



PERICLES D5.1_V1.0
Dissemination Level: PU



2020-SC6-CULT-COOP-2016-2017

PrEseRvIng and sustainably governing Cultural heritage and Landscapes in European coastal and maritime regions

Project no.: 770504

Project full title: PrEseRvIng and sustainably governing Cultural heritage and Landscapes in European coastal and maritime regions

Project Acronym: PERICLES

Deliverable number:	D5.1
Deliverable title:	Comprehensive Policy Review Report
Work package:	WP5
Due date of deliverable:	M15
Actual submission date:	M15 –26/07/2019
Start date of project:	01.05.2018
Duration:	36 months
Author/editor:	Queen’s University Belfast (QUB)
Contributing partners:	WU, UAVR, MKA, UBO

Dissemination level of this deliverable	Public
Nature of deliverable	Report

This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 770504. Further information is available at www.pericles-heritage.eu.

Table of Contents

1.	Executive summary	4
2.	Introduction.....	4
3.	Cultural Heritage in Policy	5
3.1	Galway, Ireland.....	6
3.2	Belfast and the North Coast, Northern Ireland	8
3.3	Marsaxlokk, Malta	10
3.4	Gulf of Morbihan, France	11
4.	Policy Formation.....	14
4.1	Galway, Ireland.....	15
	Policy Integration	15
	Dominant Actors.....	15
	Stakeholder Engagement	16
	Delivery and Monitoring.....	17
4.2	Belfast and the North Coast, Ireland	18
	Policy Integration	18
	Dominant Actors.....	19
	Stakeholder Engagement	19
	Delivery and Monitoring.....	21
4.3	Marsaxlokk, Malta	22
	Policy Integration	22
	Dominant Actors.....	22
	Stakeholder Engagement	22
	Delivery and Monitoring.....	23
4.4	Gulf of Morbihan, France	23

Policy Integration	23
Dominant Actors.....	23
Stakeholder Engagement	25
Delivery and Monitoring.....	25
4.5 Policy formation in other PERICLES cases	25
Aveiro, Portugal.....	25
Wadden Sea, the Netherlands	26
Pärnu Bay, Estonia.....	27
5. Next Steps.....	28
Appendix 1 Stakeholders Identified	29
Appendix 2 Policy Documents Identified	31

1. Executive summary

This deliverable, D5.1, describes the “Comprehensive Policy Review Report” of the PERICLES project as part of WP5. Analysis of cultural heritage narratives in policy in four PERICLES areas: Galway, Ireland; Belfast and the North Coast, Northern Ireland; Marsaxlokk, Malta; and the Gulf of Morbihan, France are presented. This is followed by identification of the actors and processes involved in policy formation in three areas, focussing on policy integration; dominant actors; stakeholder engagement; and delivery and monitoring. Also, a shorter policy overview is presented of three other PERICLES areas: Aveiro, Portugal; Malta; the Wadden Sea, The Netherlands; and Pärnu Bay, Estonia.

2. Introduction

PERICLES is an EU-funded research and innovation project running from 2018-2021. PERICLES promotes sustainable, participatory governance of cultural heritage in European coastal and maritime regions through a unique interdisciplinary and geographically wide-ranging approach. The overall aim of the project is to develop and demonstrate a comprehensive framework to understand, preserve and utilise maritime cultural heritage for societal good.

PERICLES is exploring the integration of cultural heritage into maritime and coastal policies. In doing so, PERICLES seeks to understand how cultural heritage is understood by policy makers and practitioners, and what institutional, cultural, knowledge or professional obstacles prevent more integrated policies and practices. PERICLES aims to use this information to determine how policy making might be improved for more effective preservation and sustainable exploitation of cultural heritage.

A critical policy analysis was conducted to identify narratives concerning coastal and marine cultural heritage in key coastal and marine policies, such as marine spatial planning policy, integrated coastal zone management and climate change adaptation policy, and to discern the actors and processes involved in their production. National, regional and local policies were assessed across a key selection of PERICLES case region areas.

This report is structured to first present the analysis of cultural heritage narratives in policy in four PERICLES areas: Galway, Ireland; Belfast and the North Coast, Northern Ireland; Marsaxlokk, Malta; and the Gulf of Morbihan, France. This is followed by identification of the actors and processes involved in policy formation in these three areas, focussing on policy integration; dominant actors; stakeholder engagement; and delivery and monitoring. Then, a shorter policy overview is presented of three other PERICLES areas: Aveiro, Portugal; Malta; the Wadden Sea, The Netherlands; and Pärnu Bay, Estonia. This “quick-scan” follows the same structure (focus on policy integration; dominant actors; stakeholder engagement; and delivery and monitoring) and serves as identification step for further exploration of policy integration through interviews. During the course of PERICLES, interviews will be conducted in all these areas to explore more fully how cultural heritage and coastal and marine institutions collaborate to produce the necessary integration and evidence required for effective

policy. The appendices present lists of identified stakeholders (Appendix A) and of relevant policy documents (Appendix B) for all seven areas, also necessary for further policy analysis.

3. Cultural Heritage in Policy

This section contains summaries of cultural heritage narratives in key policies at national, regional and local levels in Galway, Belfast and the North Coast, Malta and the Gulf of Morbihan. These highlight how cultural heritage is understood in policies in these regions, and where PERICLES will be able to provide policy recommendations to promote better understanding and expression of cultural heritage in policy.

The expression of cultural heritage in policy varies to some degree across the regions analysed. There was consensus across case regions that heritage is an important feature of coastal and marine environments that ought to be protected, however variation was observed in the extent to which this extended to intangible cultural heritage. Particular attention is given to the inclusion and importance of intangible heritage in Irish policies. Other regions expressed a weaker interest in intangible heritage, or were predominantly aligned with tangible heritage conservation. This may be a reflection of differing definitions of heritage, based on a conventional preference for physical structures, or a lack of understanding of mechanisms to preserve intangible heritage. Focus has traditionally been on heritage as tangible assets, but it is important also to include intangible heritage, which is a key feature of individual, group and place identity, and can be a crucial aspect of heritage relating the land- or seascape to its people and their traditions. The PERICLES definition of cultural heritage as a set of tangible and intangible items linked to human activities and interactions taking place within coastal and marine (geographical or cultural) areas in the past, present and imagined futures, encompasses both the tangible and intangible heritage, as well as differing interpretations of these.

Across policy sectors, the value of heritage as a connection between people, the past and their surrounding landscape is frequently recognised. The latest generation of marine policies in Europe typically includes reference to cultural heritage protection and conservation. Though this is crucial in preservation of heritage, it also highlights a failure in the majority of policies to frame cultural heritage as an exploitable resource. While there are some references to measures such as adaptive reuse, the policy narratives more frequently place development in opposition to heritage than as a feature of it, emphasising the 'pastness' of heritage. Not only does this deny its evolution alongside the landscape and its people, it also denies communities and businesses the full opportunities of exploiting it. Even in tourism policies, where exploitation of cultural heritage might be expected to feature significantly, there are some cases, such as [Tourism: An Industrial Strategy for Growth to 2025](#) (Irish Tourism Industry Confederation, 2018), where it receives little or no attention. In others, cultural heritage is recognised as a valuable tourism asset but development of it as a resource does not form the basis of strategic planning. In the [Galway County Heritage & Biodiversity Plan 2017-2022](#) (Galway County Heritage Forum, 2017), for example, cultural heritage is recognised as a resource, but planning is primarily based on increased promotion of heritage, rather than driving the development of it. The persistent focus on preservation over utilisation can mean opportunities for using cultural heritage as a means of growth may be being missed. PERICLES aspires to enhance sustainable growth and increase

employment by harnessing cultural heritage assets, and this could benefit from greater inclusion in policy for sustainable exploitation of cultural heritage.

