



## Implementing ICZM at sub-national / local level – recommendations on best practice

A. Pickaver and M. Ferreira  
EUCC – The Coastal Union



## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. ICZM implementation at sub-national / local level .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Relevance of the ICZM eight principles and actions measuring ICZM progress at local level .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 ICZM Principles versus actions measuring ICZM progress .....	5
3.1.1 Broad holistic approach .....	6
3.1.2 Long-term perspective .....	6
3.1.3 Adaptive management.....	7
3.1.4 Local specificity.....	8
3.1.5 Working with natural processes.....	9
3.1.6 Support and involvement of all stakeholders.....	11
3.1.7 Participatory approach.....	12
3.1.8 A combination of instruments .....	13
<b>4. Conclusions &amp; Recommendations .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>ANNEX 1:</b>	
The revised ICZM Implementation Progress Indicator as used in the COREPOINT project tests .....	17

### **Acknowledgements:**

This research was funded as part of the INTERREG IIB-funded COREPOINT - COastal REsearch and POlicy INTegration project which is promoting ICZM solutions across NW Europe. The authors would like to thank the COREPOINT partners and in particular, Dr Rhoda Ballinger and team for complementary report which has been directly used in the compilation of illustrations by COREPOINT case studies – *Dr Rhoda Ballinger, Cardiff University “ The COREPOINT Partner Survey Evaluation of local ICZM efforts” ,2008.*

## 1. Introduction

Integrated Coastal Zone Management is a continuous process with the general aim of implementing sustainable development in coastal zones based upon integration of policies and cooperation of all stakeholders in an informed and participatory context. The three pillars of ICZM - vertical integration, horizontal integration, and public participation – call, mainly for efficient information flow and communication structures between different levels of administration, between different economic and administrative sectors that have a stake in the coast, and between administration and the public. The drivers for coastal management vary from place to place and upon the various scales from international to sub national – local level.

This report will focus on the sub national level and aims to provide recommendations and guidelines on best practice implementation of ICZM at local level in North-West Europe, as part of the COREPOINT project. This will be achieved by combining two-fold approach:

- to associate the eight principles of ICZM and the needed actions for implementation of these principles as proposed by the EU ICZM Expert Group Working Group on Indicators and Data (WG-ID) – the ICZM Implementation Progress Indicator; and
- to illustrate the degree to which an integrated system of coastal management is being implemented around the European littoral at local levels, using the findings of the local experiences and examples researched by the COREPOINT Expert Couplet Nodes (ECNs) at various locations. These local experiences and studies will facilitate the assessment of the relevance of the EU's eight principles of best practice in local coastal management and spatial planning.

The COREPOINT ECNs are as follows: Cork Harbour (Ireland), Mont St Michel Bay (France), Golfe Du Morbihan (France), Flanders – national/regional (Belgium), Severn Estuary (Wales), Western Isles (Scotland), Sefton Coast (England), Durham Coast (England) and Donegal Beaches (Northern Ireland).

The ICZM Progress Indicator methodology which have been applied to measure progress in the implementation of ICZM in selected regions in the Corepoint project shows the level of progress being made in the implementation of the ICZM process. This indicator allows Member States and Acceding Countries to determine the extent of their national, sub-national implementation of ICZM and a means to assess whether that progress is leading to improved sustainability of the coastal resources. It evaluates the progress using semi-quantitative criteria by recognising that the cyclical ICZM process is broken down into a series of 31 discrete, ranked actions.

This report specifically includes the findings and results extracted from the test results of the EU ICZM Progress Indicator conducted in Ireland, Belgium, north-west England and north-east England and also incorporates *The COREPOINT Partner Survey Evaluation of local ICZM efforts*<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ballinger R., Cardiff University “ The COREPOINT Partner Survey Evaluation of local ICZM efforts” .COREPOINT partnership. 2008.

## **2. ICZM implementation at sub-national / local level**

Integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) is a continuous process with the general aim of implementing sustainable development in coastal zones based upon integration of policies, cooperation of all stakeholders in an informed and participatory context. ICZM implies vertical and horizontal integration and public participation which call for efficient information flow and communication structures between different levels of administration (national, regional, local), between different economic and administrative bodies that have a stake in the coast, between administration and the public, and between the research community and coastal managers.

Although the detailed responsibilities and powers of local government vary from State to State, in general, local authorities manage, regulate and facilitate a wide range of coastal activities. They also have various resource development and management roles. These include delivering various key services related to ICM, such as land use planning and zoning, coast protection, land drainage, water supply, transport infrastructure, amenity provision and environmental health. With such a broad range of statutory responsibilities and powers, local government is often considered the cornerstone of ICM delivery at local levels<sup>2</sup>.

