in Dublin. The following points summarise the main conclusions to emerge from the analysis tables presented in annex 5.

The British-Irish Council is a good starting point - it can provide high level endorsement for a coordinated approach to the Irish Sea marine spatial planning agenda.

OSPAR could have an advisory role for an Irish Sea grouping.

PISCES – is focussed on the Celtic Sea and therefore does not cover our region but it has done work on stakeholder mapping/engagement which could be utilised

Local partnerships can assist in stakeholder mapping and engagement with stakeholders in inshore and coastal waters.

A new organisation is needed – this should not be driven by one particular sector, thus avoiding capture of the agenda. This would make stakeholder buy-in easier. The organisation must be independent of any one nation and have high level political support.

NEXT STEPS

The final plenary session at the Dublin event sought to identify what the next steps might be. The following plan of action illustrates a commitment from key parties to move the agenda forward including an ambition to hold an Irish Sea conference in Spring/Summer 2012. Ideally, if resources permitted stakeholders envisaged that this conference would be the first event a new Irish Sea 'Forum'. It was agreed that the Steering Group that helped plan the two events reported on here would reconvene in autumn 2011 to progress these actions. The scene is therefore set for a new era of transnational partnership working in the Irish Sea Region to support and complement the developing marine spatial planning arrangements.

Actions Identified in Final Discussions	Lead
Explore the willingness of BIC to be involved in Marine Spatial Planning for the Irish Sea – possibility of setting up a new MSP work stream	IoM Government
Explore the potential for an officer-level meetings of the devolved administrations	DoE Northern Ireland
Work with local partnerships to raise awareness of Irish Sea and link to an Irish Sea conference in Spring/Summer 2012	NW Coastal Forum
Continue to hold Steering Group teleconferences to progress Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea	University of Liverpool
Develop an initial Business Plan and associated financing strategy covering potential different levels of central staff support and services	Steering Group (with input from NW Coastal Forum/University of Liverpool and Centrica)
First major event of new “Irish Sea Forum” (activities could include updates from devolved administrations on MSP, breakout groups)	Steering Group
Develop initial web pages associated with the Liverpool and Dublin events and associated delegate pack material, presentations and outputs.	University of Liverpool
Provide all delegates from Liverpool and Dublin events with link to web pages and an update on next steps	University of Liverpool

Possible Further Actions Arising from Discussion 4

The terms of reference and identity of the new grouping needs to be defined

Development of a communications strategy
--

Development of an Irish Sea website / information portal
--

Creation of a signpost or index of available data, information and existing initiatives across all administrations, with harmonised approach to standards and compatibility.
--

Development of communication and networking opportunities offered by different social media

Annex 1: Motivations for Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea

Stakeholder Roundtable Discussion Analysis Tables

Motivations for Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea							
Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Motivation
MSP new, helpful to see what others are doing and learn from them. Share expertise and understanding of good practice.	Many issues of common interest. Need to keep informed.	Find out what is going on in other administrations. Each area has inherent interest in the plans of others. Improves dialogue and shared understanding, including appreciation of best practice.	Rapid evolution of MSP and imminent need to adapt to climate change - need for capacity building of organisations concerned. TPW can help understanding of different MSP systems in Irish Sea. Sharing knowledge, experiences and best practice in relation to MSP, both within and across sectors. Potential value of sharing training across the Irish Sea	TPW provides an ability to learn from others. TPW is key to knowledge exchange.	TPW brings social benefits – knowledge generation. Learning from neighbouring experiences and other ways of doing things – an inclusive approach makes sure everyone can learn from best practice.	Understanding of what lessons can be learned from elsewhere e.g. in Irish Sea, Baltic... Shared understanding of issues. Opportunity to mutually influence thinking and potential outcomes. Building upon the experiences of others.	1 TPW can support MSP in the Irish Sea by facilitating knowledge exchange, improved dialogue, shared understanding, and capacity building.

