***Disclaimer***

*The information displayed in these tables has been provided February 2016 and is currently out of date. Therefore, re-use of this data is not allowed. For more information on the current status of the MSPs, contact the relevant national MSP authorities.*

### Introduction

Understanding each other’s MSP system is important to understand why certain decisions are made and how domestic MSP processes are being run. The NorthSEE project activity 6.1 dealt with analyzing the different MSP systems, and thereby provided a kick-start into the NorthSEE project work.

### Method

The following steps have been taken for development of the tables:

1. Desk research on the different MSP systems has been used to understand the key aspects of the different MSP systems. Information was collected via research articles, websites of national MSP authorities, the EU MSP platform, as well as answers given to a survey done by UNESCO on MSP systems globally have been considered.
2. Splitting up the analysis into several themes and questions and filling the table with the information collected.
3. National MSP authorities have been asked to confirm or adapt the information in the table. Some of the questions were very broad, to make it possible to cover a range of aspects of the planning systems. The relevant MSP authorities have filled in most of the boxes, but some have been left blank. Also concerning the information filled In, not all is accurate. However, the table provides a first global overview of the different aspects of the planning systems.
4. A first analysis has been conducted on the difference between the countries.
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MSP comparative analysis table

*February 2016*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Belgium | The Netherlands | Germany | Denmark | Sweden | Norway | Scotland | INITIAL FINDINGS |
| Planning at the national level | National legislation | National legislation  Water Act Section 4.1 and article 4.5a, and Spatial Planning Act Section 2.3(2) | National legislation | National legislation: Act 615 of 8 June 2016 on Maritime Spatial Planning | National legislation | White paper to the Parliament 2002 "Protecting the Riches of the Seas" | National legislation.  ‘National Marine Plan’ comprises of two Plans (inshore and offshore waters) |  |
| National MSP authority | FOD MOB (Mobility)  Marine Environment Unit (acting as Marine Spatial  Planning Unit) | Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment | Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency (BSH) | Danish Maritime Authority, Ministry of Business and Growth. | Swedish agency for marine and water management | Norwegian Environment Agency. | Marine Scotland | Specific Marine oriented ministries VS environmental ministries VS mobility mysteries |
| Planning at the regional level |  | The first kilometer is shared competence of national, regional and local government, with a specific role also for the Water Boards.  The frame work vision for the sea binds the central government and in line with the principles of good government, the regional (land) planning authorities, take the framework into consideration. | The territorial sea is an integrated part of the (terrestrial) spatial plans of the coastal federal states.  Coastal federal states are able to develop an MSP.  The government of Lower Saxony and Schleswig Holstein extended their spatial land plan incorporation the sea. | The coastal municipalities have responsibility for coastal planning, including ports and so-called “coastal waters”, for which they can plan certain uses. | The counties of Västra Götaland, Kalmar and Västernorrland have been given the responsibility by the Government to coordinate the regional work for the three national MSP plans in the Gulf of Bothnia, Skagerrak/Kattegat and Baltic.  Lead agencies in the regional/local planning are the municipalities. Each of the over 80 municipalities with sea territory can  practice MSP out to the territorial boundary (12 NM from the Base line). | Counties also the regional responsibility for aquaculture and aquaculture interests. | 11 [Scottish Marine Regions](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/seamanagement/regional/Boundaries) (until 12nm). Regional Marine Plans will be developed in turn by [Marine Planning Partnerships](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/seamanagement/regional/partnerships) (regional stakeholders), allowing more local ownership and decision making about specific issues within their area. | Germany (lander), Sweden (municipalities and regions) and Norway (counties) have one or more specific lower governmental institutions for MSP.  Scotland has developed a new entity dealing with MSP issues (Planning partnerships). |
| Regional MSP authority |  | n/a | * Lower Saxony * Schleswig Holstein | Coastal municipalities | * Västra Götaland (for Kattegat) * Municipalities | * Counties | * Marine regions |  |
| Responsibilities and planning framework (description) | • Belgian Minister of the North Sea  • Implementation of MSP is coordinated by the Marine Environment Division of the Federal Public Service (FPS) Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment | * Interdepartmental Directors’ Consultative Body North Sea led by the Ministry of I&M * Divisions in several ministries have responsibility for implementing the Policy Document for the North Sea. The Minister for Infrastructure and the Environment is responsible for coordinating policy and management and the Interdepartmental Directors’ Consultation Body North Sea (lDON). * Rijkswaterstaat is the coordinating management authority | * The Federal Ministry of Transport and Digital Infrastructure (BMVI) is responsible for setting up maritime spatial plans for the North Sea and Baltic Sea EEZs. Specific plans are prepared by the Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency (BSH). * Federal Coastal States are responsible for setting up spatial targets and principles for their respective share of internal waters and territorial sea in the North and Baltic Sea | * Danish Maritime Authority, Ministry of Business and Growth is responsible for coordinating the development of a national MSP. | Swedish  Agency for Marine and Water Management (SwAM) to develop necessary  competence in MSP, to lead the national MSP according to the implemented (2015) EU directive and to collect information that may constitute planning evidence for MSP from the  County Administrative Boards (CABs). | The Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment has the main responsibility for ensuring integrated governmental climate and environmental policies. This ministry, and the underlying Environment Agency, has the main responsibility for the management plans for Norwegian waters, | UK Marine Policy Statement (MPS) created a common vision to act in.  The Scottish National Marine Plan is developed by Marine Scotland. Marine planning will be implemented at a local level within Scottish Marine Regions, extending out to 12 nautical miles.  Regional marine planning powers will be delegated to the Partnerships by Scottish Ministers. These powers will not include licensing or consenting as these will remain the responsibility of consenting bodies such as [Marine Scotland](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/marine/Licensing/marine) and Local Authorities. Marine Scotland will provide support. | Different approaches of set up of responsibilities:  - Establishment of new internal bodies  - Establishment of new task for minister  - Use a certain ministry to plan  - Use of more implementation-oriented organization to plan. |

