

Marine Spatial Planning from theory to practice: current priorities and challenges, lessons learned and future steps

DAVID JOHNSON AND MARIA ADELAIDE FERREIRA



Johnson, D. and M.A. Ferreira 2020. Marine Spatial Planning from theory to practice: current priorities and challenges, lessons learned and future steps. Ocean Governance in Archipelagic Regions. International Conference 2019, 7-10 October 2019, Horta, Azores, Portugal. *Arquipelago*. Life and Marine Sciences. Supplement 11.

David Johnson¹ (e-mail: david.johnson@seascapeconsultants.co.uk) and M.A. Ferreira². ¹Seascape Consultants Ltd., Jermyn's House, Romsey, Hampshire, SO52 0QA, United Kingdom. ²MARE – Marine and Environmental Sciences Centre, Faculty of Sciences, University of Lisbon, Laboratório Marítimo da Guia, Avenida Nossa Senhora do Cabo, 939, 2750-374 Cascais, Portugal.

Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) is a globally endorsed means to inform future orientated, rational organisation of marine space for sustainable development (Ehler & Douvère 2009). However, to fulfil its potential, it must address a number of challenges, including the inclusion of human dimensions and social data, transboundary issues (namely with areas beyond national jurisdictions – ABNJ), global climate change and environmental sustainability (Frazão Santos et al. 2019; Wright et al. 2019) and overcome criticism and mistrust generated by resulting from poorly designed or ineffective processes (e.g., Fairgrieve 2016; Flannery & Ellis 2016; Jones et al. 2016).

Archipelagic regions present special circumstances, such as environmental and socio-economic specificities – oceanic features, remoteness, dependence on the sea (MarSP 2019) that require appropriate legal frameworks, information sharing and bespoke plans to integrate community priorities, and to promote the involvement of local communities both in planning and management, i.e., in what concerns the design and implementation of effective marine protected area (MPA) networks, and the control of fishing and tourism activities (Vince et al. 2017).

In what concerns MSP and Blue Growth perspectives, it is important to appreciate industry opportunities and key drivers for the next decade, including rapid advances in automatization and digitization, but also evolving consumer demands and rapid environmental change (Gianni et al. 2019, Halpern et al. 2019; IPCC 2019). Fine-scale species-specific habitat suitability models are needed to identify important areas that can then be incorporated into marine spatial plans as climate refugia (Johnson et al. 2018; Johnson & Kenchington 2019).

Delivering sustainable development of human activities at sea requires measuring progress of MSP initiatives over time, especially considering the dilated timeframes (multidecadal/multigenerational) of their implementation. I.a., this will imply the design and implementation of adequate, tell-tale indicators (e.g., Ehler, 2014; Ferreira et al. 2018; Lukic et al. 2018), an area where more thinking is required as we are currently behind the curve!

Key words: Archipelagic regions; local community resilience; marine spatial planning; performance evaluation; sustainable development

Da teoria à prática em Ordenamento do Espaço Marítimo: prioridades e desafios actuais, aprendizagens e passos futuros

O Ordenamento do Espaço Marítimo (OEM) é um processo endossado a nível mundial para a promoção de uma organização racional, prospectiva (orientada para o futuro) e estratégica do espaço marinho, contribuindo, dessa forma, para o desenvolvimento sustentável (Ehler & Douvère 2009). No entanto, para concretizar o seu potencial, o OEM tem que dar resposta a uma série de desafios, incluindo a integração de dimensões humanas e de dados sociais, questões transfronteiriças (nomeadamente, nas áreas fora das jurisdições nacionais – ABNJ), mudanças climáticas globais e sustentabilidade ambiental (Frazão Santos et al. 2019; Wright et al. 2019) e ultrapassar as críticas e a desconfiança geradas por (ou resultantes de) processos mal desenhados ou ineficazes (por exemplo, Fairgrieve 2016; Flannery & Ellis 2016; Jones et al. 2016).

As regiões arquipelágicas apresentam um conjunto de especificidades ambientais e socioeconómicas – por exemplo, o carácter oceânico e remoto e a dependência do mar (MarSP 2019) – que requerem estruturas legais apropriadas, partilha de informação e planos feitos “por medida”, de forma a promover o envolvimento das comunidades locais e integrar as suas prioridades, tanto durante o planeamento como na gestão, nomeadamente no que diz respeito ao desenho e implementação de redes efectivas de áreas marinhas protegidas (AMP) e ao controlo da pesca e do turismo (Vince et al. 2017).