Motivations for Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea							
Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Motivation
	Administrative boundaries are artificial and do not relate to natural processes – it makes sense to manage at the whole Irish Sea level.	Getting the best for wildlife – ecosystem functions across administrative boundaries. TPW maximises the opportunity to do things sustainably.	TPW can help understanding of the Irish Sea system particularly in relation to natural systems including oceanographic processes. TPW can assist in the delivery of the ecosystem approach to MSP.	Better ecosystem management (i.e. pollution or species do not align with administrative boundaries).	Fish/ecosystems are mobile and do not respect artificial administrative boundaries – therefore need all administrations to work together towards holistic management.	TPW helps address issues at an appropriate spatial scale respecting biogeographic boundaries rather than administrative ones. TPW essential in achieving ‘good ecological status’.	2 TPW can support MSP in the Irish Sea by facilitating an approach which is consistent with the transnational scale of natural processes.
TPW can help understanding of cross-border issues and impacts	TPW can help understanding of what is going on in the wider area and appreciation of cross-boundary impacts	TPW can help reduce conflict	TPW can help understanding of cross-border transnational planning (and associated governance issues)	The most problematic areas are often those at administrative boundaries, so a coordinated approach is most effective in dealing with these.		TPW must be operable at the local level as well as a high level, many trans-boundary issues are very localised.	3 TPW can support MSP in the Irish Sea by increasing understanding of cross-boundary issues and impacts.

Motivations for Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea							
Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Motivation
Share information/data		Information sharing/ pooling of knowledge	TPW can promote data sharing and TPW can increase data availability/accessibility between/amongst stakeholders	TPW can assist in the swapping of data on mobile species in order to ascertain ecological health and also to socio-economic data. TPW can assist in the development of research collaborations	Sharing information	TPW could facilitate data and information sharing	4 TPW can support MSP in the Irish Sea by facilitating sharing of information and data.
TPW needed to help integration not just for sea but also between sea/coastal zone/land.	Irish Sea is a small area. The need to work together is greater because of concentration of activity. Intensity of use shrinks available space. Need to dovetail plans together and ensure compatibility and integration	TPW helps provide a holistic appreciation of the big picture, where you can begin to find win-win situations/foster an integrated approach across administrative boundaries. TPW provides greater opportunities for multi-use of space and co-location	The Irish Sea is a shared resource.	TPW is intrinsic to effective MSP for the Irish Sea – you simply can't have MSP without it.			5 TPW can support MSP in the Irish Sea by encouraging an integrated, multi-use approach to this intensively used shared resource.

Motivations for Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea							
Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Motivation
Better understanding and compliance with EU obligations e.g. EU Roadmap for MSP and the Water Framework Directive.	TPW can help achieve compliance with EU directives e.g. Marine Strategy Framework Directive	EU legislation is a driver for TPW	TPW can facilitate implementation of SEA/EIA directives and promote improved understanding of cumulative and large scale impacts and cross-boundary consultation e.g. in relation to offshore development		International legislation obliges us to work together. A common approach is needed especially in relation to EU legislation e.g. EIA/SEA		6 TPW can support MSP in the Irish Sea by facilitating a coordinated approach to international/EU obligations.
		Improve efficiency.	TPW can bring economic benefits, avoid duplication of effort/costs, provides opportunities for resource sharing and also access to funding to support joint working (e.g INTERREG).	TPW also provides opportunities to achieve economies of scale in MSP and avoid duplication e.g. harmonisation of the permit process for major energy developments.	Many economic benefits / saving money with TPW, especially in current financial climate. Aim for maximum benefit from least effort. Availability of funds to support TPW.	Potential to streamline and integrate consenting processes e.g. from an industry perspective in terms of development.	7 TPW can support MSP in the Irish Sea by improving efficiency, avoiding duplication of effort and costs, and opening up access to new funding opportunities.