Finally, cultural heritage is frequently referred to alongside natural heritage and the coastal and marine environment, emphasising the situation of it within the landscape and recognition of the impacts of environmental threats and activities on heritage. This is evident in policies from all of the regions analysed. However, the extent to which the processes of policy formation and implementation are effectively integrated is not clear from the document analysis alone. The forthcoming in-depth policy and practice interviews are intended to evaluate this in practice.

3.1 Galway, Ireland

The overriding narrative of all Irish policies and plans that relate to heritage is that Ireland's heritage is of high importance. The Government is currently developing a new National Heritage Plan, called *Heritage Ireland 2030* (Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, [Heritage Ireland 2030: Public Consultation](#), 2018). This will integrate essential national heritage policy principles into the future strategy of the whole of Government, bring together a variety of other relevant heritage initiatives, and provide an overarching space for engagement and action over the next decade. Relating to this, [Investing in our Culture, Language & Heritage 2018-2027](#) (Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, 2018) is the Government's ten-year plan setting out their objectives for capital investment in Ireland's culture, language and heritage. It is designed to enhance cultural participation for all in Ireland, to promote and celebrate Ireland as a centre for cultural excellence, and to economically exploit cultural resources. It details considerable investment in culture, heritage and the Irish language that is designated for the ten-year period, to protect heritage now and for the future. The €1.2 billion investment is comprised of €460 million for National Cultural Institutions, €265 million for a cultural and creativity investment programme, €285 million for natural and built heritage, and €178 million for the Gaeltacht, the Irish language and the Islands. This includes €27 million to maintain sustainable island communities through the development of important marine infrastructure on a number of offshore islands, in particular on the Aran Islands of Inis Óírr and Inis Meáin and the development of the pier at Machaire Rabhartaigh.

Cultural heritage narratives in Irish policies across the spectrum and at all levels are particularly inclusive of intangible heritage. This is evident in the development of [Heritage Ireland 2030](#) and [Investing in Our Culture, Language and Heritage](#), as well as in the references to heritage in the marine policy documents, and, in particular, in [Conserving Ireland's Maritime Heritage](#) (The Heritage Council, 2006) and regional and local development plans. In 2015, Ireland signed up to the [2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage](#). The Government's Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht have also recently published their permanent [National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage](#) (Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, 2019) which represents official State recognition of 30 Irish cultural practices and will protect and promote them. The traditions listed in the inventory include maritime practices such as Boyne Currach making and Snap net fishing.

In addition to strong heritage policies, in Ireland there is also good expression of cultural heritage in marine policies. This is seen in [An Integrated Marine Plan for Ireland: Roadmap](#) (Government of

Ireland, 2012), which recognises the “*strong and long maritime heritage, culture and tradition*” in Ireland. One of its three high-level goals, alongside a thriving maritime economy and healthy ecosystems, is to increase engagement with the sea by building on this rich maritime heritage and strengthening the nation’s maritime identity. Also, a specific chapter in the [National Marine Planning Framework Baseline Report](#) (Government of Ireland, 2018) is devoted to cultural heritage and assets. The report emphasises that Ireland is a maritime nation, stating that “*Ireland’s coastal waters have been central to the development of life on this island since the first water craft crossed the seaways from Britain and the European continent almost 10,000 years ago.*” The document recognises the scope and value of heritage tourism, but also the important role of heritage in developing cultural identity in coastal regions, and it raises awareness of the need to protect and preserve heritage.

There is also specific reference to coastal and marine heritage in Irish heritage policies. As with the integration of heritage in coastal and marine policies, this specification of maritime heritage in cultural heritage policies reflects the significance of the Ireland’s maritime culture. In [Conserving Ireland’s Maritime Heritage](#) (Heritage Council, 2006) the Heritage Council advocates a new concept of heritage sustainability, in which one of their primary recommendations is for a cohesive strategy for the sustainable use and development of marine and coastal areas. This strategy would include the identification of important maritime heritage features and provision for their long-term protection. There are also specific policies regarding the visual impact of developments on coastal landscapes, the need to develop an unambiguous national policy for erosion and flood management, and a policy to strengthen the viability of island communities and heritage features. Other policy areas of particular relevance to PERICLES relate to traditional and heritage boats, and recreation and tourism. The Heritage Council supports efforts to preserve boating traditions, including recording the recollections and anecdotes of traditional boat builders and users to place the boats in their proper cultural and social context. With regards to coastal tourism, they stress that the planning and management of it needs to be given far greater priority, and would benefit from increased cooperation between tourism development agencies, local authorities and other agencies, and the valuation of maritime heritage’s potential as an economic resource.

Curiously, cultural heritage is not specifically mentioned in the Irish Tourism Industry Confederation’s 2018 publication [Tourism: An Industrial Strategy for Growth to 2025](#) (Irish Tourism Industry Confederation, 2018). Although the Government recognises the value of heritage to tourism in the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht publication [Investing in our Culture, Language & Heritage 2018-2027](#) (Government of Ireland, 2018), this does not appear to have transferred to the industry at the national level. This is an area in which PERICLES can influence sustainable exploitation of heritage.

At the local level in Galway County, the importance of raising awareness of and sharing cultural heritage is specified in the [Galway County Heritage & Biodiversity Plan 2017-2022](#) (Galway County Heritage Forum, 2017) and the [Galway Heritage Plan 2015/2021](#) (The Heritage Council, 2015). Galway County Council recognises the value of heritage to the region’s tourism industry in [Galway County 2040](#) (Galway County Council, 2017), as does the Heritage Council in the [Galway Heritage Plan 2015/2021](#). The County Council is committed to the development of marine tourism, describing Galway’s maritime heritage as having “*untapped potential*” (*Galway County 2040*). This is also recognised by the regional tourism industry in Galway who have identified the “*Culturally Curious*” as one of their two target markets for the area in [The Connemara Coast & Aran Islands Visitor Experience](#)

[Development Plan](#) (Failte Ireland, 2018). This Plan is designed to encourage all operators and organisations involved in delivering a tourism product to reinforce and add value through aligning with cultural stories and themes, which can form the basis of experiences.

3.2 Belfast and the North Coast, Northern Ireland

The [UK Marine Policy Statement](#) (UK Government, 2011) is the framework for preparing Marine Plans and taking decisions affecting the marine environment across the UK. It sits alongside and interacts with existing planning regimes, including terrestrial planning. The [UK Marine Policy Statement](#) has a clear policy towards tangible heritage assets, asserting a general presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets within an appropriate setting. This presumption should be proportionate to the significance of the asset. Any adverse impacts to designated areas are only permitted under rare circumstances where it can be demonstrated as necessary and will result in economic, environmental or social public benefits that outweigh the impact. The marine plan authority should also take into account the existing character and quality of seascapes, including how highly they are valued and their capacity to accommodate change specific to any development.