## MSP authorities / institutional structure

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Belgium | The Netherlands | Germany | Denmark | Sweden | Norway | Scotland | INITIAL FINDINGS |
| Composition of Planning Team (national) | Agency professional staff and consultants | Multiple agency professional staff | Agency professional staff and consultants | Multiple agency professional staff and consultants | Agency professional staff and consultants | Multiple agency professional staff | Multiple agency professional staff |  |
| Size of Core Planning Team (national) | 1-5 professional staff | 6-10 professional staff | 1-5 professional staff | 1-2 professional staff for coordination plus  expected 6-10 professional staff for sector input | 11 professional staff | 11-20 professional staff | 1-5 professional staff | Norway has a relatively big planning team, while SCOT and DE, based on their EEZ are small. |
| Other Agencies involved | Environment, | Environment, | Environment, | Environment | Environment, | Environment, | Environment, | - Use of a lot of different agencies to gather input.  - DE and NOR rather limited number of other agencies involved. |
| Economic Development | Economic Development | Economic Development | Economic Development | Economic Development |  | Economic Development |
| Fisheries | Fisheries, |  | Fisheries | Fisheries, | Fisheries, | Fisheries |
| Aquaculture |  |  | Aquaculture | Aquaculture | Aquaculture | Aquaculture |
| Marine Transport, | Maritime Transport, | Marine Transport, | Marine Transport | Marine Transport, | Marine Transport | Marine Transport, |
| Ports, | Ports, |  | Ports |  |  | Ports, |
| Marine Mining/Aggregate Extraction , | Mining/Aggregate Extraction (Rijkswaterstaat), |  | Marine Mining/Aggregate Extraction | Marine Mining/Aggregate Extraction |  |  |
| Energy | Energy, |  | Energy | Energy, | Energy, | Energy, |
| Tourism |  |  | Tourism | Tourism, |  | Tourism, |
| Military | Military/Coast Guard | Military | Military | Military, |  | Military, |
| Coastal Land Use, | Cultural Heritage Agency |  | Coastal Land Use |  |  | Coastal Land Use, |
| All authorities having a competency at sea |  |  | All authorities having a competency at sea | Municiptalities and County Administartive board |  | Subsea cables,  migratory fish |

## National MSP authorities

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Belgium | The Netherlands | Germany National MSPs | Denmark | Sweden | Norway | Scotland | INITIAL FINDINGS |
| Name of Plan | Belgian Marine Spatial Plan | Policy document on the North Sea 2016-2021 | Spatial Plan for the German Exclusive Economic Zone  in the North Sea, | [Not yet named] | [no yet namned] | Integrated Management Plan for The Norwegian Part of the North  Sea and Skagerrak. | Scotland's National Marine Plan | MSP vs Policy Document vs Integrated Management Plan? (binding level) |
| Planning Area Geographic Scope | Exclusive Economic Zone and Territorial Sea (0-200 nm) | Exclusive Economic Zone and Territorial Sea | Exclusive Economic Zone (12-200 nm) only | Exclusive Economic Zone and Territorial Sea (0-200 nm) | Other (please specify)  1nm from baseline so 11nm-to midline including EEZ.  The Swedish territorial water is divided into two zones, Public Waters and Private Water. The Private Water zones,  comprises the water area 300 m from the shore line | Exclusive Economic Zone and Territorial Sea (0-200 nm). *Sea areas out to the baseline (i.e., a straight line between the outer islets and reefs)* | Exclusive Economic Zone and Territorial Sea (0-200  nm) | Normal EEZ and Territorial Sea. Germany only EEZ (Lander have territorial Sea). Norway and Sweden municipalities / counties plan the coastal sea. |
| Size of Planning Area (km2) | Less than 10,000 km2  *Total area of the Belgian Part of the North Sea (BPNS): 3,454kmÇ (i.e. about 0.5% of the entire*  *North Sea area)*  *• Size of territorial sea (12-nm zone from the baseline): 1,437kmÇ*  *• Exclusive Economic Zone: 2,017 kmÇ* | 50,000-100,000 km2  *• Size of Planning Area: 58,000 km2*  *• Only central government has jurisdiction over marine areas beyond 1 km from the coast (the first*  *km is shared with municipal and provincial authorities).* | 50,000-100,000 km2 | More than 100,000 km2*• Total Danish sea area: 105,000 km2*  *• Marine internal waters: 3,500 km2*  *• Territorial sea (12 nm zone): 40,000 km2*  *• Exclusive Economic Zone: 61,500 km2* | 50,000-100,000 km2 | 10,000-50,000 km2 | More than 100,000 km2 | * Similar sizes except for Belgium |
| Current status of planning | Plan approved by government or relevant authority | Plan approved by government. Nb. Revisions to the plan happen regularly. | Plan implemented | Act on Maritime Spatial Planning passed in 2016. The implementation process is currently being planned. | Planning underway. In 2015 the government adopted a marine spatial planning ordinance | Plan implemented | Plan implemented | * NL and BE: 3rd MSP * SCOT: first MSP implemented * Sweden, process started. * Denmark: new. |
| Years of Planning Phase | 2011-2014 (planning process) | 2 years or less prior to establishing plan | 2005-2009 (planning process) | 2016-2021 (planning process) | 2015-2019 (planning process) | 2009-2013 (planning process) | 2015 – 2020 (when plan is valid) |  |
| Planning period | More than 4 years | 2016-2021 (when plan is valid), Water Acts requires new plan every 6 years, in line with MSFD cycle. | More than 4 years | 5 years planning process. 10 years plan validity | Maximum 8 years between plans | 2-4 years | More than 4 years |  |