Motivations for Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea							
Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Motivation
Development / implementation of MSP requires stakeholder engagement. TPW is one way in which stakeholders can be mobilised	To safeguard existing and potential landowner/user interests			Stakeholder engagement is important to the MSP process. There must be an effective way to ensure that their voices are heard. Some sea users do not have formally recognised rights/lack political expression of their interests, particularly if it is based in another administration (e.g. fisheries). TPW can help give a voice to such groups.		TPW in the form of a forum or formal structure could help to give stakeholders equal weighting, encourage broad based participation and representation of smaller or single stakeholders. It provides opportunities to bring agendas to a wider forum. The existence of a forum becomes a motivating factor from an individual perspective helping to ensure broad based participation.	8 TPW can support MSP in the Irish Sea by providing a broad-based forum for stakeholder engagement and enabling stakeholders to bring agendas to a wide audience.

Motivations for Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea							
Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Motivation
	Sectoral/ stakeholder interests often cross administrative boundaries and some are mobile – it makes sense to manage at the whole Irish Sea level.	TPW gives consistency to stakeholders who often work across administrative boundaries.		TPW is necessary for effective stakeholder engagement as many ‘users’ of the sea cross administrative boundaries.	Freedom of the seas – the right to roam means some commonality of approach is needed.		9 TPW can support MSP in the Irish Sea by facilitating a joined up approach which recognises that stakeholder interests cross administrative boundaries.
TPW can help develop a coordinated approach to economic development (e.g. renewable energy and tourism) in the Irish Sea		TPW can assist in meeting government targets e.g. related to renewable energy where critical infrastructure crosses administrative boundaries		TPW allows for a more holistic response to development issues such as windfarm development. The scale of offshore planning is generally transnational	TPW can facilitate a common approach e.g. in relation to the energy industry where a common planning approach is needed if we want to move towards creating ‘green’ infrastructure		10 TPW can support MSP in the Irish Sea by helping to develop a coordinated approach to major cross-boundary development issues.

Motivations for Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea							
Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Motivation
		Setting down common processes	Creation of appropriate joint information infrastructure and data management protocols	TPW could encourage data to be collected on the same basis. TPW can facilitate joint projects and accessing funding, particularly from EU sources		Building cooperation	11 TPW can support MSP in the Irish Sea by building cooperation and developing areas of joint working and common practice.
			TPW can help develop a better appreciation of the shared maritime heritage, culture and perspective of the Irish Sea region and promote sharing of lessons/coordination among planning bodies in relation to this theme	There is a shared maritime Celtic culture and being able to come together as one can help protect all shared interests.			12 TPW can support MSP in the Irish Sea by developing a better appreciation of the shared maritime Celtic heritage, culture and perspective.

Motivations for Transnational Partnership Working in the Irish Sea							
Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Motivation
				In the case of Wales its policy and legislation is often subsumed with that of England, so being able to represent itself in a TPW context can be seen as an expression of national sovereignty		TPW at Irish Sea level may be a way of overcoming limitations of high level coordination at the regional sea level – points to the importance of the British Irish Council	13 TPW can support MSP in the Irish Sea by providing a forum to strengthen regional sea, national and local maritime governance and identity.

Annex 2: What are the merits of different transnational partnership working options?

Stakeholder Roundtable Discussion Analysis Tables

Table A: Features of Transnational Partnerships in other European Seas: Discussion Prompt Material

Partnership	Foundation	Mix of Partners	Focus of Activities	Main Meeting Cycle	Sub Groups	Secretariat
<i>Arctic Council</i>	Ottawa Declaration of 1996	Inter- governmental forum with observers	Sustainable development / environmental protection	Biennial meetings	Working Groups	Secretariat plus revolving chair
<i>OSPAR</i>	Oslo Convention 1972	Inter- governmental forum with observers	Protection of the marine environment	Annual meetings	Strategy Committees and Working Groups	Changing secretariat plus student internships
<i>Atlantic Arc Commission</i>	Formal partnership 1989	Regional /local government collaboration	Transport, sustainable development, fisheries, research / innovation	Political Bureau meetings 2 x per year	Working Groups	Executive and Technical secretariats National Coordinators
<i>Black Sea Synergy</i>	Statement between EU and Foreign Ministers 2008	National/ local government and civil society groups	Tackling common problems /Transport and Environment	Regular	Sector partnerships	No formal secretariat but EU supported
<i>Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development</i>	Barcelona Convention 1972	International, national governments and NGOs	Integrating environment and development	Biennial meetings	Rotating bureau of national representatives Focal Points to Review Work Areas	UNEP/MAP supported secretariat
<i>Wadden Sea Forum</i>	Informal established by Wadden Sea Trilateral Cooperation 2002	Independent platform of sectoral / regional / local government stakeholders	Cultural heritage, ecological protection and sustainable development	Plenary meetings 2 x per year	Steering Group and Working Groups	Small secretariat