Local government can play many roles of relevance to ICZM, such as representing local interests, and play a key role in creating sustainable communities - as recognised and requested by Local Agenda 21. Many local authorities, for example, have responsibilities relating to land use planning and zoning, coast protection, land drainage, water supply, transport infrastructure, amenity provision and environmental health. All of these are relevant to coastal management so it is vital that there is effective communication and integration within local government itself.

The majority of North-West Member States have governance systems that consist of central Government departments working in conjunction with other State agencies and local government authorities. In the particular case of Belgium a mixed competence is in place – national level (federal) and regional (Flemish). The local municipalities have also responsibilities and this implies close cooperation between federal state and region in determining coastal policy and management.

---

<sup>2</sup> in *Review of International Approaches to Integrated Coastal Management (ICM)*, COREPOINT partnership, Revised version Feb. 2007.

### **3. Relevance of the ICZM eight principles and actions measuring ICZM progress at local level**

#### ***3.1 ICZM Principles versus actions measuring ICZM progress***

The need for an integrated and strategic approach for the management of coastal zones has gained evidence by the Europe-wide sub-national (regional and local level) experiences collected during the *EU ICZM Demonstration Programme of 1999*. These have led to the presentation of two documents by the European Commission in September 2000: a Strategy for Europe<sup>3</sup> and a Recommendation concerning the implementation of Integrated Coastal Zone Management<sup>4</sup> ICZM Recommendation (2002/413/EC) by which a formal agreement on eight key principles of good ICZM to ensure success for improving European Union's coastal sustainability have been outlined.

As a response to the Recommendation, the first High Level Forum on Community Strategies for Integrated Coastal Zone Management, held in Spain in October 2002 (Anon, 2002), commended the use of comparable indicators in assessing both the status of the coast and the degree to which an integrated system of coastal management is being introduced around the European littoral.

A document describing an indicator to measure the progress of ICZM implementation in the coastal zone was presented by the WG-ID to the second meeting of the Group of Experts in June 2003, and has been tested Europe wide since then. The indicator shows the level of progress being made in the implementation of the ICZM process. It evaluates the progress using semi-quantitative criteria by recognising that the cyclical ICZM process is broken down into a series of 31 discrete, ranked actions. These actions, which are needed to pass from a situation where no ICZM is being used to one where it is being fully implemented, are ordered into five continuous phases<sup>5</sup>.

More recently, the Evaluation of ICZM in Europe<sup>6</sup> has led the EC to present another document reflecting the results of analysis regarding implementation of ICZM Recommendation in all EU countries. The EC recognizes that a one key achievement of the EU ICZM Recommendation has been *"...to codify a common set of principles that should underlie sound coastal planning and management. While the evaluation confirms the relevance of these ICZM principles, the implementation of the EU ICZM Recommendation also reveals varying interpretations and understanding of ICZM across Europe. To foster a more coherent and effective implementation of ICZM, the principles need to be made more operational and better communicated."*<sup>7</sup>

In order to support this concluding recommendation, the following exercise is proposed: - an association between the eight principles of ICZM and the needed actions for implementation of these principles as proposed by the EU ICZM Implementation Progress Indicator, which aims to better communicate the way towards successful ICZM implementation at local level.

---

<sup>3</sup> Communication by the Commission to the Council and the Parliament on Integrated Coastal Zone Management: a Strategy for Europe (COM/2000/547), adopted 27 September, 2000.

<sup>4</sup> (2002/413/EC) Commission of the European Communities, 2002.

<sup>5</sup> See Annex 1 and *Ocean & Coastal Marine Science 47 449 2004*.

<sup>6</sup> An evaluation of integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) in Europe, 1/12/2006, <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/iczm/home.htm>.

<sup>7</sup> Communication from the Commission - Report to the European Parliament and the Council: an evaluation of Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) in Europe /\* COM/2007/0308 final

### 3.1.1 Broad holistic approach

- a broad overall perspective (thematic and geographic) which will take into account the interdependence and disparity of natural systems and human activities with an impact on coastal areas;

#### Key actions for ICZM implementation supporting principle 1:

- PHASE 1: action 3. There are spatial development plans which include the coastal zone but do not treat it as a distinct and separate entity

#### Level of implementation:

PHASE	Action	REGIONAL				LOCAL		
		NE England	Belgium	NW England	Ireland	NW England	NE England	Ireland
1	3	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red

Green = Affirmative response

Red = Negative response

Yellow = Undecided

#### COREPOINT experience:

##### (i) Using data from tests of the EU ICZM Progress Indicator

It appears that this principle is largely being implemented in England at regional and local levels. There seems to be some difference in regional and local application in Belgium and Ireland.