The [Draft Marine Plan for Northern Ireland](#) (Northern Ireland Executive, 2018) requires that public authorities act in accordance with the policy expressed in the [UK Marine Policy Statement](#). In addition, there is also a specific core policy for heritage assets. Public authorities must take into consideration any potential adverse impacts of a planning proposal on heritage or the setting of heritage assets. The [Draft Marine Plan for Northern Ireland](#) also includes the objective (Objective 5) to promote the preservation and enjoyment of marine related heritage assets.

The Department of the Environment [Towards an ICZM Strategy for Northern Ireland 2006-2026](#) (Northern Ireland Executive, 2016) vision includes commitment to the preservation, maintenance and enhancement and promotion of natural and built resources through legislation, good practice mechanisms and through the concern and interest of the public, Government, and industry. Natural and built heritage is listed as an issue to be considered in ICZM planning, although the discussion predominantly relates to natural heritage. However, one of the Strategy aims, under the Sustainable Communities theme, is: *“To maintain the distinct cultural identities, traditions and skills of coastal communities and protect and present important aspects of their history.”*

The Northern Ireland Executive also has a series of Planning Policy Statements (PPS) produced by the Department of the Environment that relate to cultural heritage. [PPS 16](#) (Department of the Environment, 2013) on Tourism has a policy committing to the safeguarding of tourism assets, including those not already subject to protection, whereby planning permission will not be granted for development that would cause an adverse impact on any feature of interest to tourists. [PPS 6](#) (Department of the Environment, 1999) regarding planning, archaeology and the built heritage provides specific protection to cultural heritage assets belonging to the built environment. Policy favours retaining listed buildings, in addition to the setting of buildings and, in particular, conservation areas and Areas of Townscape Character, however the Department will normally permit the change of use of a listed building where this secures its upkeep and survival and the character and architectural or historic interest of the building would be preserved or enhanced. [PPS 23](#) (Department of the Environment, 2014) formalises the policy towards enabling development for the conservation of

significant places by specifying the exceptional conditions under which development will be permitted. Permission will only be granted when the development is expected to bring significant long-term benefits and when conservation is unviable. The impact must be precisely defined at the outset and the scale must not exceed what is necessary to support conservation. The Department should be satisfied that sufficient subsidy is not available from any other source and that the public benefit outweighs departing from other planning policies. Crucially, development must not materially harm the heritage values of the significant place or its setting and must avoid detrimental fragmentation of management. It should be aimed at securing the long-term future and/or continued use of the place, and be necessary to resolve problems arising from the inherent needs of the heritage asset itself.

The national tourism organisation, Tourism NI, have published [A Strategic Framework to Unlock the Potential of Heritage-led Tourism in Northern Ireland](#) (Tourism NI, 2017). Tourism NI have a vision for more cultural heritage visitors to come to Northern Ireland, as well as for Northern Ireland to offer something distinctive and new, and framed in a narrative that celebrates the people and place. They want to see Northern Ireland become a must-see destination for culturally-motivated travellers. [A Strategic Framework to Unlock the Potential of Heritage-led Tourism in Northern Ireland](#) sets out strategic recommendations, including the need to convene a leadership group for the strategic development of heritage tourism and plans to produce a multi-tier heritage asset audit and cultural calendar, as well as to analyse tourism data in relation to culture and heritage. Plans are also announced to develop new products and itineraries that cross-cut, such as driving routes and packages.

The [Regional Development Strategy RDS 2035](#) (Department for Regional Development, 2010) recognises the contribution that Northern Ireland's built heritage assets make to its sense of place and history, and their importance as a resource for tourism and recreation. The RDS promotes conservation, protection and, where possible, enhancement of the region's built heritage and natural environment. This is complemented by policy, which aims to support urban and rural renaissance by advocating the need to develop innovative ways to bring forward under-utilised land and buildings.

Cultural heritage is well-represented in policy at area and local levels. In the [Antrim Coast & Glens AONB Management Plan](#) (Antrim Coast & Glens, ANOB, 2008) cultural heritage is one of the three named themes in this plan, alongside natural heritage and sustainable communities. There is a strong narrative of conservation and preservation, while Landscape and Seascape Character Assessments that assess natural and cultural heritage together at the landscape level have been conducted for use as a framework for area management. The [Mourne AONB](#) states a policy specifically for coastal and maritime heritage, aimed at supporting and encouraging community groups to actively engage in conserving their coastal heritage. This includes plans for a conducting a research project with local communities for collation and interpretation of aspects of coastal heritage, including fishing, shipping, smuggling, wrack harvesting, and producing an exhibition based on it.

Cultural heritage also features strongly in the Causeway Coast AONB's future vision. One of the four objectives in the [Causeway Coast AONB Action Plan](#) (Causeway Coast & Glens ANOB, 2013) is: 3. *Protect, enhance and increase access to the historic fabric of the AONB*, and associated cultural traditions, and this is supported by a series of actions concerning inventory, risk assessment and public access or involvement. Some of the actions under this objective are also linked to actions in Objective 4 (promote vibrant and sustainable communities with a strong sense of identity) and Objective 1

(conserve and enhance the natural environment). The [Community Plan for Causeway Coast and Glens 2017-2030](#) (Causeway Coast & Glens Borough Council, 2018) acknowledges the rich cultural heritage of the area, including the Giant's Causeway which is a UNESCO World Heritage Site and the most popular tourism attraction in Northern Ireland. There is a commitment to understand, protect and look after the historic and natural environment of the Causeway Coast and Glens area, but also to benefit economically from it. The [Northern Area Plan](#) (Department of the Environment, 2016), which covers the Causeway Coast, includes protection for the most valued built heritage within towns and villages. No development will be approved within the Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast World Heritage Site, other than essential facilities for visitors. There is also a policy to prevent over-development on Rathlin Island, and to prevent large-scale development in Areas of Significant Archaeological Interest.

3.3 Marsaxlokk, Malta

The [Strategic Plan for Environment and Development \(SPED\) \(2015-2020\)](#) is an example of a Marine Spatial Planning policy that is highly regulated in terms of zoning and development plans. The objectives are to *"Ensure the sustainable management of land and sea resources together with the protection of the environment and guide the development and use of land and sea space"*. Drivers are focused on the need for more integrated approaches, economic growth and the conflicts that are perceived amongst different users (exploitation v. conservation). This policy is led by the MEPA agency (Environment and Planning Authority) and aims to involve all the sectors in the planning and stakeholder participation in the MSP process and will be reviewed every 5 years.

For the [National Tourism Policy 2015-2020](#), there are specific chapters addressing the management of tourism in coastal areas. The government, through the tourism authorities, will support the development of coastal areas and marinas for both conservation and tourism exploitation. There is a need for more effective management and enforcement, as well as making the rocky areas more accessible, where users can have the same access and infrastructures as beaches. The plan considers Blue Flag marinas for this purpose. The Blue Flag initiative is an independent non-profit eco-label program promoting environmentally responsible beach tourism. There are also plans for restoring the wreck ports and more abandoned areas and create renewed areas for diving activities. This policy aims to exploit and develop the marine and coastal resources by involving public-private projects.