Table B: Possible Options for Future Transnational partnership Working in the Irish Sea: Discussion Prompt Material

Area of Coverage	Foundation	Mix of Partners	Focus of Activities 1	Focus of Activities 2	Main Meeting Cycle	Sub Groups	Secretariat
Atlantic Arc	High Level International Agreement	Inter-governmental forum with observers	Protection of the marine environment	Sea focused	Biennial meeting	Strategy Committee and Working Groups	Executive and technical secretariats plus national coordinators
Celtic Seas	Formal Partnership	National/ local government and civil society groups	Integrating environment and development	ICZM/ marine focused	Annual meeting	Rotating committee of national representatives plus advisors to review work areas	Changing secretariat plus student internships
Irish Sea	Informal Partnership	Independent platform of sectoral / regional / local government stakeholders	Tackling common problems	Transnation-al Regional Devt	Meeting 2 x per year	Sector partnerships	No formal secretariat
Other?	Other?	Other?	Other?	Other?	Other?	Other?	Other?

What are the merits of different transnational partnership working options? Area of Coverage				
Possible Options	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Proposal
Atlantic Arc	Vast area, difficult to reach agreement. Unmanageable as one entity. However could be split into several sub groups. May have some attractions in terms of being able to attract funding from EU.		Merits of different options depend on desired outcomes. Knowledge exchange may be a key outcome supporting Atlantic Arc TPW recognising that this is likely to be viewed as a key outcome at all scales.	The Irish Sea could be the primary area of interest in the short term, but there is a need to recognise there is a secondary, wider area of influence. There will be a need to fit into the bigger picture particularly in the longer term.
Celtic Seas	Celtic Seas recognised by OSPAR. Main advantage is that it includes all of Ireland and allows for greater consideration of the east west dimensions and activity in more peripheral marine areas.	How tightly are the 'Celtic Seas' defined – it could go as far as the Bay of Biscay?	If the outcome is to achieve planning and management at an ecosystem scale and to balance economic/social and environmental pillars then the Celtic Seas plus an extension to the shelf break could have merits. However, balancing of different pillars of sustainability could also feature at Irish Sea level	
Irish Sea	The Irish Sea represents a focal point of action that can be built out from – we need to know what partnerships already exist in the Irish Sea so that we can begin a more coordinated effort	The Irish Sea is a more tightly defined geographic unit. There are good links already established. If the area is expanded then many new parties will need to be involved and will it be the case of 'too many cooks'?	If the key outcome envisaged is an integrated approach to consenting and multi use of space / co-location then the smaller scale of the Irish Sea could be best.	
Other		No sea sits in isolation.		