## Objectives, goals and drivers of National MSP

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Belgium | The Netherlands | Germany | Denmark | Sweden | Norway | Scotland | INITIAL FINDINGS |
| Major Drivers of MSP / Main issues | • Issues: uses within nature protection zones, offshore wind development and MPAs  • Future uses: submarine cables and pipelines, aquaculture, Other: offshore energy storage | * Sand extraction for shore protection; * Marine biodiversity (Good Environmental Status of MSFD); * Offshore (wind) energy; * Shipping, safety at sea, and accessibility of ports; * Defence   Are interest of national priority. Other uses and values of the sea are considered, e.g. fisheries, leisure/tourism, under water cultural heritage.  Plan sets out rules for activities and how the potential conflicting interactions between activities of national  interest are handled. | * safe and efficient navigation, * marine protection, commerce * offshore windpark planning   Spatial Planning Act:   * Securing and strengthening maritime traffic, * Strengthening economic capacity * Promotion of offshore wind * Long-term sustainable use of properties and potential of EEZ through reversible uses, economic use of space, and priority of marine uses, and * Securing natural resources | * Promotion of economic growth, the development of marine areas and the use of marine resources on a sustainable basis; * Taking account of the interaction of economic, social, environmental and safety aspects to support sustainable development and growth in the maritime sector.. * Promotion of the coexistence of various relevant activities and uses of marine space. * Ensuring cohesion in land-sea planning and application of an ecosystem-based approach. | Major driver is the ordinance, the implementation of the MSP EU-directive  Interests relate toclaims by global and local shipping,  energy production (including cables and pipelines for energy trans- mission), defense, fishing and aquaculture, and recreation and tourism as well as environmental protection and care of the cultural environment  These sectors have interests but none have been driving forces behind of MSP | set an overall framework for both existing and new activities in these waters, and facilitates the co-existence of different industries, particularly the fisheries industry, maritime transport and petroleum industry. The aim of the plan is to establish a holistic and ecosystem-based management of the activities | * Significant pressures in the marine environment: climate change contributed to by human activity, * and fishing which impacts on the seabed and species * Clean and safe seas * Healthy and biologically diverse * Productive sea (economic growth) | - Climate change is sometimes mentioned as major driver? How do countries differ in this perspective and what MSP can do with respect to climate change?  - Economic growth concerns (blue economy) is for some a bigger concern than for others. How to deal with economic growth potential and how to make sure it is not all about the sea as a resource.  - Need for integrated approach. Was an integrated approach lacking? How does MSP help in this? Are other plans sector oriented? Or was there already an integrated approach?  - Are conflicts observed between nature and human activities? What are the concerns exactly? |
| Economic growth concerns | Economic growth with a pariticular view to blue growth opportunities |  | Economic growth concerns | Economic growth concerns, |  | Economic growth concerns, |
| Perceived conflicts among uses, | Energy transition (offshore wind and other soources): sailing through and co-use of space within windpfarms. |  | Perceived conflicts among uses | Perceived conflicts among uses, | Perceived conflicts among uses, | Perceived conflicts among uses, |
| Perceived conflicts between uses and nature  conservation | Concerns on cumulative impacts of human uses. |  |  | Perceived conflicts between uses and nature  conservation |  | Perceived conflicts between uses and nature  conservation |
| Marine conservation or biodiversity concerns | Marine conservation, restoration and biodiversity obligations and targets (building with the North Sea Nature) |  |  | Marine conservation or biodiversity concerns | Marine conservation or biodiversity concerns |  |
| Need for a more integrated approach |  |  | Need for a more integrated approach | Need for a more integrated approach | Need for a more integrated approach , | Need for a more integrated approach |
| New and emerging uses | New and emerging uses | New and emerging uses | New and emerging uses | New and emerging uses | New and emerging uses | New and emerging uses |
|  | Climate change will be taken up more intensly. | Climate Protection Policy |  |  |  |  |
| Effects of climate change |  |  |  |  |  | Effects of climate change |
| Major Principles of MSP Identified | From plan:   * Precautionary principle, * Sustainability principle, * Security principle | Precautionary principle, ecosystem based management, GES of MSFD is corner stone (incl N2000 targets).  Politically guided (steered) and stakeholder driven process.   * the Central Government is endeavouring to pursue a development-oriented approach to the sea that leaves room for new initiatives and allows flexible management of the sea. |  | Principles not yet established. | * Plans shall indicate the preferred use of marine space * Plans shall contribute to good resource management * Good environmental status is a prerequisite for sustainable economic development |  | * Achieving a sustainable marine economy * Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society * Living within environmental limits * Promoting good governance * Using sound science responsibly | No major differences. Most economic, conservation and good governance. |
| Related to economic development | Related to economic development | Principles related to economic development |  | Principles related to economic development | Principles related to economic development | Principles related to economic development |
| Related to marine conservation | Related to marine conservation |  |  | Principles related to marine conservation | Principles related to marine conservation | Principles related to good governance, |
| Related to good governance | Related to good governance | Principles related to good governance |  | Principles related to good governance |  | Principles related to marine conservation |
| Major Goals Identified |  | From plan: North Sea is clean, healthy and productive, the ecosystem is functioning optimally and is resilient, and use of the North Sea is sustainable” | From Pla: Balances the needs of safe and efficient navigation, marine protection, commerce and science. | Goals not yet established. | * Plans that provide an accepted view of the national government’s intentions on how marine space shall be used | From plan:  a tool with an ecosystem-based, integrated approach to the management of marine areas. | From plan   * Economic * Social * Marine Ecosystem * Climate Change – Mitigation * Climate Change – Adaptation | - Some countries have social goals and governance goals incorporated in their MSP. |
| Economic | Economic | Economic goals, |  | Economic | Economic goals | Economic goals, |
| Social | Social |  |  | Social (jobs), | Social, |  |
| Environmental/Ecological | Environmental/Ecological | Environmental/Ecological goals |  | Environmental improvement compared to development without plans | Environmental/Ecological goals, | Environmental/Ecological goals |
| Governance |  |  |  |  | Governance, |  |
| SMART Objectives Specified / objectives of plan | Some SMART objectives were specified where  possible | Some SMART objectives where specific where possible (e.g. offshore wind & sand extraction strategy, routing/landing of cables and pipelines). | SMART objectives were not considered | Objectives not yet established. |  | SMART objectives were too difficult to specify | Some SMART objectives were specified where  possible | - Mostly there have not been any SMART objectives identified. NL, BE and SCOT have some of them. |
| Objectives Linked to Goals |  | All objectives linked to goals |  | Objectives and goals not yet established. | All objectives linked to goals | All objectives linked to goals |  |  |