Regarding policies for a special interest, the *Boat Restoration Scheme* (2018), designed by Ministry for the Environment, Sustainable Development and Climate Change and supported by the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF), the fund for the EU's Maritime and Fisheries Policies for 2014-2020) aims to *"Help fishermen in the transition to sustainable fishing; support coastal communities in diversifying their economies, finance projects that create new jobs and improve quality of life along European coast; and make it easier for applicants to access financing"*. The scheme is monitored through the executing agency, the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, which processes applications and decides who is eligible. This also refers to *lampuki* (dolphinfish/dorado) fishing traditionally done with boats called *luzzu*, of which the design dates back to ancient times, and which are typically related to the village of Marsaxlokk. Heritage and touristic value of *luzzu* lies in its bright color painting and the eyes painted on the bow. The local councils, also in Marsaxlokk, receive the applications and assist applicants in the process. The discourse of the scheme is based around the risk of losing the small-scale fishing boats that also have a high cultural and community value and

therefore should be supported to be preserved. This scheme encourages fishermen to renovate old boats and transform their practices from fisheries to tourism.

Also, there is the [Fishing for Litter](#) scheme that addresses the problem of pollution in a holistic manner. Plastic is causing a big problem, particularly in the sea, and risk assessment included studies conducted on *lampuki* fishing about the nylon fishing lines that are polluting the sea. Policy towards this is based on looking for alternative biodegradable materials and by launching this scheme to economically compensate fishermen that collect plastic from the sea. The holistic approach to litter clean-up allows to related *lampuki* fishing to traditional and emergent tourist practices, to the *luzzu*, and to the local importance of *lampuki* dishes, provide an (indirect) link to preserving and developing cultural heritage in Marsaxlokk.

3.4 Gulf of Morbihan, France

In France, the historical monuments statute aims to protect buildings and furniture that have an artistic, architectural or historical interest. There are two levels of protection: registration (*inscription*) and classifying (*classement*). A registered monument usually has a regional interest, whereas classified monuments are considered national heritage. The French National Architects (*Architects des Bâtiments de France-ABF*) have the legal ability to register or classify a building or a piece of furniture under the historical monuments status.

The Ministry of Environment can classify or register natural sites and landscapes under a protection status as a result of the May 2nd 1930 *Natural Monuments Protection Act*. This is the most appropriate tool to face cultural heritage protection issues.

Registration does not provide as much protection as classification. Registration means the monument or site must be monitored in order to maintain it. If a building or a landscape is registered, work can be done on the building or on the site. However, if the work that has to be done is a demolition, state architects must give their approval beforehand.

Classified monuments and landscapes are rigorously protected by the 1930 law. No work can be done on the site without the approval of the ABF and the ministry of environment. Classifying a site is the most efficient tool to protect it as a national heritage. Since 1965, a few sites of the Gulf of Morbihan have been registered and seven others are classified.

Created by a July 7th 2016 law, *Remarkable Heritage Spaces (RHS)* are towns, villages or districts whose conservation or restoration has public interest regarding history, architecture, archeology, arts or landscapes. RHS aim to protect urban heritage as well as landscapes. They are transcribed in local urban master plans.

Regional Nature Parks (RNP) were created by the decree of 1st of March 1967. According to article *L.333-1 environment code*, a RNP can be established when a geographical area's heritage natural and cultural and landscapes have a specific interest. RNPs are a part of the general environment protection and economic development policy, spatial planning policy and education policy.

In order to create a RNP, the area's natural and cultural heritage must be fragile and threatened and its preservation ought to be considered a matter of national interest. The charter – comprising a report with guidelines, a map of uses and an action program - is the project of the RNP. The charter can be considered as a soft law tool, as it expresses pieces of advice, recommendations and actions to be carried out. However, regional and local urban planning documents must be compatible with the charter.

Marine Nature Parks (MNP) were created in 2006 and represent the French type of Marine Protected Areas. MNPs are a relevant tool to protect marine natural heritage and landscapes. The general aim of this policy is to improve the knowledge of the marine environment, to protect its specific ecosystems and to promote sustainable development of maritime activities. More specifically, MNPs have more operational goals such as good marine waters and ecosystems ecological quality, and species, heritage and habitat conservation.

National Parks in France were created by act of law in 1960, and their legal framework remained unchanged until a 2006 act intended to modernize it. National Parks are managed by public establishments. Their goal is to protect national, cultural and landscape heritage and to ensure an effective follow-up. Only two National Parks in continental France cover both land and maritime spaces.

The Coastal Conservatory is a public institution, unique in the European Union, created in 1975. Its mission is to buy a coastal land under threat by urbanizations or deteriorated in order to restore it to its natural state and landscape it in order to give access to the public while respecting the ecosystem. Coastal land acquisition is also justified by its landscape and heritage value that ought to be protected.

French Coastline Act (Loi littorale) 1986 is the highest in the legal hierarchy of urban planning. The coastline act requires that any new urban extension should be done in continuity with pre-existing towns and villages. Outside urban areas, any new construction is banned in a 100-meter stretch of land from the shore. *The Local Urban Plan (PLU)* may extend this strip of land to more than 100 meters in a case of erosion or sensitive ecosystem.

The Gulf of Morbihan is a special case of legal governance, with three types of planning: heritage planning, ICZM and MSP planning (SMVM – DSF) and urban planning (SCOT – PLU).

Territorial and local urban master plans must provide for natural spaces, which are defined as urbanization cuts. In territorial and local master plans remarkable spaces and landscapes should be protected by urban zoning. Only light constructions may be realized within these spaces in order to allow access for the public or for economic valorization.

In spaces near to the shore, new constructions are authorized only in areas where diffuse urbanization already exist or if the constructions were planned in a *Coastal Development Scheme (SMVM)*.

Several planning instruments are identified as a framework for any future construction or works such as territorial and local urban master plans, the coastal development plan and the strategy document for each sea basin. The most important instruments are the urban planning documents within the urban planning code. These different documents are linked by different types of legal scope.

According to *article L.141-1 Town Planning Code*, Regional Urban Master Plans (SCOT) give guidelines on how urbanization should be regulated and targets to reach and it may list natural and cultural heritage issues. According to *article L151-1 Town Planning Code*, Local Urban Development Plans (PLU) are the local regulation for any new construction, zoning. Some specific monuments, landscapes, woodlands, wetlands, roads, etc. that should be protected and conserved for their heritage value may be classified in the plan. This tool is a first step towards full protection for natural and cultural heritage, although some city councils are reluctant to use it.

The main ICZM tool, though rarely implemented, is the *Coastal Development Scheme SMVM*. This scheme was created by a 1986 decree. Its goal is to determine the vocation of various areas at sea and on land, in a specific geographical area that has to deal with diverging interests regarding urban planning and maritime environment protection.

The Gulf of Morbihan RNP (PNRGM) was created in 2014. The charter contains 4 guidelines regarding heritage. 1- Preserve, safeguard and improve the biodiversity of the Gulf, 2- preserve water as a universal heritage, 3- value the quality of the Gulf's landscapes, 4- contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the territory's cultural heritage.