##### (ii) As illustrated by COREPOINT case studies experiences

This is borne out in the COREPOINT case study area results which revealed that, although all the ICZM initiatives reviewed have in some way or another a non-statutory ICZM plan, they do include sustainable development as a key aim and most address a wide range of topics, there appears some bias to certain topics within some of the efforts. This is also reflected in the focus of many ICZM initiatives towards addressing environmental rather than both socio-economic and cultural characteristics of the local areas. However, the study also showed that most ICZM efforts do not consider their regional context in sufficient detail. There also appears limited consideration of land-sea interactions as well as cross-boundary impacts and issues.

### 3.1.2 Long-term perspective

- a long-term perspective which will take into account the precautionary principle and the needs of present and future generations;

#### Key actions for ICZM implementation supporting principle 2:

- PHASE 1: Action 4. Aspects of coastal zone, including marine areas, are regularly monitored
- PHASE 3: action 14. A Report on the State of the Coast has been written with the intention of repeating the exercise every five or ten years.
- PHASE 4: Action 28. A long-term financial commitment is in place for the implementation of ICZM
- PHASE 4: action 31. Monitoring shows a demonstrable trend towards a more sustainable use of coastal and marine resources.

Level of implementation:

PHASE	Action	REGIONAL				LOCAL		
		NE England	Belgium	NW England	Ireland	NW England	NE England	Ireland
1	4	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green
3	14	Red	Green	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red
4	28	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
4	31	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow

Green = Affirmative response  
 Red = Negative response  
 Yellow = Undecided

**COREPOINT experience:**

(i) Using data from tests of the EU ICZM Progress Indicator

The results generally reveal a rather mixed picture in terms of conformity to this principle. In most cases, the coastal zone is being monitored and in some cases the monitoring is showing a trend towards a more sustainable use of coastal and marine resources. There has been only a limited application to producing a state of the coast report every 5 years. This is considered vital to ensure that any progress in ICZM implementation can be linked to greater sustainability. It is worrying that nowhere is there a long-term financial commitment to implement ICZM in the future.

(ii) As illustrated by COREPOINT case studies experiences

ICZM implementation generally fall into two distinct periods: those which commenced in the mid-to late 1990s, all UK-based, and those which are a much more recent development of the last three years. A few of the local areas, notably County Donegal and Belgium have no ICZM plans or programmes as yet. Given the lack of local ICZM plans and programmes in some areas and the relative infancy of the plans and programmes elsewhere it is relatively early days to assess their contribution to the adherence to this principle. In particular, few areas have undertaken or even yet considered plan / programme review. Only three areas have stated ICZM plan / programme review periods and only one of these, for the Northern Ireland Coastal Strategy, has a review period of over 10 years. Some programmes, such as the Severn Estuary Partnership, which has been in existence for over a decade, have not yet undertaken a formal review process. This lack of ICZM plan review is a significant obstacle to the adoption of a long-term perspective.

Responses relating to the availability of long-term data sets for ICZM planning indicate a somewhat patchy and generally poor situation. Only the Sefton Coast Partnership Plan appears to have access to long-term data related to natural processes, ecology and sectoral coastal development trends. Although a few respondents suggested that such data was partially available, most highlighted a paucity of data and information on sectoral trends for ICZM development.

**3.1.3 Adaptive management**

*- adaptive management during a gradual process which will facilitate adjustment as problems and knowledge develop. This implies the need for a sound scientific basis concerning the evolution of the coastal zone;*

**Key actions for ICZM implementation supporting principle 3:**

- PHASE 2: action 11. A sustainable development strategy which includes specific references to coasts and seas is in place.

Level of implementation:

PHASE	Action	REGIONAL				LOCAL		
		NE England	Belgium	NW England	Ireland	NW England	NE England	Ireland
2	11	Red	Red	Green	Red	Yellow	Red	Red

Green = Affirmative response

Red = Negative response

Yellow = Undecided

**COREPOINT experience:**

**(i) Using data from tests of the EU ICZM Progress Indicator**

In general, adaptive management is not being practiced in the COREPOINT region.