## Legal aspects of national MSPs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Belgium | The Netherlands | Germany | Denmark | Sweden | Norway | Scotland | INITIAL FINDINGS |
| Legal basis | A Royal Decree of November 20, 2012 dictates the establishment of an advisory committee and the  procedure for the adoption of a MSP in the Belgian maritime regions. The Royal Decree of March 20,  2014 adopts the present MSP | The National Water Plan provides a policy framework (vision) for MSP based on the Water Act. The Policy Document on the North Sea is not itself a legal document but was prepared on the basis of  Water Decree (Waterbesluit). Additional procedural regulations apply under the National Water Act  (Waterwet), the Spatial Planning Act (Wet ruimtelijke ordening) and the Environmental Management Act  (Wet milieubeheer). | Federal Maritime Responsibilities Act (SeeAufG), as of 26 July 2002 plus related regulations, incl. Marine Facilities Ordinance (SeeAnlV) | National legislation: Act 615 of 8 June 2016 on Maritime Spatial Planning | The Swedish Environmental Code (EC, 1998:808) and the Plan and Building Act (2010:900) constitute the  legal base for marine spatial planning in Sweden. The Marine Spatial Planning Ordinance (2015:400) regulates the process of the marine spatial planning. the Plan and Building Act regulates the responsibilities and mandate for  the municipalities to plan | The Act relating to the management of wild living marine resources (Marine Resources Act, 2008). Further, MSP is anchored in government reports to the parliament and in government declarations. Also, a number of area-based management tools are in place, with a basis in various legislations | Marine planning matters in Scotland’s inshore waters are governed by the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010, an Act of the Scottish Parliament, and in its offshore waters by the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, an Act of the UK Parliament. |  |
| Legal impact | Current MSP has more legal impact than the previous. The North Sea master plan (2003) was not legally binding as  such, but can be seen as a first step towards maritime spatial planning in Belgium. Nevertheless, it served  as the basis for some binding Royal Decrees. | The plan is used to regulate activities in and use of the area through the permitting system. It  sets out rules for activities and how the potential conflicting interactions between activities of national  interest are handled. | The maritime spatial plan shall include targets (legally binding) and principles (guidelines that need to be particularly considered in the decision process) of spatial planning with regard to economic and scientific use, with regard to ensuring safety and efficiency of maritime traffic and as well with regard to protection of the marine environment. | The maritime spatial plan will be legally binding. | The plan is guiding, but not legally  binding. It should indicate the municipalities’ intentions about the future development. It should also  consider issues of national interests. The Plan and Building Act is a framework law emphasizing the need  for stakeholder involvement, but is not stipulating what the plan should contain or how it should be  developed. | There is limited legislative authority behind MSP in Norwegian waters. | The National Marine Plan sets out strategic policies for the sustainable development of Scotland’s marine resource. The regional plans.  This Plan does not replace or remove existing regulatory regimes or legislative requirements. Rather provides a consistent framework for their continued operation.  The Marine Acts require that public authorities must take authorisation or enforcement decisions in accordance with this Plan, such as on Marine licensing, fishing licences, Aquaculture development consents and Ports and Harbours. | Two main elements:  - There is a direct legal impact from the MSP  - Limit amount of impact and the plan tries to steer the management of the area (NOR) or set the frame for other institutions (SWE, SCOT). |
| Legal Status of Plan | Regulatory/Enforceable | Regulatory/Enforceable | Regulatory/Enforceable | Regulatory/Enforceable | Advisory/Strategic | Regulatory/Enforceable | Regulatory/Enforceable | All regulatory, except for the Swedish which is more strategic/advisory |

## Legal aspects of national MSPs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Belgium | The Netherlands | Germany | Denmark | Sweden | Norway | Scotland | INITIAL FINDINGS |
| Total funding for planning (up to impl. Phase) | Less than US$1,000,000 | Less than EUR1,000,000 | Less than $1,000,000 | Less than $1,000,000 |  | Less than US$1,000,000 | Less than US$1,000,000 |  |
| Sustained funding for implementation | Funding exists to fully implement the plan | Funding exists to fully implement the plan | No funding exists to fully implement the plan | Not known or approved at this time | Not known or approved at this time | Funding exists to fully implement the plan | Funding exists to fully implement the plan | Germany has no funding for implementation? |
| Source of Funding | General government revenues | General government revenues |  | General government revenues | General government revenues | General government revenues | General government revenues | Other sources of funding in the future? Public Private Partnershiop for actions? |
| Financial plan | No financial plan for future funding has been  developed | Financial plan will be included in the management plan | No financial plan for future funding has been  developed | No financial plan for future funding has been  developed | Yearly plans are made at the responcible authorities | No financial plan for future funding has been  developed | No financial plan for future funding has been  developed | Only NL has a financial plan included. Describe this part and why do the other countries not have a certain plan. |