What are the merits of different transnational partnership working options? Foundation					
Possible Options	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 5	Proposal
High Level International Agreement	The ministerial agreement on one plan for the Solway Firth was cited as an example of a formal activity which was beneficial for stimulating further partnership working.	These options already exist with the British Irish Council however questions were raised as to how accountable this is to the general Irish Sea stakeholder.	High level international agreements with an emphasis on sharing would be needed to encourage information exchange as many organisations can be reticent to exchange knowledge though sometimes with good reason where commercial sensitivities are involved. Formal agreements would also be necessary to establish an integrated approach to consenting and to ensure compliance with multi-use of space. High level agreements are also necessary to ensure cross-sectoral consideration across economic, environmental and social pillars in different aspects of MSP.	Any TPW must have high level sponsorship.	High level international agreement and formal partnership arrangements are thought to be necessary to ensure effective TPW in support of MSP in the Irish Sea. Involvement of the British Irish Council, and those involved directly in MSP activities, possibly supported by an Irish Sea MSP secretariat/formally constituted stakeholder group could be one way forward. However, it is desirable that there is also a more informal mechanism which is inclusive of a wide range of stakeholders and is fluid and flexible to meet changing circumstances.
Formal Partnership	The main advantage of a formal partnership with government involvement was seen as having the power and the ability to make progress with initiatives more rapidly. The idea of an Irish Sea secretariat was proposed - this would be a formally constituted stakeholder group that would work with planning bodies around the Irish Sea to assist in the production of marine plans. Such an organisation would also permit groups of partners to engage in smaller, more locally focussed projects.				
Informal Partnership	Whilst informal partnerships can have advantages in that they can be kept running with minimal resources, there is a danger that they just become a series of meetings where little else is achieved. However, they do have some flexibility as smaller groupings of partners would be able to pursue funding sources.	Informal partnership has benefits as evidenced by the number of people/organisations from around the Irish Sea present at the workshop. Future arrangements should be inclusive and capable of involving more as time goes by and circumstances require, fluidity and flexibility important.	Informal partnerships may be useful in relation to dealing with issues at the appropriate ecosystem scale.		
Other		Favour a mix informal and formal. Should incorporate a bottom up approach and range from informal to formal at high level.	TPW must involve those working on day to day decision making in the marine environment.		

What are the merits of different transnational partnership working options? Mix of Partners				
Possible Options	Group 1	Group 2	Group 4	Proposal
Intergovernmental forum with observers	The main challenge to consider is where individual groups are up to in terms of activities – some may be already involved in partnership working and have capacity to become fully involved in joint initiatives whereas others may not be up to speed with current developments.	The group opted for a 3-way mix with all levels –informal, formal and high level international partners needing to be engaged in the partner mix. The partnership needs to reflect final foundation structure. Sectoral interests need to be engaged as well as all levels of government. The partner mix needs to be wide-ranging.	The group considered that an Intergovernmental Forum (supported by a high level agreement) might be the best way forward, but suggested that it should be informed by a series of ad hoc technical working groups bringing in wider interests	A wide mix of partners could be involved including high level international representation, key national/local government agencies and wider stakeholder interests.
National/local government with civil society groups				
Independent platform of sectoral /regional/local government stakeholders				
Other				

What are the merits of different transnational partnership working options? Focus of Activities 1				
Possible Options	Group 1	Group 2	Group 4	Proposal
Protection of the marine environment	The overall focus of activities would be based on common need, and could be something that is scoped out with the six planning bodies.	This will be dependent upon legislation and will be different for the different administrations Recommended a focus of activity on sustainable development and management recognising economic, social and environmental drivers and addressing issues of mutual/common interest. The feeling was that sustainable development encompasses all of the suggested options and that TPW should not be purely focused on just one element e.g. environmental protection or tackling problems.	The group was unanimous that the focus should encompass both environmental and development aspects and the need to work toward sustainable development, take account of ecosystem services, and try to understand cause and effect relationships. However, the challenges associated with the science and data needs to support such an approach were acknowledged and it was suggested that it would be necessary to focus on common issues. Equally the challenges of bringing such wide ranging interests together were raised including issues related to effective communication reflecting different perspectives, language and 'jargon'.	TPW could focus on the sustainable development and management of the Irish Sea.
Integrating environment and development				
Tackling common problems				
Other?				