**(ii) As illustrated by COREPOINT case studies experiences**

In terms of the monitoring and review of the ICZM efforts, the results were rather mixed. Few ICZM programmes have considered these aspects, reflecting the relatively early stage of development of the ICZM initiatives in many areas. Even some of the longer established programmes have only considered these elements, but have not yet implemented them. Consequently, the capacity for the overall ICZM planning process to be adaptive appears rather variable across the study areas. It appears that even though all of the ICZM efforts use some sort of structured process to identify issues for management there is generally sufficient flexibility in the approaches for the management efforts to be able to respond to issues as they emerge. In relation to responses referring to access and use of data and information, the results were also variable with the UK ICZM efforts appearing to have access to the widest range of different types of coastal information. Specific information gaps impeding an adaptive approach to coastal management included major gaps relating to:

- long term data sets & info on coastal flooding & vulnerability (Durham);
- medium/longer term processes and environmental hazards (Western Isles)
- coastal erosion and flooding (Mont Saint Michel).

To the extent to which such information is able to or has informed the various stages of ICZM and spatial planning development and, hence been able to facilitate adaptive approaches, was investigated. It is clear that there are relatively poor levels of information and use and accessibility at most of the stages of ICZM development. Even during the early stages, most respondents inadequate or only partial access to relevant information. There was a slightly more encouraging response to the question about access to data and information from previous policy development with most respondents suggesting that this is available. Despite such inadequacies, all of the ICZM initiatives appear to recognise the uncertainties and limitations of their information base and are attempting to fill information gaps, as appropriate.

**3.1.4 Local specificity**

*- local specificity and the great diversity of European coastal zones, which will make it possible to respond to their practical needs with specific solutions and flexible measures;*

**Key actions for ICZM implementation supporting principle 5:**

- PHASE 2: action 10. Ad hoc actions on the coast are being carried out that include recognisable elements of ICZM.
- PHASE 2: action 12. Guidelines have been produced by national, regional or local governments which advise planning authorities on appropriate uses of the coastal zone.

Level of implementation:

PHASE	Action	REGIONAL				LOCAL		
		NE England	Belgium	NW England	Ireland	NW England	NE England	Ireland
2	10	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
2	12	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Red

Green = Affirmative response  
 Red = Negative response  
 Yellow = Undecided

**COREPOINT experience:**

*(i) Using data from tests of the EU ICZM Progress Indicator*

This principle is being carried out fully in England and Belgium and only partially in Ireland.

*(ii) As illustrated by COREPOINT case studies experiences*

In general, most of the ICZM plans/programmes cover topics directly relevant to the key management issues identified by the COREPOINT partners and all initiatives make an attempt to consider local coastal characteristics and impacts. To support this, most of the local programmes appear to have mechanisms enabling involvement of local administrative bodies and stakeholders and even the more large-scale regional and national programmes have mechanisms to facilitate the partial involvement of these stakeholders. However, the respondents highlighted variable and generally only partial access and use of local information in ICZM plan/programme process (Figure xxx). There are particular gaps in the access and use of local information relating to coastal communities. Additionally, although there appears to be an attempt to acquire local knowledge and facilitate participation at this level in many of the examples this is, however, frequently less than adequate. Generally then, these results would suggest that the local ICZM planning efforts within the COREPOINT Expert Couplets are attempting to address the principle of local specificity, but that there are some significant variations between the COREPOINT partners' responses.

**3.1.5 Working with natural processes**

*- working with natural processes and respecting the carrying capacity of ecosystems, which will make human activities more environmentally friendly, socially responsible and economically sound in the long run;*

**Key actions for ICZM implementation supporting principle 5:**

- PHASE 1: action 5. Planning on the coast includes the statutory protection of natural areas.
- PHASE 3: action 15. There is a statutory coastal zone management plan.
- PHASE 3: action 17. A non-statutory coastal zone management strategy has been drawn up and an action plan is being implemented

**Level of implementation:**

PHASE	Action	REGIONAL				LOCAL		
		NE England	Belgium	NW England	Ireland	NW England	NE England	Ireland
1	5	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
3	15	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
3	17	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red

Green = Affirmative response  
 Red = Negative response  
 Yellow = Undecided

**COREPOINT experience:**

**(i) Using data from tests of the EU ICZM Progress Indicator**

There is partial implementation of this principle. Planning on the coast includes the statutory protection of natural areas is being conducted throughout the region tested. However, in no region is there a statutory coastal zone management plan or a non-statutory coastal zone management strategy and action plan being implemented

**(ii) As illustrated by COREPOINT case studies experiences**

The aims of most of the ICZM initiatives are clearly closely aligned to natural resource management: all but two of them having the protection of natural areas and environmental enhancement as key aims. Natural hazard management, however, is slightly less commonly cited aim. Whilst such a distinct focus on natural resource management within the ICZM efforts is likely to lead to strong coherence with this principle it may, however, lead to false perceptions of ICZM as being too environmental. However, when the ICZM initiatives were investigated to see which natural process-related topics were included in their programmes, there appeared to be less focus on these aspects as well as slightly further divergence between the case studies. Landscape protection and onshore nature conservation appear to be the most frequently included.