## Financial aspects of national MSPs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Belgium | The Netherlands | Germany Uses in plan | Den | Sweden | Norway | Scotland | INITIAL FINDINGS |
| Major Marine uses considered in Plan (Ehler) | International Commercial Fishing, | International Commercial Fishing, |  | International Commercial Fishing | International Commercial Fishing, | International Commercial Fishing, | International Commercial Fishing, | Most countries have included a large diversity of sectors. Some differences:  Germany has no fishing  Countries with lower government MSP layers do not have land sea interaction and recreational fishing etc. |
| Recreational Fishing, | Recreational Fishing, |  | Recreational Fishing | Recreational Fishing, |  | Recreational Fishing, |
| Artisanal Fishing, |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aquaculture, | Aquaculture, |  | Aquaculture |  | Aquaculture, | Aquaculture, |
| Marine Transport, | Marine Transport, | Marine Transport, | Marine Transport | Marine Transport, | Marine Transport, | Marine Transport, |
| Ports | Ports, |  | Ports |  |  | Ports, |
| Offshore Renewable Energy, | Offshore Renewable Energy, | Offshore Renewable Energy, | Offshore Renewable Energy | Offshore Renewable Energy, | Offshore Renewable Energy, | Offshore Renewable Energy, |
|  | Offshore oil & gas | Offshore Oil & Gas , | Offshore Oil & Gas |  | Offshore Oil & Gas , | Offshore Oil & Gas , |
| Mineral Mining/Aggregate Extraction , | Mineral Mining/Aggregate Extraction , | Mineral Mining/Aggregate Extraction , | Mineral Mining/Aggregate Extraction | Mineral Mining/Aggregate Extraction , |  | Mineral Mining/Aggregate Extraction , |
| Domestic Commercial Fishing, | Domestic Commercial Fishing, |  | Domestic Commercial Fishing | Domestic Commercial Fishing | Domestic Commercial Fishing | Domestic Commercial Fishing |
| Military | Military, | Military, | Military | Military, |  | Military, |
| Recreation & Tourism | Recreation & Tourism |  | Recreation & Tourism | Recreation & Tourism , | Recreation &  Tourism , | Recreation & Tourism |
| Underwater Cultural Heritage, | Underwater Cultural Heritage, |  | Underwater Cultural Heritage | Underwater Cultural Heritage, | Underwater Cultural Heritage, | Underwater Cultural Heritage, |
| Marine Conservation, | Marine Conservation, | Marine Conservation, | Marine Conservation | Marine Conservation, | Marine Conservation, | Marine Conservation, |
| Coastal Land Uses | Land/sea interaction |  | Land/sea interaction | Land sea intraction |  | Coastal Land Uses, |
|  |  | Research |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cables and pipelines |  | Cables and pipelines |  |  |  |
|  | CO2 storage |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uses in plan (country fiches and plans) | Shipping | Shipping | Shipping | Shipping | Shipping | Shipping | Shipping, | Nature protection not in Sweden, Scotland and Norway.  Military not in Sweden and Norway.  Submarine cables not in Sweden and Norway.  Scientific research only in DE and BEL? |
| Ports |  | Ports |  |  |  | Ports, Harbours and Ferries |
| Mineral extraction | Mineral extraction | Mineral extraction | Mineral extraction | Mineral extraction | Mineral extraction | Aggregates (dredging etc) |
|  | Oil and gas exploitation | Oil and gas exploitation |  |  | Petroleum activities |  |
| Offshore renewable energy production | Offshore renewable energy production | Offshore renewable energy production | Offshore renewable energy production | Offshore renewable energy | Offshore renewable energy | Offshore Wind and Marine Renewable Energy |
| Fishing | Fishing | Fishing | Fishing | Fishing | Fisheries and Seafood | Sea Fisheries Wild Salmon and Diadromous Fish |
| Aquaculture | Aquaculture | Aquaculture | Aquaculture |  |  | Aquaculture |
| Tourism (incl. recreation and sports) | Tourism (incl. recreation and sports) | Tourism (incl. recreation and sports) | Tourism (incl. recreation and sports) – optional | Regional development intrests/sectors | Travel and tourism and leisure activities | Recreation and Tourism |
| Under water cultural heritage | Under water cultural heritage | Under water cultural heritage |  |  |  |  |
| Nature protection | Nature protection | Nature protection | Preservation, protection and improvement of the environment | Nature protection |  |  |
| Military | Military | Military |  | Military |  | Defence |
| Scientific Research |  | Scientific Research |  |  |  |  |
| Submarine cables and pipelines | Submarine cables and pipelines | Submarine cables and pipelines |  | Submarine cables and pipelines |  | Submarine Cables |
|  |  |  |  | Marine connectivity | Marine bioprospecting | Oil and Gas Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) |
| Co-existence of uses | Co-existence of uses was considered in designating areas for future activities. E.g.: A  ‘plug at sea’ or cabling station for offshore wind could also provide a resting place for  seals; wind farms can provide underwater habitat on artificial reefs; areas between  windmills are designated for aquaculture; ‘energy atolls’ for energy storage can also provide sandy habitat for breeding birds. | The Policy encourages  multiple use of space where this is appropriate and outlines the action to take in situations where there is a conflict of interest between activities of national importance. | This is included in the guidelines for the EEZ MSPs:   * Strengtheningeconomic capacity through orderly spatial development and optimisation of spatial use. * Long-term sustainable use of the properties and potential of the EEZ through reversible uses, economic use of space, and priority of marine uses | The maritime spatial plan is expected to provide for and promote co-existence of certain activities. | Co-existence among sectors/uses is priority | The management plans set an overall framework for both existing and new activities in these waters, and facilitates the co-existence of different industries, particularly the fisheries industry, maritime transport and petroleum industry. | Proposals which enable coexistence with other development sectors and activities within the Scottish marine area are encouraged in planning and decision making processes  to encourage development proposals which bring together activities which are compatible or synergistic in one location,  Opportunities for coexistence and synergies may be identified through existing examples, by sectors as new practices and technologies emerge or by data collection | All countries included co-existence of uses. |
| Use of zoning and type of zoning |  | IMO shipping lanes, prefered routing of cables and pipelines, sand extraction strategy, N2000 B&H areas, “plaice box”, designated areas for offshore wind. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land-sea interaction | * The MSP, Annex 2, p 10, defines the coastal zone as the zone that includes both land and sea. This areashould be seen as one spatial area where important economic, ecological and social challenges are * situated. * The Plan states that marine, land and water management mechanisms are complementary | Land-sea interactions are explicitly considered in section 3.13 of the Policy Document.  Focus is on the following interactions:  Electricity production  Commercial mineral extraction  Coastal defence  Oil and gas extraction  CO2 storage  Shipping/boat building and servicing  Military use  Fisheries  Aquaculture and mariculture  Telecommunications  Recreation  Cultural aspects  Increase in knowledge | Land-sea interaction is not one of the 5 principles of MSP in Germany’s EEZs.  Land-sea interactions are considered within the context of the federal state MSP plans, which include terrestrial areas and the 12nm territorial sea. For the North Sea, Lower Saxony has not developed an MSP including land-sea interaction. | The MSP Act has among its purposes the taking into account of land-sea interactions. | The national MSP does not include the coast. Environmental impacts will however be addressed with inclusion of coastal zone.  Regional/local MSP has strong land-sea interactions. | The plan refers to coastal waters and the shore zone, but not specific to land-sea interaction.  Land use in the coastal zone is regulated primarily through municipal planning under the Planning and Building Act. | Land-sea interactions have also been taken into account as part of the marine planning process. | Land-Sea interactions different when there is also a sub-national MSP authority involved (counties, lander, municipalities etc.). |
| Resilience to climate change impacts | Coastal protection is important to defend the coast against storms and flooding. A specific location is designated in the Belgian MSP to test new means for coastal defence. | Climate change and climate adaptation are considered in the Policy Document with  respect to coastal defence, impacts to the marine ecosystem, extreme weather and sea  level rise, and transition to carbon-neutral energy supply (renewable energy), accesibility of ports. | This is included in the guidelines for the EEZ MSPs: „Promotion of offshore wind energy use in accordance with the Federal Government's sustainability strategy,“ which considers the Federal Government’s Integrated Energy and Climate Protection Programme (IEKP). | Denmark's maritime spatial planning shall aim to contribute to sustainable development of the preservation, protection and improvement of the environment, including resilience to the con-sequences of climate change. | Report on CC influence of marine sectors has been produced and CC stressors are included in the planning and environmental assessment. | Climate change is often mentioned, also in combination with ocean acidification. | The National Marine Plan considers climate change in two distinct ways; in terms of how actions under this Plan might help mitigate the degree of anthropogenic induced climate change; and how actions under this Plan need to be adapted to take into account the effects of climate change. | Mitigation measures (emissions reduction /renewable energy) vs Adaptation measures (Coastal defense measures etc.).  Not all plans include adaptation measures (mainly the plans with regional MSP authorities lack these issues) |