What are the merits of different transnational partnership working options? Focus of Activities 2				
Possible Options	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Proposal
Sea Focused	TPW should be focussed on tangible issues rather than just high level policy.	It seems logical to be sea and ICZM focused.	Agreed that the area of focus will vary according to the issue being confronted, but that in general the coast should be included (e.g. as per WFD) as should transnational dimension. Avoiding coast could bring advantages in terms of more effective focussing of effort with potential gains in being able to achieve more with fewer resources as avoids getting bogged down with local issues.	TPW could relate to marine planning and management and ICZM, but with the scope to embrace wider transnational perspectives as appropriate.
ICZM/Marine Focused				
Transnational Regional Development				
Other				

What are the merits of different transnational partnership working options? Main Meeting Cycle			
Possible Options	Group 6	Group 7	Proposal
Biennial meeting	Meetings very regular at the beginning to start the process – then let partners decide frequency after that.	Need to retain flexible approach with scope to adapt to changing priorities as they arise, e.g. increase frequency to deal with more urgent more localised issues, but for high level transnational meetings one per year may suffice.	There could be annual high level transnational meetings plus additional meetings where necessary.
Annual meeting			
2 x meetings per year			
Other?			

What are the merits of different transnational partnership working options? Sub Groups					
Possible Options	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Proposal
Strategy Committee and Working Groups	Work of the proposed Intergovernmental Forum should be informed by a number of ad hoc	Establishment of a series of short sharp and focussed working groups involving key expertise and interests in particular topics (fisheries, energy etc) to establish position papers that can then involve transnational elements of individual jurisdictions in the MSP process. The benefits of this model were seen to be that it was very task orientated (not a 'talking shop'), was resource efficient (no standing organisations etc.) would be able to motivate participants that really mattered and would have a high degree of leverage due to the link back to the governments involved. The drawbacks were seen to be potential difficulties in integration and coordination of topics (although integration could be a specific working group), that it could end up relying on a relatively small pool of expertise who could be worn out by involvement in multiple groups. It may not properly respect national sensitivities on certain topics and may face problems due to varying timescales for MSP activity.	Strategy Committee with rotating chair and Working Groups preferred option (national coordinators to disseminate information out to stakeholders).	Favoured Strategy Committee and Working Groups. Rotating committee of national representatives plus advisors to review work areas. Desirability of specialist or expert sub groups was highlighted.	A Strategy Committee could be established plus task orientated working groups as required guided by an agreed set of 'ground rules'.
Rotating committee of national representatives plus advisors to review work areas	Technical Working Groups which would form and meet according to needs. It was suggested that the Intergovernmental Forum would need to set the 'ground rules' and priorities for joint working/sub groups so that the following benefits could be accrued: better coordination between administrations, more joined up policy, possible economic savings. Equally the rules could require activity to be focused upon addressing cross boundary issues, cross cutting issues.				
Sector Partnerships					
Other?					

What are the merits of different transnational partnership working options? Secretariat				
Possible Options	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Proposal
Executive and secretariat plus national coordinators	Rotating secretariat established by the British Irish Council which was seen definitely as the only credible body for this.	Could be based on British Irish Council, piggy backing on other existing groups (economic)	Executive and technical secretariat plus national coordinators. Changing secretariat plus student internships	A formal link to the British Irish Council could be beneficial, plus national coordinators and a rotating secretariat plus student internships.
Changing secretariat plus student internships				
No formal secretariat				
Other?				

Annex 3: What might be the objectives for future TPW in the Irish Sea?

Stakeholder Roundtable Discussion Analysis Tables

What might be the objectives for future TPW in the Irish Sea?			
GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4
Define stakeholders – stakeholder mapping, streamlined and systematic approach to engagement reflecting different groupings of stakeholders and their activities.	Defining stakeholders - different groups of stakeholders need to be identified, recognising there are different stakeholders for different activities and that different levels of engagement may be required. A streamlined and systematic approach to stakeholder involvement is needed.	To provide a mechanism for identifying and engaging stakeholders at different levels of government and grass roots and set ground rules for communication between stakeholders	To provide a broad based forum for all Irish Sea users and provide an opportunity for voices to be heard
Exchange of knowledge – informal/formal networking, exchange of good practice	Exchange of knowledge – across borders, formal and informal networking including marine planners and others	To facilitate knowledge exchange and capacity building across all administrations and sectors about marine planning	
To avoid duplication and cost by facilitating sharing of data and information	Avoid duplication and cost by data sharing and sharing of knowledge and information – exploration of legal implications		Encourage data and information sharing and harmonisation across all jurisdictions
	To produce a statutory memorandum of understanding – something with teeth like MMO or British Irish Council		To encourage and maintain political support of a broad-based forum
		To facilitate a more coordinated, efficient planning process for transnational issues/projects/ align MSP processes across boundaries	To facilitate good working relationships among transnational partners
			To secure long term funding

Annex 4: What might be the key areas for collaborative action?