The COREPOINT study areas also pointed that there is considerably more information available for ICZM development on natural physical processes than on natural variability of habitats and species. It appears that for most of the ICZM initiatives there is a distinct need for more information on such aspects. There is a clear relative paucity of long-term and medium-term information on both natural physical processes and natural variability of habitats and species compared with information on short-term changes. Without access to such information it could be argued that management is unable to take account of natural processes and is, therefore, unable to comply fully with this particular principle.

Most respondents suggested that the ICZM efforts were partially able to account for their impact on the evolution and dynamics of natural coastal processes, the natural limits of the coastal environment and the natural variability of habitats and species. However, with few of the ICZM efforts having reached programme review and evaluation, such observations should be taken as preliminary and indicative only. More ICZM initiatives consider policies from the nature conservation arena, than from catchment and shoreline management documents. However, as river basin planning becomes more formalised under the Water Framework Directive, it is to be hoped that linkages between ICZM and river basin /catchment planning will develop. The pattern of consideration of policies for the spatial plans is not too dissimilar, with most consideration being apparently given to policies from the nature conservation sector. The apparently relatively low consideration of shoreline management policies within spatial planning documents, however, is of concern. Potentially this could mean that this principle is not achieved.

### 3.1.6 Support and involvement of all stakeholders

- involving all the parties concerned (economic and social partners, the organisations representing coastal zone residents, non-governmental organisations and the business sector) in the management process, for example by means of agreements and based on shared responsibility;

#### Key actions for ICZM implementation supporting principle 6:

- PHASE 1: action 2. Sectoral stakeholders meet on an ad hoc basis to discuss specific coastal and marine issues
- PHASE 2: action 7. Adequate funding is usually available for undertaking actions on the coast
- PHASE 2: action 8. A stocktake of the coast (identifying who does what, where and how) has been carried out.
- PHASE 3: action 13. All relevant parties concerned in the ICZM decision-making process have been identified and are involved.
- PHASE 3: action 22. A properly staffed and properly funded partnership of coastal and marine stakeholders is in place.
- PHASE 3: action 23. ICZM partnerships are consulted routinely about proposals to do with the coastal zone
- PHASE 3: action 24. Adequate mechanisms are in place to allow coastal communities to take a participative role in ICZM decisions

#### Level of implementation:

PHASE	Action	REGIONAL				LOCAL		
		NE England	Belgium	NW England	Ireland	NW England	NE England	Ireland
1	2	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green
2	7	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
2	8	Green	Green	Red	Red	Red	Green	Green
3	13	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Green	Red
3	22	Red	Green	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
3	23	Red	Green	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
3	24	Red	Green	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red

Green = Affirmative response  
 Red = Negative response  
 Yellow = Undecided

#### COREPOINT experience:

##### (i) Using data from tests of the EU ICZM Progress Indicator

In the early phase of ICZM implementation, stakeholders are meeting to discuss coastal zone management issues on an as needs basis. Only in the case of Belgium, however, is support and involvement being implemented at an advanced level. The situation in England and Ireland is similar although the results suggest that there are regional differences in England.

##### (ii) As illustrated by COREPOINT case studies experiences

Most of the ICZM efforts state stakeholder engagement as an overarching aim and with only one exception all involve at least eleven key sectors. The stakeholders most commonly come from the nature conservation, tourism, recreation, pollution control, land use planning and economic development sectors. Most stakeholders come from the local area and represent locally based organisations. The national and regional ICZM initiatives, in contrast, only partially involve such

bodies, reflecting their more strategic focus. Engagement with neighbouring administrations was not generally adequate: this deficit is likely to impede a strategic and coherent approach to ICZM at a regional scale. Given the relative infancy of many of the initiatives under review it is not surprising then that it has been recorded that there are more stakeholders involved in the early phases, particularly in programme initiation and issue identification, rather in programme monitoring and evaluation. .