In the Gulf of Morbihan, the SMVM appears to be one of the most relevant policies regarding marine planning and zoning because its aim is to protect marine economic activities and marine and coastal environment. The first SMVM in the Gulf of Morbihan was adopted in 2006. It included 5 main orientations, including "contain urbanization and protect the landscapes". At the time, the coastline and the landscapes of the gulf were under pressure due to increasing and unregulated urbanization of natural spaces. The gulf's landscapes were recognized as a remarkable yet fragile and threatened heritage that must be preserved. However, this SMVM did not take into account a number of others issues, for example climate change. With the establishment of the regional natural park (PNRGM), the gulf's governance has changed. The [new SMVM](#), in development, will give more attention to space use planning. It will set an integrated policy and guidelines to resolve and avoid conflict between different users of the gulf.

The *Sea Basin Strategy Document (DSF)* is a Marine Spatial Planning tool that aims to promote the coexistence of relevant activities and uses at sea. Relevant activities and interests must be taken into consideration, which may include underwater cultural heritage. The DSF is elaborated by the maritime prefect and the regional prefect. As there are 4 sea basins in continental France, there are 4 DSFs. The Gulf of Morbihan is part of the *Atlantic North DSF*. Cultural heritage is not well accounted for in this planning. It is only perceived as a tourism issue. The DSF covers too large an area to protect or take into account the specific heritage of the Gulf of Morbihan. Therefore, the DSF is not the most appropriate tool to protect cultural heritage as it mainly addresses economic and environmental issues.

4. Policy Formation

Relevant policies for each case region were also analysed in terms of policy integration, dominant actors, stakeholder engagement, and delivery and monitoring. The analysis indicates that there is generally good awareness of other policies at different levels and across various sectors, as well as statements of intent to incorporate them or work with their departments or organisations. How such integration manifests in delivery, however, is not communicated in the documents.

The analysis suggests that dominant actors in policymaking are similar across the regions. In the majority of cases, policy is government-led, or led by the organisation commissioning them. Top-down approaches prevail, although they are often supplemented by expert input and at least some form of public consultation. There is also little variation in plans for delivery and monitoring between the regions. Actors and time-frames for implementation are typically specified. The majority of policies state an evaluation and review strategy, and, with a few exceptions, there is a common preference for an action plan and indicators.

There is evidence of a shift towards more participatory and increasingly deliberative approaches to policy development, although this is where there are large gaps in the extent to which they are manifest in practice between the PERICLES case areas. Participation is especially encouraged in the policies from Ireland, for example, with extensive consultations, discussion documents, online forums and on-going stakeholder discourse encouraging partnerships and participatory processes. Malta, however, shows a very mixed picture, dependent on sectors, and participatory approaches were found to be rare in Portuguese policy formation, and when consultation did occur it was only after plans had been shaped. Across the regions, where participation was encouraged, consultative methods based on public meetings or gathering views on drafts were the most commonly used methods overall, with fewer instances of two-way dialogue and stakeholder deliberation. The momentum towards deliberative participatory methods becomes apparent when dates of publication are considered. In regions where such methods are employed, policies and plans that were developed more recently display trends towards increasingly participatory and deliberative methods.

PERICLES supports deliberative participatory governance of cultural heritage. Participation is concerned with inclusion and equal participation, in that actors can contribute their views, while deliberation is based on expanding and using discussions in the decision-making process. Participation is identifiable in the majority of policies; however, deliberation does not necessarily feature alongside it. Furthermore, PERICLES extends the concept of deliberation beyond discussion groups to include in situ deliberation and dialogue, where deliberation and interpretation are linked to place and identity. The PERICLES concept of participatory governance, which is grounded in theories of deliberative democracy, social learning, plural values and co-production, will underpin an effective multi-actor framework for cultural heritage in key policy and planning arenas.

The following are summaries of the policy analysis findings on deliberative participation in policy formation and implementation. The interviews with key policy makers and practitioners will further investigate how policies are formed and identify how deliberation and participation in policy formation can be improved.

4.1 Galway, Ireland

Policy Integration

The analysis of Irish policies suggests that there is generally good vertical and horizontal integration. Most policies show awareness of and integration with existing policy, legislation and guidance, and many also state the involvement of expert organisations.

[Heritage Ireland 2030](#), for example, builds on heritage commitments in Project Ireland 2040 and will inform other relevant initiatives at national and local level. It stresses that the management and protection of Ireland's heritage sits within a broad framework of national, cross-border, international and EU legislation and policy. It also identifies relevant initiatives: Project Ireland 2040, Investing in our Culture, Language and Heritage 2018-2027, the National Biodiversity Action Plan, the National Landscape and Peatland Strategies, National Planning Framework, Action Plan for Rural Development, Heritage Council Strategy, Climate Change Adaptation and Architectural and Archaeological policies and initiatives such as Archaeology 2025, and local heritage plans as well as Culture 2025, Éire Ildánach and the Creative Ireland Programme.

Likewise, [An Integrated Marine Plan for Ireland: Roadmap](#) has been framed within the context of what is happening at the broader global and EU levels, particularly the Integrated Maritime Policy for the European Union and the EU Strategy for the Atlantic.

At the regional level, the [Galway Heritage & Biodiversity Plan 2017-2022](#) aims to build upon the accomplishments of the 2004-2008 and 2010-2016 plans, while taking account of changes in the national and local environment since the publication of these plans. It also relates to the National Heritage Plan, Culture 2025, the National Biodiversity Plan, Creative Ireland, Galway County Cultural Plan, and Galway 2020. More locally, [The Connemara Coast & Aran Islands Visitor Experience Development Plan](#) has been aligned with all area plans. Its implementation will be consistent with and conform to the provisions of all adopted or approved Statutory Policies, Strategies, Plans and Programmes that have direct influence on this Plan. This includes provisions for the protection and management of the environment, including land designated as Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas.

Dominant Actors

At all levels, policy is typically led by the relevant governmental department or non-governmental organisation. Many national and regional level policies are dominated by those responsible, even when stakeholder input has been sought. Of all the documents analysed, the greatest inclusion of stakeholder voices can be seen in the [An Integrated Marine Plan for Ireland: Roadmap](#), the [National Marine Planning Framework](#), [Galway Heritage Plan 2015/2021](#), and [The Connemara Coast & Aran Islands Visitor Experience Development Plan](#).

The [Galway County Heritage & Biodiversity Plan 2017-2022](#) differs in that it was expert-led. Produced by the Galway County Heritage Forum, they established three working groups to assist in the development of the plan. The membership of each working group was drawn from the Forum membership. Working groups could also invite persons who are not members of the Forum with knowledge and expertise in relation to a specific action or initiative.

Tourism documents tend to be dominated by industry voices, although a notable deviation from this is [The Connemara Coast and Aran Islands Visitor Experience Development Plan](#) which involved consultation with a wide range of stakeholders and citizens, with nine public meetings in locations across the region that facilitated local influence. None of the documents reviewed could be described as bottom-up, although a trend moving towards greater participatory and deliberative stakeholder involvement can be identified in some, such as [An Integrated Marine Plan for Ireland: Roadmap](#), which had the most stakeholder and citizen influence of those included in this analysis and will be discussed in further detail below.

The Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht are planning for greater local authority roles and greater local community influence in managing heritage in the future. Their [Heritage Ireland 2030](#) plan supports local communities in caring for their heritage, underpinning the increasingly important role that local authorities play in protecting and managing heritage for the enjoyment and benefit of all, and will provide a framework and context for local heritage plans.

Stakeholder Engagement

Engaging stakeholders, including citizens, in policymaking is a feature of the majority of the documents analysed for the Galway case region. Most often, this was in the form of public consultation, although there was variation in the extent of this across the policies. In some cases, for example the [Integrated Marine Plan for Ireland](#) and the [National Climate Change Adaptation Framework](#), there are also plans for on-going stakeholder discourse through which arising problems could be addressed.

The development of the [Galway County Heritage & Biodiversity Plan 2017-2022](#) is said to have involved consultation at all levels, although specific details regarding the process were omitted from the publication, and the [Heritage Ireland 2030](#) and [Galway Heritage Plan 2015/2021](#) consultation exercises were in the form of standard public consultations, gathering views on draft objectives and consideration of any objections to them.

In contrast, the first step in developing an [Integrated Marine Plan for Ireland](#) through its public consultation was to gather the widest possible source of ideas and opinions to better inform the process. In February 2012, a consultation document entitled [Our Ocean Wealth: Seeking Your Views: New Ways; New Approaches; New Thinking](#) was launched. The discussion document was of the typical public consultation format and posed ten questions designed to capture the views and ideas of the public on generating sustainable growth in the marine economy. However, in addition to this, further views and ideas were welcomed and a public debate was facilitated through an online discussion forum. One hundred and ninety-two submissions were received from a wide range of stakeholders. From the consultation there was a call for traditional policy making to be replaced with a more open, inclusive process at all levels. The process of engaging with the public is planned to continue, giving citizens further opportunities to make meaningful contributions. Continued stakeholder participation is also a feature of Ireland's [National Climate Change Adaptation Framework](#), for which local authorities will continue to consult and encourage partnership with stakeholders when addressing adaptation matters at a local level, particularly through the open and participative process for making development plans, into which local adaptation planning is to be integrated.

Also noteworthy are the new routes of engagement demonstrated in the stakeholder engagement strategies for policymaking in Ireland, such as online forums ([Integrated Marine Plan for Ireland](#)) and

an active social media presence ([National Marine Planning Framework](#)). Nominations for the [National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage](#) were invited via a nationwide call.

Delivery and Monitoring

The level of detail provided on how policies and plans will be delivered varies greatly. In a minority of cases, delivery and monitoring and review are not specified in the documents, although this is not to say that they are not covered by pre-existing standard delivery and review procedures of the authoring organisation. These include [Investing in our Culture, Language & Heritage 2018-2027](#), [Tourism: An Industrial Strategy for Growth to 2025](#), and [Galway County Development Plan 2015-2021](#). In some other cases there is minimal description. This includes [Galway Country 2040](#), which lists broad relevant actions surrounding promotion of the development of infrastructure, supporting industry and services, and promoting Galway's image and brand, but does not detail a method of delivery or specify any time-frames.

In [Conserving Ireland's Maritime Heritage](#) there are plans to improve on the Heritage Council's implementation and review of plans by the introduction of a new concept of heritage sustainability: *"In application, the concept of 'heritage sustainability' will broaden the scope of impact assessment to cover both natural and cultural components of the national heritage. In the long term, when coupled to a suitable set of sustainability indicators, this will constitute a stronger and more effective management ethic than the one currently pursued"*.

Other documents provide far more detail on the implementation and review processes. Some good examples of these include [Heritage Ireland 2030](#), [Harnessing Our Ocean Wealth – An IMP for Ireland](#) and the [Galway County Heritage & Biodiversity Plan 2017-2022](#). Each of the themes in [Heritage Ireland 2030](#) are to have specific actions and objectives. A steering group of stakeholders will oversee the roll out and implementation of the plan through development of an Action Plan. [Heritage Ireland 2030](#) will be reviewed every three years and a progress report will be produced after each review with clear recommendations. Actions and objectives within the plan will be revised as progress is reviewed, and a full review will be undertaken after ten years.

The Government model to implement [Harnessing Our Ocean Wealth – An IMP for Ireland](#), assigns overarching responsibility to the Marine Coordination Group (MCG) and the Minister for Agriculture, Food and the Marine to supervise cross-government delivery and implementation. The model is based on:

1. Individual departments implementing relevant policy and strategy programmes;
2. Improved cross-government communication and engagement;
3. On-going updates to the MCG;
4. Focused task forces with broad participation that address specific actions; and
5. Annual reviews of progress to commence in 2014, with feedback to stakeholders.

It will be a dynamic plan that will evolve over the period to 2020 in light of evolving circumstances nationally and internationally.

The [National Climate Change Adaptation Framework](#) will also be updated and refined over time as more data on impacts becomes available and as experience of dealing with adaptation issues

increases. For effective monitoring and review, adaptation plans will identify those who will be responsible for monitoring the plan, the criteria against which plans will be reviewed, the review process mechanism and the timescales for reviews to be carried out. The use of adaptation indicators is referred to.

Finally, the aim, vision, objectives and themes of the [Galway County Heritage & Biodiversity Plan 2017-2022](#) will be delivered through a series of strategic actions over a six-year period. Each year the Forum will agree on a detailed work programme drawn from the actions listed in the current plan and include a timeframe for delivery of the actions, identify sources of funding, set out any projects proposed under the actions and agree on lead and associate partners. The plan will be implemented through strategic partnerships to ensure that the people of the county are involved in the delivery of the plan. The Galway County Heritage Forum will monitor the annual work programme and progress is to be evaluated annually.

4.2 Belfast and the North Coast, Ireland

Policy Integration

There is generally good vertical and horizontal interaction with other relevant policies, policymakers and experts in the Northern Irish policies, with this being more evident in the recently published policies than the older ones. Most refer to their policy context, which shows awareness to and compatibility with existing policy, legislation and guidance, and in some cases also state the involvement of expert groups.

At the national level, the [UK Marine Policy Statement](#) has been subject to, and informed by, an Appraisal of Sustainability (AoS). This incorporated the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive 11 (SEA Directive). A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and an Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) screening have also been carried out. Also, [Towards an ICZM Strategy for Northern Ireland 2006-2026](#) promotes integrated management by encouraging bodies to work together and to consider management of the coastal zone as a whole, and promotes a new approach to management that will bring users and regulators together to discuss and resolve issues at a local level.

Regional, local and designated area policies are also well integrated with relevant policies and plans. For example, the key policy framework alongside which the [Antrim Coast & Glens ANOB Management Plan](#) sits is provided by the Regional Development Strategy, the relevant Planning Policy Statements and the Area Plans relevant for the AONB – the North East Area Plan (2002), the draft Northern Area Plan (2016), the Ballymena Area Plan (1986-2001) and the Larne Area Plan (2010). The emerging Antrim, Ballymena and Larne Area Plan (2016) will provide the framework for that part of the AONB during the lifetime of this Management Plan. Other relevant policies are contained within the Environment and Heritage Service (EHS) Natural Heritage Strategic Plan (2003), Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD) Rural Strategy (2007-2013), DARD draft Rural Development Programme (2007-2013), the Northern Ireland Biodiversity Strategy (2002), the Regional Development Strategy for Northern Ireland (2025), EHS's Shared Horizons – the Future of Northern Ireland Protected Landscapes (2003) and Northern Ireland Tourist Board's (NITB) Strategic Framework for Tourism

Development in Northern Ireland (2004-2007). There is also planned integration with the tourism area plan.