| Use of ecosystem approach | Applied with success | Applied with success | Considered, but not used | Will be applied. | Not yet concrete | Applied with success | Applied with success | How did the countries use the ecosystem approach? Why did Germany lack this? |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Belgium | The Netherlands | Germany Stakeholders | Denmark | Sweden | Norway | Scotland | INITIAL FINDINGS |
| Stakeholder engagement | From 2 July - 29 September 2013 a public consultation about the draft MSP and the environmental impact  assessment.  140 contributions, related to the content and  the procedure of the plan, and also to the content of the environmental impact assessment. All comments  have been carefully considered and the plan has been adapted at several places.  [www.consult-environment.be](http://www.consult-environment.be). | Stakeholders can provide continuous input on  the Policy Document through the general mechanisms of House of Representatives  and participation procedures on major policies and legislation. [www.noordzeeloket.nl](http://www.noordzeeloket.nl)  For the 2016-2021 plan, a pré process was undertaken, drafting a vision for 2050 (in 2013/2014) this resulted in the North Sea 2050 Spatial development Agenda. 8 participatory workshops, 1 conference, advise of the Council of Children. Mostly direct stakeholders have been involved. The MSFD ran it’s own cycle with consultation. A maritime strategy was published in 2015, largly made with the imput of players in the Dutch Maritime Cluster. Together with a sand extraction strategy which was drafted over the period this was input for the MSP for 2016-2021. On 2 June 2014 a Memorandum on Scope and Details for the revisiion of the National Water Plan (incl MSP North Sea) was made available for public consultation. From 23 December 2014 to 22 June 2015 the Draft Policy Document on teh North Sea and the Marine Strategy part 3 were available for consultation. The specific Counsel for Infrastructure and Environment (OIM) was consulted on 25 september 2014. [note this Counsel consists of the organised stakeholder groups like the Dutch Wind Energy Association, fisheries associations and ngo’s]. Most of teh North Sea countries have been visited to present the draft Policy Document. | Broad public participation was secured through consultations with stakeholders (agencies and NGOs): marine environment and nature conservation, fisheries, energy, sand and gravel, shipping, military, tourism, leisure boating, research. | The planning process will be designed to be open and transparent with ample stakeholder involvement. This will be succeeded by a 6-month hearing period for the final plan. | Stakeholders are included. First years mainly by sharing information. Then national sector authorities and regional governments and municipalities are engaged. Current steps more actively involving the private sectors and interest groups (incl NGO). | consultations with stakeholders took place at three different stages.  S1: written feedback from stakeholders on plan for Environmental impact assessments (EIAs),  S2: written feedback from stakeholders on EIAs,  S3: stakeholder hearing conference on Assessment of cumulative effects. | Marine Schotland developed a Statement of Public Participation (SPP), consisting of 9 steps to be taken in the process to engage stakeholders.  <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/seamanagement/national/nmpspp> | All have been integration stakeholders. Differences might be:  - Nr of stakeholder meetings  - Continuous input services  - More local approach (going to the stakeholders themselves: SCOT).  - When to involve stakeholder in the process (start of process, EIA, draft of MSP?) |
| Groups of stakeholders | All marine uses | All users of marine space and interest groups |  | All marine uses |  |  | All marine uses | Little difference, questions are:  - The necessity to incl the general public. How and why?  - How to involve other governmental agencies at the same level?  - How to involve governmental agencies at a lower level (criteria)  - Choose for all marine uses or only the relevant ones? |
|  |  | Relevant marine uses |  | Relevant marine uses | Relevant marine uses |  |
| Non-governmental organisations | Non-governmental organisations | Non-governmental organisations | Non-governmental organisations | Non-governmental organisations | Non-governmental organisations | Non-governmental organisations |
| General public | General public) | General public | General public | General public (very little) | General public | General public |
| Other government agencies | Other government agencies | Other government agencies | Other government agencies | Other government agencies (main stakeholders) | Other government agencies | Other government agencies |
| Other relevant levels of government | Other relevant levels of government | Other relevant levels of government | Other relevant levels of government | Other relevant levels of government | Other relevant levels of government | Other relevant levels of government engaged, |
| Neighboring countries | North Sea countries |  | Neighboring countries | Neighboring countries |  |  |
| Purpose of stakeholder engagement | Issue identification, | Issue identification, |  | Issue identification | Issue identification, | Issue identification | Issue identification | - Some countries only for info, issues and evidence.  SCOT,NL and BE also for plan formulation. BE also for the implementation and DE and BE also for monitoring and evaluation |
| Source of Information/ evidence gathering | Source of  information/ evidence gathering | Source of Information/evidence gathering | Source of Information/evidence gathering | Source of Information/evidence gathering | Source of Information/evidence gathering | Source of Information/evidence gathering |
| Consensus building | Consensus building, |  | Consensus building, | Consensus building, | Consensus building, | Consensus building, |
| Goal setting, |  |  |  | Goal setting |  |  |
| Plan formulation, | Plan formulation, | Plan formulation |  |  |  | Plan formulation, |
| Plan implementation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monitoring and evaluation |  | Monitoring and evaluation |  |  |  |  |
| Frequency of stakeholder engagement | Throughout the MSP process | Throughout the MSP process | * At beginning of MSP process, * At some point during the MSP process | Throughout the MSP process | Throughout the MSP process | * At some point during the MSP process, * At end of MSP process, * Throughout the MSP process | * Throughout the MSP process | Same, but DE more focussed on specific moments. |
| Conflicts resolved during stakeholder engagement | No clear conflict resolution process existed, but most  conflicts resolved | Clear conflict resolution process existed, and most conflicts were resolved, and/or processes have been agreed to take negotiations forward (e.g. sailing through and co-use of windfarms). Habitat protection in various areas like teh Doggerbank have been presented to parliament to decide upon. | No clear conflict resolution process existed, but most  conflicts resolved | No clear conflict resolution process has been established. | Too early in the process to say | Clear conflict resolution process existed, and most  conflicts resolved | * No clear conflict resolution process existed, but most * conflicts resolved | In NOR and NL case of clear conflicts which have most been solved (explain what and how) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Belgium | The Netherlands Relation with other plans and processes | Germany | Denmark | Sweden | Norway | Scotland | INITIAL FINDINGS |
| Trans boundary consultation | Cross-border consultation was carried out with the Netherlands, France, and the United Kingdom.  Information was shared effectively across borders | Section 6 covers international cooperation.  Information was shared actively across borders | Information was shared effectively across borders | Information will be shared across borders. | Information was shared effectively across borders |  | Information was shared effectively across borders | Information was shared at all (except NOR). How was information distributed in the process and with what purpose? |