### 3.1.7 Participatory approach

*- support and involvement of relevant administrative bodies at national, regional and local level between which appropriate links should be established or maintained with the aim of improved coordination of the various existing policies. Partnership with and between regional and local authorities should apply when appropriate;*

#### Key actions for ICZM implementation supporting principle 7:

- PHASE 2: action 9. There is a formal mechanism whereby stakeholders meet regularly to discuss a range of coastal and marine issues.
- PHASE 3: action 18. There are open channels of communication between those responsible for the coast at all levels of government.
- PHASE 3: action 19. Each administrative level has at least one member of staff whose sole responsibility is ICZM.
- PHASE 4: action 25. There is a strong, constant effective political support for the ICZM process
- PHASE 4: action 26. There is a routine (rather than occasional) cooperation across coastal and marine boundaries
- PHASE 4: action 30. Mechanisms for reviewing and evaluating progress in implementing ICZM are embedded in governance

#### Level of implementation:

PHASE	Action	REGIONAL					LOCAL		
		NE England	Belgium	NW England	Ireland		NW England	NE England	Ireland
2	9	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Red	
3	18	Red	Green	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	
3	19	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	
4	25	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	
4	26	Red	Red	Red	Red	Green	Green	Red	
4	30	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	

Green = Affirmative response  
 Red = Negative response  
 Yellow = Undecided

## **COREPOINT experience:**

### *(i) Using data from tests of the EU ICZM Progress Indicator*

This principle is, largely, not being implemented in the Corepoint region with that exception that in some cases there is a formal mechanism whereby stakeholders are able to meet regularly.

### *(ii) As illustrated by COREPOINT case studies experiences*

For most of the ICZM efforts the results indicate reasonable levels of consultation with many different types of stakeholders. Particularly good levels of consultation occur with recreation groups and NGOs. However, levels of active participation as opposed to consultation were generally significantly lower for all the sectors and across all the study areas. Both industry and the business sector appear particularly poorly engaged in ICZM – a negative feature which has commonly been reported elsewhere. Public participation is generally much higher during the early stages of ICZM development, particularly during issue identification. One respondent commented on the issues associated with this and, in particular, the problems associated with the long-term nature of ICZM which may cause difficulties maintaining high participation levels. Out of the ICZM programmes which have progressed beyond the initial development stages, only a small subset engage the public in programme evaluation and review.

Respondents were more or less unanimous in their views on the benefits of public participation with most highlighting increased public awareness, knowledge and understanding of coastal issues as the key positive outcomes of such involvement. The ability for ICZM to be able to address local community issues was also cited as a benefit by most. Respondents were also generally in agreement that public participation also increases public ownership of issues. Other benefits of public participation cited by respondents include:

- increased local empowerment
- gaining of credibility and authority through the use of a transparent decision-making process; and
- better decision-making

Despite such clear benefits, the partners reported on a variety of factors which limit successful public engagement in the ICZM process. Particular issues included difficulties in gaining appropriate stakeholder representation and not letting particular single-issue groups dominate the agenda. Facilitation costs were highlighted as a major concern. Issues associated with long-term funding and the relative level of funding to achieve adequate levels of public engagement are significant problems for some of the UK ICZM initiatives, but only appear to be a relatively minor issue compared for the other ICZM efforts.

Few negative impacts of public engagement in ICZM decision-making were cited although several respondents commented further on the significant implication of public participation on both time and financial resources. One respondent referred to the redistribution of power as a potential negative impact of such participation and other responses highlighted the impact of such involvement on the sustainability of the initiative. Several respondents also pointed out that it is important to ensure that the aims of public participation are clearly stated from the outset otherwise expectations can be falsely raised and the public then become disenfranchised with the process.

## **3.1.8 A combination of instruments**

*- use of a combination of instruments designed to facilitate coherence between sectoral policy objectives and coherence between planning and management.*

### **Key actions for ICZM implementation supporting principle 8:**

- PHASE 1: action 1. Decisions about planning and managing the coast are governed by general legal instruments
- PHASE 2: action 6. Existing instruments are being adapted and combined to deal with coastal planning and management issues.

- PHASE 2: action 8. A stocktake of the coast (identifying who does what, where and how has been carried out.
- PHASE 3: action 16. Strategic Environmental Assessment are used commonly to examine policies, strategies and plans for the coastal zone.
- PHASE 3: action 20. Statutory development plans span the interface between land and sea
- PHASE 3: action 21. Spatial planning of sea areas is required by law.
- PHASE 4: action 27. A comprehensive set of coastal and marine indicators is being used to assess progress towards a more sustainable situation
- PHASE 4: action 29. End users have access to as much information of sufficient quality as they need to make timely, coherent and well-crafted decisions.