Tourism policies show particularly good horizontal connections across organisations. The [Strategic Framework to Unlock the Potential of Heritage-led Tourism in Northern Ireland](#) will bring government, lead agencies and funders together to identify priority investment areas and themes, who should lead and what level of ambition and investment is required. This will result in the development of major and minor programmes to address gaps in the market and underperforming heritage assets. For the [Belfast Tourism Strategy 2015-2020](#), Visit Belfast and Belfast City Council are drivers of the Action Plans, supported by the Northern Ireland Tourist Board and Tourism Ireland, with Belfast City Council responsible for harnessing public sector activity and Visit Belfast focusing on the private sector.

Dominant Actors

In Northern Ireland, policy at the national and regional levels is typically led by the relevant governmental department or non-governmental organisation. For example, the [UK Marine Policy Statement](#) is UK government-led and sits alongside and interacts with existing planning regimes across the UK, and the Northern Ireland Policy Planning Statements and [Regional Development Strategy 2035](#) are led and dominated by the department responsible for, even though stakeholder input may have been sought. The [Strategic Framework to Unlock the Potential of Heritage-led Tourism in Northern Ireland](#) is currently dominated by Tourism NI, with others being involved at a later stage.

Community interests take a greater lead in local level planning, such as community and area plans, and protected area plans. Policy and planning at the local level is particularly encouraging of bottom-up stakeholder involvement in policy and planning, while regional policy stakeholder contribution is often by consultation rather than active participation. For example, for the [Draft Marine Plan for Northern Ireland](#), the Marine Plan Authority facilitated stakeholder focussed meetings and workshops. All evidence provided by stakeholders was taken into account during the development of the Marine Plan, thereby influencing it but not actively shaping it. This plan is also designed to support and complement other existing legislation, policies, plans and strategies.

Problems are identified and addressed in the policy development stage through the expert and stakeholder involvement channels outlined below. In some cases, there are also plans for on-going stakeholder discourse through which arising problems could be addressed (e.g. the [Draft Marine Plan for Northern Ireland](#) and the [ICZM Strategy for Northern Ireland](#)). The [Northern Ireland Climate Change Adaptation Programme](#) is an iterative process, representative of the adaptive management approach that is one of the key management approaches to climate change. Progress will be outlined in an annual report, and the subsequent Adaptation Programme refined based on the findings of this.

Stakeholder Engagement

Engaging stakeholders, including citizens, in policymaking has gained increasing importance in Northern Ireland, and some policies from this region are among the most deliberative of those analysed. Policies from more recent years are in contrast to those produced earlier in both the extent of their stakeholder participation and in the participatory methods used.

External stakeholder consultation for the [Northern Ireland Climate Change Adaptation Programme](#) utilised a wide range of consultation approaches to ensure the scope of stakeholders was extensive. The consultation approach was based on the adaptation themes identified for Northern Ireland. The stakeholder events used various methods to engage the participants in discussion, including expert talks, scenario-based workshops, open meetings, and web-based surveys.

Another good example is the [Community Plan for Causeway Coast and Glens 2017-2030](#), for which the development process was open to all who wished to be part of it. Participants included statutory partners, individuals from the general public, elected representatives, the community & voluntary sector and specialists from within the identified strategic themes. Actions included a range of public engagement processes: public meetings in all seven District Electoral Areas; specific group engagement; questionnaire; register of interest (online and offline) for individuals and group representatives to put forward written submissions to the Community Planning process.

Similarly, the [Mourne AONB Management Plan](#) consultation process involved numerous organisations and individuals and was structured on continuous engagement with key stakeholders and the wider community. Various methods of consultation were used to find out local peoples' perceptions of the area, their needs and concerns and their aspirations for the future. These included meetings with interested members of the public and local stakeholders, providing questionnaires at public locations, presentation of information and gathering of comments at local events, such as livestock marts and festivals, and informal discussion during every day activities like sheep shearing. A series of interactive public consultation meetings was organised with the support of East Down Rural Community Network, while the Management Plan Officer attended other public meetings to record opinions and issues relating directly to the Mourne AONB.

For the other policies, current practice typically includes several rounds of public consultation at various stages of the process, and following the publication of draft plans, responses are invited for consideration (e.g. the [Northern Area Plan 2016](#) and the [Northern Ireland Regional Development Strategy 2035](#)). Some even include provisions for on-going stakeholder involvement in the implementation phase. For example, the [ICZM Strategy for Northern Ireland](#) promotes a new approach to management that will bring users and regulators together to discuss and resolve issues at a local level. A Coastal and Marine Forum will provide stakeholder involvement, public information and education on ICZM, as well as being responsible for monitoring progress and reporting against the targets of the strategy.

Tourism development policies are generally less engaged than marine policies, heritage policies or area plans. Most do not refer to any stakeholder involvement. With the [Strategic Framework to Unlock the Potential of Heritage-led Tourism in Northern Ireland](#), the private sector (non-heritage, but relevant stakeholders in tourism, place-making and economic development) are to be engaged where possible in the development process – but only once some of the groundwork has been done and a vision and routes for the private sector to engage can be fully articulated. A notable exception to the general trend, however, is the [Belfast Tourism Strategy 2015-2020](#), for which six months of extensive consultation was undertaken. This included face to face interviews with over 120 stakeholders involved in the Belfast tourism industry, as well as another 70 people through workshop settings, and remote consultation via business surveys.

Delivery and Monitoring

There is variation in the level of detail provided on how commitments will be delivered, however of those that specify a strategy, action plans are a typical feature. In order to deliver on the ambitions of the [Belfast Tourism Strategy 2015-2020](#), for example, a series of detailed action plans have been developed. These set out the range of key actions or activities, along with potential member organisations and an assessment of timescales for the delivery of the activities. Each action plan is the responsibility of a Task and Finish Group who meet on an 'as needs' basis and whose existence lasts until the task is completed.

Actions for the [ICZM Strategy for Northern Ireland](#) are based on their objectives. A table containing mechanisms and actions, responsible organisations and key indicators in the form of targets is provided for each of the objectives listed. The [ICZM Strategy for Northern Ireland](#) does not impose any new duties on Government Departments, public bodies, organisations or individuals in its delivery. Instead, it prompts all relevant bodies to take steps to implement those actions, which they have committed to. There are also no resources set aside for the implementation of the objectives, the majority of which are to be taken forward as part of day-to-day operations of those responsible. However, a time-scale has been decided for production and implementation of the ICZM, with three years to produce it, four years to implement it, and the remainder of the plan's twenty-year lifespan focused on maintaining it.

Finally, a slightly different phased development approach is being taken to implement the action plan for the [East Bank Development Strategy](#) with actions grouped into short term (2017-2020), medium term (2021-2026) and long-term (2027-2037) categories.