Stakeholder Roundtable Discussion Analysis Tables

What might be the key areas for collaborative action?			
GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4
Raise awareness – a key action for the short term	Short Term provision of basic information at Irish Sea level, what is the current position in all administrations, where do you go if you want further information	Sharing of information and examples of best practice	Delivery of a communications strategy
Web site – signposting what is happening in the Irish Sea – none threatening – light touch approach links out to devolved administrations and opportunities for stakeholder networking , newsletter, video streams, webinars, policy links, workspace for professional planners etc	An Irish Sea Website making links across administrations, linking stakeholders information and knowledge, emphasis on signposting and a light touch approach. Synoptic picture of what is happening in the Irish Sea, newsletter. Where should it be hosted? Possibility to build upon Irish Sea Conservations Zones website?	Web site – could be a useful place for alerting people to meetings, events, new developments and allow stakeholders to register themselves as interested parties. And network with others from their sector and across sectors. Useful repository for information about working practices and an online learning forum.	Help to raise awareness through a website with registered membership could be used, can send out electronic newsletters and updates. (Issue of long term funding and who would maintain such a site would need to be considered)
Create stakeholder database with contact details			Bottom up approach to stakeholder mapping and creation of a database of sectoral networks. Mapping should develop understanding of links between different sectors, assess the dynamics of different sectors and would help to facilitate dialogue and action between different marine users

What might be the key areas for collaborative action?			
GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4
In longer term data sets and maps could be made available	In longer term website could be a more active tool embracing GIS and enabling the manipulation of data layers		Creation of a signpost or index of available data, information and existing initiatives across all administrations, with harmonised approach to standards and compatibility
In longer term training sessions e.g. licensing , planning			
In longer term opportunities offered by different social media could be explored.			
		The terms of reference and identity of any new group needs to be clearly defined in order to sell the benefits of being part of the organisation	
			Organisation and facilitation of an Annual Forum or conference to allow sharing of information and dissemination of progress.

Annex 5: Can existing transnational partnerships deliver this agenda?

Stakeholder Roundtable Discussion Analysis Tables

Can existing transnational partnerships deliver this agenda?			
GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4
<p>OSPAR: - Too high level and covers a much bigger scale.</p> <p>Could have an advisory role for an Irish Sea group</p> <p>PISCES – doesn't cover our region but has done work on stakeholder mapping/engagement which could be utilised</p> <p>A new organisation is needed – this should not be driven by one particular sector, thus avoiding capture of the agenda. This would make stakeholder buy-in easier.</p>	<p>British-Irish Council: - This is a good starting point; high level so can endorse the Irish Sea/MSP agenda. Represents a good opportunity for political buy-in. BIC could be a vehicle for intergovernmental discussion.</p> <p>If MSP is put on the agenda of BIC we can use their mechanisms to undertake activities, or they could commission work for an Irish Sea MSP group.</p>	<p>Irish Sea conservation Zones: - have already identified many of the Irish Sea stakeholders and has GIS database that could be utilised, but based on artificial boundaries and have an environmental focus that can be a barrier to some stakeholders getting involved – does not address socio-economic dimensions of Irish Sea activity.</p> <p>A new organisation must be independent of any one nation and have high level political support</p>	<p>Local partnerships: - Can assist in stakeholder mapping, but have no shared vision/many competing objectives and a more narrow focus on inshore and coastal waters.</p> <p>Current economic climate and issues of funding put coastal partnerships in an uncertain position for future activity</p>