**Level of implementation:**

PHASE	Action	REGIONAL					LOCAL		
		NE England	Belgium	NW England	Ireland		NW England	NE England	Ireland
1	1	Green	Green	Green	Green		Green	Green	Green
2	6	Green	Green	Green	Red		Red	Green	Red
2	8	Green	Green	Red	Red		Red	Green	Green
3	16	Green	Green	Green	Green		Green	Red	Red
3	20	Red	Yellow	Red	Red		Red	Red	Red
3	21	Red	Green	Red	Red		Red	Red	Red
4	27	Red	Red	Red	Red		Red	Red	Red
4	29	Red	Green	Red	Red		Red	Red	Red

Green = Affirmative response  
 Red = Negative response  
 Yellow = Undecided

**COREPOINT experience:**

**(i) Using data from tests of the EU ICZM Progress Indicator**

This principle is being implemented in the early stages of ICZM but not yet, apart from Belgium, in the later phases.

**(ii) As illustrated by COREPOINT case studies experiences**

Most of the ICZM appear to use a range of instruments to implement ICZM within the Expert Couplet study areas. However, few responses indicated that there are adequate procedures available to identify the most appropriate sets of tools and to ensure consistency between tools.

## 4. Conclusions & Recommendations

This report has provided a summary of the results and findings extracted from the test results of the ICZM Progress Indicator conducted in the COREPOINT study areas – Ireland, Belgium, north-west England and north-east England – and the COREPOINT partner survey findings, views and experiences focusing on the way in which the EC principles of ICZM are being addressed across the region at local levels (COREPOINT: Ballinger R., 2008). The combination of the test results and partner survey findings provided a more consistent and completed view of the experiences and practices in the North West Europe region.

This final section summarises the key findings, and particularly attempts to capture the degree to which the ICZM principles are being implemented, based upon the test results of the EU ICZM Progress Indicator. The following table is based simply on the majority of the answers given under each action measuring ICZM progress. There are four degrees of implementation: (i) ICZM principle fully implemented (=majority of Yes answers); (ii) ICZM principle not implemented(=majority of No answers); (iii) ICZM principle partly implemented (= equal number of Yes and No answers); and (iv) no information available (=associated with Don't know answers).

ICZM Principles degree of implementation based upon COREPOINT test results of the EU ICZM Progress Indicator							
ICZM PRINCIPLES	REGIONAL				LOCAL		
	NE England	Belgium	NW England	Ireland	NW England	NE England	Ireland
<i>Broad holistic approach</i>	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red
<i>Long-term perspective</i>	Green/Red spots	Green/Red spots	Red	Red	Red	Green	Red
<i>Adaptive management</i>	Red	Red	Green	Red	Yellow	Red	Red
<i>Local specificity</i>	Green	Green	Green	Green/Red spots	Green	Green	Green/Red spots
<i>Working with natural processes</i>	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
<i>Support and involvement of all stakeholders</i>	Red	Green	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
<i>Participatory approach</i>	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
<i>A combination of instruments</i>	Green/Red spots	Green	Green/Red spots	Green/Red spots	Green/Red spots	Green	Green

Green = ICZM Principle fully implemented  
 Red = ICZM Principle not implemented  
 Green/Red spots = ICZM Principle partly implemented  
 Yellow = No information available

The degree of implementation of ICZM Principles, as presented in the table, has exposed rather mixed fulfilment but showing good evolution at (sub-national) regional and local levels throughout the region. There are certainly interesting results regarding the local specificity, broad holistic

approach (in England) and a combination of instruments at least in the early stages of ICZM. In general, the most challenging principles are those dealing with adaptive management, working with natural processes, participatory approach and involvement of all stakeholders. Actions dealing with lack of *adequate funding* and *the development of a strategy* present the greatest problems within the implementation. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight that most of these principles are largely being implemented in the early phases of the ICZM progress indicator action list. These results have been supported, in most cases, by the findings of the partner survey experiences.

As part of the COREPOINT project the test results and findings will continue to feed into European discussion and the present exercise to clarify the principles and clarify their operationalisation (COM (2007) 0308 final).

Finally, this section concludes with a set of recommendations for further enhancement of the ICZM principles implementation – as a prerequisite for a more sustainable coast.

### **Recommendations:**

Based upon the test results and the conclusions from the case studies, it is recommended that sub-national and/or local levels of administration attempt to determine if the use of their coastline is becoming more, or less, sustainable. Therefore, it is recommended that:-

1. The Progress Indicator set should be used regularly to determine the degree of implementation of ICZM at regional and local level.
2. Selected, State of the Coast or Sustainability indicators should be tested at the same time.
3. The results of the two sets of tests should be interpreted as one set of linked results.