| Harmonization with other plans | * the Belgian Action plan for renewable energy; * National Strategy and Operational Programme drawn up in the framework of the European Common Fisheries Policy * Masterplan Coastal Safety (10/06/11). | * MSFD process: * The Netherlands has followed the 3-step process laid out under the MSFD to produce its Marine Strategy. * Maritime strategy 2015-2025. * Comply with Water Framework Directive (WFD) * Natura 2000policy and obligations. * Common Fisheries Policy: * recognises EU competence on setting fishing measures and addresses this in the policy plan. | MSFD Through administrative agreements, a joint committee was established between the federal government and the coastal Länder, i.e. the BLANO (Bund/Länder-Committee North- and Baltic Sea). The BLANO functions as a steering group for the implementation of the directive | The MSP is expected to take account of existing sector plans for the involved sectors. | * It is a major challenge to align national MSP with local/regional planning | Water plans: Norway have been divided into 11 water regions, each region headed by a river basin authority which is one of the affected counties in the region. It has been prepared water management plans for 20 percent of rivers and coastal waters in Norway in 2010. Plans will be completed during 2015 the rest of the country, with environmental achievement in 2021. | Marine Planning Framework in Scotland decribes the other process and plans. Specific attention is given to UK legislation, UK Coastal and Protection Act 2009, UK Marine Policy Statement  (agreed between all UK administrations). Also close connection to sectoral plans (SOEP, sectorla offshore energy plan) | * Countries with sub-national MSP authorities organise harmonization with other levels through official committees/planning procedures/ * Sectoral plans have mostly been taken into account |
| Relation to ICZM | Strong connection to adjacent coastal management  program | The most powerful thing in the world! Living below the sea level makes integrated coastal management part of our DNA. We have a strategy and money up to 2100. Building with natureprinciples have been applied for various weak connections (where possible).  The 2013 National Coastal Vision, prepared as part of the Delta Programme, provided a comprehensive vision for the development of a safe, attractive and economically robust coast. The regional government is responsible for spatial coastal development. National Water Plan (overarching governmental policy document) has one section devoted to the coast.  Specific process to understand land-sea interactions properly. As 1 of the three major actions presented in teh North Sea 2050 Spatial Agenda.  Adjecent water bodies, like the Wadden, IJsselmeer, West- and Easter Scheldt, riversystems all have planning and policy programs in effect. | No coastal management program to connect to.  At the Länder level, ICM projects are being continuously carried out under the auspices of spatial planning. In Lower Saxony the establishment of an ICZM information platform was part of the Land strategy. Its objective is to support the players in the coastal region with planning and is intended as an informal means of information exchange between all the players with activities in the coastal region. It provides information about major projects, plans and processes relevant to ICZM in Lower Saxony’s coastal zone. | No connection yet developed to coastal management programmes. | * On local/regional level of MSP | Weak connection to adjacent coastal management  program  Counties are responsible for preparing regional plans and regional planning provisions, and have the opportunity to prepare regional coastal plans. | Weak connection to adjacent coastal management  program | Belgium strong connection. Others weak connection. |
| Relation to Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) | Existing and future MPAs incorporated in the  management plan | Existing and future MPAs incorporated in the policy plan. Management plans are in place or will be drawn up under N2000 legislation. | MPAs planned under a separate process | Existing and future MPAs incorporated in the management plan | Existing MPAs are included as MPAs in the MSP. | MPAs planned under a separate process | Existing and future MPAs incorporated in the management plan | NL, SCOT & BE: MPAs incorporated. NOR and GER under separate process. How to align MPAs in the plan? |
| Use of SEA | Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or  Programmatic Environmental Impact  Statement (PEIS) completed | Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or  Programmatic Environmental Impact  Statement (PEIS) completed  SEA and EIAs are checked by specific independent Environmental Assessment Commission, giving advise on substance and methodology. Advice 14 July 2015, report number: 2995-36.  Main advise: “to conduct further analysis of the total impacts on teh environment and achievement of teh avrious ambitions for the North Sea, and on the basis of that, assessing whether (in teh log term) this might lead to conflicts and/or risks of significant environmental impact necessitationg the making of choises and/or prioritisation. The Central Government has adopted this recommendation, prior to presenting the Policy Document for the Northsea / MSP to the parliament. | Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or  Programmatic Environmental Impact  Statement (PEIS) completed | Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) will be used. | SEA is under way and a specific analytic tool for integrating cumulative impact assessment in the planning process is under development (name: Symphony) | Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or  Programmatic Environmental Impact  Statement (PEIS) completed | Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or  Programmatic Environmental Impact  Statement (PEIS) completed | All completed. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Belgium | The Netherlands Data and tools for planning | Germany | Denmark | Sweden | Norway | Scotland | INITIAL FINDINGS |
| Use of decision support tools | No decision support tools used | Design criteria are used (e.g. distance between shipping and offshore wind sites) | No decision support tools used | Marine Spatial Data Infrastructure will provide access to relevant data in addition to viewing tools. | Decision support tools successfully used  Symphony (se previous row) | No decision support tools used | Decision support tools successfully used | BE, NL, GER, NO used no tools. SWE and SCOT did. What kind of tools, how have they been used? |
| Use of information for planning | Used existing information, but needed  extensive collation | * Used existing information primarily * Needed to collect additional information through new studies | Not considered | A national MSDI is under development and will include 80+ public sector data sets on relevant maritime activities and factors that must be included in the planning process. | * Using existing information, undertaking extensive collation * Collecting additional information through new studies targeting specific issues of concern (conflicts etc)   the Västra Götaland county administrative board is developing its longstanding  collaboration with the four coastal municipalities on the production of planning data | Used existing information, but needed  extensive collation | Needed to collect additional information through new  studies | Some countries needed new studies, other used existing information |
| Data rights and data infrastructure | Belgian Marine Atlas: http://odnature.naturalsciences.be/marine-atlas/data | Website with all relevant information: www.noordzeeloket.nl/en  North Sea Atlas: <https://www.noordzeeloket.nl/en/spatial-management/north-sea-atlas/index.aspx>  <http://www.nationaalgeoregister.nl/geonetwork/srv/dut/search> |  | Nearly all public sector data needed for MSP are open data and these will be included in the MSDI. The MSDI will make the live data accessible from their source so there always is an updated overview of marine activities and uses. | * Most data are/will be open source |  | MSS data is used in national assessments, such as [Scotland’s Marine Atlas](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/marine/science/atlas), [Charting Progress 2](http://chartingprogress.defra.gov.uk/) and international assessments conducted by inter-governmental organisations such as [OSPAR](http://www.ospar.org/) and [ICES](http://www.ices.dk/Pages/default.aspx)) |  |
| Data exchange (international and other sectors) |  |  |  | Engaged in data harmonisation activities in the Baltic context. | Open (except working material) |  |  |  |
| Sort and types of data |  | Reports + GIS files (on request) |  | Sector data for the planning process | GIS files and reports |  |  |  |
| Use of scenarios for planning | Multiple scenarios developed | Considered, but no new scenario’s used | Not considered | May be considered. | Undertaken | Other techniques used, e.g., forecasts, projections | Other techniques used, e.g., forecasts, projections | Only BE used scenario building as a ground for their MSP. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Belgium | The Netherlands | Germany | Denmark | Sweden | Norway | Scotland | INITIAL FINDINGS |
| Compliance with Plan by government and ministries | Strong compliance by relevant government ministries/agencies | Strong compliance by relevant government ministries/agencies | Strong compliance by relevant government ministries/agencies | Not yet known | Aiming for strong compliance by relevant government ministries/agencies | Strong compliance by relevant government ministries/agencies | Mixed success in compliance by relevant government  ministries | SCOT is the only one with a mixed compliancy by other ministries and users. Reasons for this? How to increase compliance? |
| Compliance by users | Strong compliance by major users | Strong compliance by major users | Strong compliance by major users | Not yet known | Aiming for strong compliance | Strong compliance by major users | Mixed success in compliance by major users |  |
| Pilot plans and projects | Certain amount of innovative actions incorporated in plan | Nr of actions and pilot projects developed in plan |  | None yet. | * Several collaboration projects |  |  | Not clear yet how specific actions are defined in the plans and how they will be implemented. |