No que diz respeito ao OEM e às perspectivas de Crescimento Azul, é importante reconhecer as oportunidades existentes na indústria e os principais factores impulsionadores para a próxima década, que incluem os rápidos avanços nas áreas da automatização e digitalização, mas também a evolução dos padrões de exigência dos consumidores e das alterações ambientais (Gianni et al. 2019, Halpern et al. 2019; IPCC 2019). São também necessários modelos em alta resolução da preferência de determinadas espécies por habitats específicos, que permitam identificar áreas importantes a ser incorporadas nos planos de OEM como refúgios climáticos para essas espécies (Johnson et al. 2018; Johnson & Kenchington 2019).

Alcançar o desenvolvimento sustentável das actividades humanas no mar implica também a capacidade de se medir o progresso das iniciativas de OEM ao longo do tempo, especialmente tendo em conta os dilatados horizontes temporais (multidecadais/multigeracionais) envolvidos na sua implementação. Tal requererá, entre outros aspectos, o desenho e a implementação de indicadores adequados (por exemplo, Ehler 2014; Ferreira et al. 2018; Lukic et al. 2018), uma área cujo desenvolvimento está atrasado e que requer visão de futuro!

Palavras chave: Regiões arquipelágicas; resiliência das comunidades locais; ordenamento do espaço marítimo; avaliação de desempenho; desenvolvimento sustentável

REFERENCES

- Ehler, C. 2014. A Guide to Evaluating Marine Spatial Plans. UNESCO, IOC Manuals and Guides. 70. Paris. 84 pp.
- Ehler, C., and F. Douvère 2009. Marine Spatial Planning: a step-by-step approach toward ecosystem-based management. Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission and Man and the Biosphere Programme. *UNESCO IOC Manual and Guides* No. 53, ICAM Dossier No. 6. Paris. 99 pp.
- Fairgrieve, R. 2016. Maritime spatial planning – “ad utilitatem omnium”. *Planning Theory & Practice* 17: 140-143.
- Ferreira, M.A., D. Johnson, C. Pereira da Silva, and T. Ramos 2018. Developing a performance evaluation

- mechanism for Portuguese Marine Spatial Planning using a participatory approach. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 180: 913-923. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.01.183>
- Flannery, W. & G. Ellis 2016. Exploring the winners and losers of marine environmental governance. *Planning Theory & Practice* 17 (1): 121-122.
- Gianni, M., M.A. Ferreira, R. Boschen-Rose and D. Johnson 2019. Industry reactions to ATLAS recommendations. Deliverable 7.5 of the EU ATLAS project. 52 pp.
- Halpern, B.S., M. Frazier, J. Afflerbach, J.S. Lowndes, F. Micheli, C. O'Hara, C. Scarborough, and K.A. Selkoe 2019. Recent pace of change in human impact on the world's ocean. *Science Reports* 9: 11609. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-47201-9>
- IPCC 2019. Summary for Policymakers. In: H.-O. Pörtner, D.C. Roberts, V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, M. Tignor, E. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, M. Nicolai, A. Okem, J. Petzold, B. Rama, N. Weyer (Eds). *IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate*. 1170 pp.
- Johnson, D., M.A., Ferreira and E. Kenchington 2018. Climate change is likely to severely limit the effectiveness of deep-sea ABMTs in the North Atlantic. *Marine Policy* 87: 111-122. doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.09.034.
- Johnson, D. and E. Kenchington 2019. Should potential for climate change refugia be mainstreamed into the criteria for describing EBSAs? *Conservation Letters* 9: 12:e12634. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12634>
- Jones, P.J.S., L.M., Lieberknecht and W. Qiu 2016. Marine spatial planning in reality: introduction to case studies and discussion of findings. *Marine Policy* 71: 256-264.
- Frazão Santos C, T. Agardy, F. Andrade, L.B. Crowder, C.N. Ehler and M. Orbach 2019. Major challenges in developing marine spatial planning. *Marine Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2018.08.032>
- Lukic, I., D. Nigohosyan, J.M. Vet, M. Pascual, J. Fernandez and A. Schultz-Zehden 2018. Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) for blue growth: Annex III.2: Handbook on MSP indicators development. ECORYS, Executive Agency for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (European Commission), S.Pro, Thetis, University of Liverpool. 58 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2826/04538>
- MarSP 2019. Macaronesian Maritime Spatial Planning webpage. Available from: <http://marsp.eu/#home-page> (cited 2 October 2019).
- Vince, J., E. Brierley, S. Stevenson and P. Dunstan 2017. Ocean Governance in the south Pacific region: progress and plans for action. *Marine Policy* 79:40-45.
- Wright, G.W., K. Gjerde, D. Johnson, A.R. Finkelstein, M.A. Ferreira, D.C. Dunn, M. Rodríguez Chavez and A. Grehan 2019. Marine Spatial Planning in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction. *Marine Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2018.12.003>