**REFERENCES:**

Ballinger R., Cardiff University "The COREPOINT Partner Survey Evaluation of local ICZM efforts" .COREPOINT partnership. 2008

Ballinger, R.C., Cummins, V., Philippe, M. and O'Hagan, A.M. (2008) " The point of COREPOINT: Improving capacity for Integrated Coastal Zone Management in North West Europe" . COREPOINT partnership. 2008

Communication by the Commission to the Council and the Parliament on Integrated Coastal Zone Management: a Strategy for Europe (COM/2000/547), adopted 27 September, 2000.

Commission of the European Communities. 2002b. Council Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May, concerning the implementation of Integrated Coastal Zone Management in Europe. (2002/413/EC); Brussels L 148/24

Communication from the Commission - Report to the European Parliament and the Council: an evaluation of Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) in Europe /\* COM/2007/0308 final

Pickaver, A. H., Gilbert, C. and Breton, F. 2004. "An indicator set to measure the progress in the implementation of integrated coastal zone management in Europe". *Ocean & Coastal Marine Science* 47: 449-462

Rupprecht. (2006). Evaluation of Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) in Europe. Rupprecht Consult, Germany; pp 1- 360. <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/iczm/home.htm>.

*Review of International Approaches to Integrated Coastal Management (ICM)*, COREPOINT partnership, Revised version Feb. 2007

**ANNEX 1: The revised ICZM Implementation Progress Indicator as used in the COREPOINT project tests**

Phase	Action	Description
<b>Aspects of coastal planning and management are in place</b>	1	Decisions about planning and managing the coast are governed by general legal instruments.
	2	Sectoral stakeholders meet on an ad hoc basis to discuss specific coastal and marine issues.
	3	There are spatial development plans which include the coastal zone but do not treat it as a distinct and separate entity.
	4	Aspects of the coastal zone, including marine areas, are regularly monitored.
	5	Planning on the coast includes the statutory protection of natural areas.
<b>A framework exists for taking ICZM forward</b>	6	Existing instruments are being adapted and combined to deal with coastal planning and management issues.
	7	Adequate funding is usually available for undertaking actions on the coast.
	8	A stocktake of the coast (identifying who does what, where and how) has been carried out.
	9	There is a formal mechanism whereby stakeholders meet regularly to discuss a range of coastal and marine issues.
	10	Ad hoc actions on the coast are being carried out that include recognisable elements of ICZM.
	11	A sustainable development strategy which includes specific references to coasts and seas is in place.
	12	Guidelines have been produced by national, regional or local governments which advise planning authorities on appropriate uses of the coastal zone.
<b>Most aspects of an ICZM approach to planning and managing the coast are in place and functioning reasonably well</b>	13	All relevant parties concerned in the ICZM decision-making process have been identified and are involved.
	14	A report on the State of the Coast has been written with the intention of repeating the exercise every five or ten years.
	15	There is a statutory coastal zone management plan.
	16	Strategic Environmental Assessments are used commonly to examine policies, strategies and plans for the coastal zone.
	17	A non-statutory coastal zone management strategy has been drawn up and an action plan is being implemented.
	18	There are open channels of communication between those responsible for the coast at all levels of government.
	19	Each administrative level has at least one member of staff whose sole responsibility is ICZM.
	20	Statutory development plans span the interface between land and sea.
	21	Spatial planning of sea areas is required by law.
	22	A properly staffed and properly funded partnership of coastal and marine stakeholders is in place.
	23	ICZM partnerships are consulted routinely about proposals to do with the coastal zone.
	24	Adequate mechanisms are in place to allow coastal communities to take a participative role in ICZM decisions.
<b>An efficient,</b>	25	There is strong, constant and effective political support for the ICZM process.

<b>Phase</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>adaptive and integrative process is embedded at all levels of governance and is delivering greater sustainable use of the coast</b>	26	There is routine (rather than occasional) cooperation across coastal and marine boundaries.
	27	A comprehensive set of coastal and marine indicators is being used to assess progress towards a more sustainable situation.
	28	A long-term financial commitment is in place for the implementation of ICZM.
	29	End users have access to as much information of sufficient quality as they need to make timely, coherent and well-crafted decisions.
	30	Mechanisms for reviewing and evaluating progress in implementing ICZM are embedded in governance.
	31	Monitoring shows a demonstrable trend towards a more sustainable use of coastal and marine resources.