## Compliance for plans

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Belgium | The Netherlands | Germany | Denmark | Sweden | Norway | Scotland |  |
| Monitoring and Evaluation of plan effectiveness | A plan for monitoring and evaluation is included in the  Plan.  The plan will be reviewed every six years and is legally binding. | Monitoring and evaluation part of regular policy cycle, no specifics hereon included in teh MSP.  The Policy Document on the North Sea 2009-2015 was evaluated whilst drawing up the revised document  for 2016-2021. This current Policy Document will be reviewed and revised in line with the requirements  of the MSP Directive | Monitoring and evaluation considered but not  emphasised in plan | Monitoring and evaluation will be included in the plan. | Not yet known | A plan for monitoring and evaluation is included in the plan | Monitoring and evaluation to be considered  after implementation. Marine Scotland developed a monitoing and Evaluation plan <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0049/00497943.pdf> | Most countries active with monitoring and evaluation of plan. Germany less. |
| Use of indictators to measures effectiveness | No indicators were identified | Environmental, economic, social and governance indicators used. | No indicators were identified | Indicators are expected to be included in the plan. | Yes | Environmental indicators used to measure  plan effectiveness | Environmental, economic, social and governance indicators used. | Norway only environmental indicators  BE and GER no indicators. |
| Frequency of plan revision | Review/revision more than every 5 years | every 6 years or on a need to do so base. | Review/revision more than every 5 years | At least every 10 years. | * At least every 8 years | Review/revision every 4-5 years | Review/revision every 3 years | Scotland has short time frame for evaluating plan. |
| Evaluation used for plan revision | Evaluation results used to revise and adapt first plan | Evaluation results used to revise and adapt first plan | Plan has not been revised yet | Will be worked into the monitoring and evaluation provisions of the plan. | * Not yet known | Evaluation results used to revise and adapt first plan | Plan has not been revised yet | For countries with a plan the evaluations are used for plan revision. For new MSP countries this is not the case. |

## Monitoring & Evaluation