For monitoring, many policies and strategies, such as the [Community Plan for Causeway Coast and Glens 2017-2030](#), the [Regional Development Strategy 2035](#) and the [ICZM Strategy for Northern Ireland](#), monitor by measurable indicators for their outcomes and regular review of these. The [Strategic Framework to Unlock the Potential of Heritage-led Tourism in Northern Ireland](#) also discusses the need to set clear, collective and measurable targets for all initiatives but does not specify these. For the [Regional Development Strategy 2035](#) a monitoring group will be set up, indicators will be agreed and the monitoring and evaluation reports will be presented to the Executive on an annual basis, with progress analysed by the Department on a three-yearly basis.

Others, including the [Belfast Tourism Strategy 2015-2020](#) and the [Northern Ireland Climate Change Adaptation Programme](#), work on a progress reporting and review basis. As discussed previously, the [Northern Ireland Climate Change Adaptation Programme](#) will involve an iterative process of implementation and monitoring. For this, a Cross-Departmental Working Group on Climate Change (CDWG CC) has been established to ensure appropriate governance and accountability. It provides a platform that facilitates effective control and monitoring of climate change actions across the departments, and ensures that legal obligations under the UK Climate Change Act 2008 are met.

4.3 Marsaxlokk, Malta

Policy Integration

Relations between national and local government are both formal and informal. Although the creation of the Local Government Good Governance (LGGG) working group seems to bring the actors closer together, not all the formal policies are equally implemented at local level and therefore, more cooperation and understanding between local and national level is needed. One example is the fish market in Marsaxlokk, where according to informal conversations with the Mayor, national policies in terms of commercial uses and ports affect the Marsaxlokk waterfront in a way that is disorganised and misusing the community space. The local government is not completely satisfied and more consultation and discussion between both levels is needed in order to tackle the real issues with the involvement of the community as main users of the space on a daily basis.

Dominant Actors

The majority of governance structures are mainly dominated by governmental and private interests. Some structures such as the Committee of Guarantee within the Ministry of Culture might have some heritage experts from NGOs as well.

Each policy is mainly led by the corresponding Ministry or Department. However, there are transversal voices such as Transport Authority in Malta, which influences different sectors in relation to fisheries, tourism and marine planning. For instance, in Marsaxlokk there is the case of transport and boat location policies around which the traditional fishing boats will be placed and managed. Considering the importance of the boats for fishing and tourism attraction, this means Transport Malta influences tourism and fisheries.

Depending on the sector, there can be many or few voices participating in the policy. For instance, although culture has strict policies to protect heritage, even with agencies with Special Powers by law like the Superintendence of Culture, there is more involvement of other stakeholders at different levels and joint responsibilities, which might also have a stake in policy making. In contrast, other sectors like tourism, fisheries or local development are still more closed with fewer voices.

Stakeholder Engagement

Most of the policies are designed and planned at national level, with consultation of experts for each of the sectors, depending on the policy and case. The Local Government Good Governance (LGGG) working group, composed of local government key stakeholders, aims is to discuss issues relating to improving local government functions and operations.

New discourses that aim to include more participants in strategic developments are becoming more visible. An example of this is the strategic policy for IZCM, led by the Planning Authority (PA). The PA believes that through dedicated awareness raising, different levels of stakeholders could be empowered to take actions that support the co-ordinated efforts required in coastal and marine resource management and for that purpose is developing a framework with a tool-box of suitable awareness raising techniques that can be deployed as necessary by the Planning Authority, as part of its efforts to implement the MSP Directive and ICZM policies in line with the [Strategic Plan for](#)

[Environment and Development \(SPED\) \(2015-2020\)](#). The toolbox is expected to include guidance on how each technique can best be deployed and monitored. Within the PA, the project is managed by the Green and Blue Development Unit, which has a role to mainstream sustainability, climate change, and environment issues within the planning system and co-ordinate work on maritime spatial planning. The EU & Multilateral Affairs Unit within the Foreign Policy Research, EU and Funding Division will provide assistance. The [Strategic Plan for Environment and Development \(SPED\) \(2015-2020\)](#) aims to involve all the sectors in the planning and stakeholder participation in the MSP process.

Delivery and Monitoring

Malta is mainly based on a central-local government structure due to its dimensions. Hence, policies that are designed at central level are often implemented directly by the central government, executed and managed by different agencies that are in contact with the local governments. For example, Heritage Malta, Transport Malta or the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture are policy executors (agencies) and the ones that closely work with the local governments to adopt these policies. One exception in relation to cultural heritage is where there is a regional committee within the Ministry of Culture, responsible for the organisation of cultural activities that promote the localities of the region.

4.4 Gulf of Morbihan, France

Policy Integration

Local Urban Development Plans (PLU) and Regional Urban Master Plans (SCOT) must be compatible with the [Coastal Development Scheme \(SMVM\)](#). This means that these specific documents ought to abide by the guidelines set in the SMVM and not contradict specific measures contained in the SMVM. Therefore, the SMVM can be considered as the main planning tool in the Gulf of Morbihan and the highest document in this specific hierarchy of legal norms.

There are two SCOTs on the territory of the Gulf. They must be compatible with the RNP's charter, especially the guidelines regarding urban planning, landscape protection, natural spaces protection and heritage protection.

There is one PLU for each municipality in the Gulf. For the RNP's member cities, their local urban master plan must be compatible with the park's charter and its guidelines regarding urban planning and natural/cultural heritage protection. The park gives a non-legally binding opinion when local urban plans are revised or when new plans are created, in order to ensure that the charter's guidelines are properly taken into account.

Dominant Actors

The coastal and marine policy is led by the French government, especially the Ministry of Ecological Transition. This policy is then applied by regional state administrations and representatives: maritime prefects at sea, regional and department prefects on land. Territorial local authorities must comply with this policy and enforce it. The territorial local authorities are the regional council, the district (*département*) council and administration, city/municipalities councils and public establishments for inter-city cooperation.

Cultural heritage policy is led by the ministry of culture and the ministry of ecological transition. It is also enforced by the territorial authorities at regional and local levels, for example regional prefects and municipalities. The region has the competence to do an inventory of natural and cultural heritage. These policies and legal requirements are part of the heritage code, the environment code, and the town planning code.

Legislation and regulation regarding natural and culture heritage, especially registered/classified natural sites and monuments, and national/regional/marine nature parks is part of the environmental code.

The Regional Council (regional territorial authority) leads the RNP policy. It has the authority to initiate the procedure for establishment of a park in order to protect natural and cultural heritage. The decision to create the park is the power of the ministry of environment through a national decree. The management of the park is ensured by a board of directors ("*syndicat mixte*"). The charter is elaborated by the regional council and all the city councils that are part of the park project. The park's area has to undergo an environmental impact assessment and a public survey in order to be given the ministry's approval.

The park has a specific governance model. Municipalities participate in order to decide action programs. The management council is a public body, composed of elected representatives of the local authorities that are in the park's perimeter (city councils, county councils, regional councils). The management council and the board of directors prepare all future decisions regarding the park's management and implement the charter's action program. Many stakeholders also take part in the park's governance, such as local state administration, youth organizations, and scientific organizations.

For Marine Nature Parks, the ministry of environment launches the creation procedure by a ministerial order so that various studies of the area can be done. The general public will then be associated to the procedure by a public inquiry. Eventually, a national decree from the minister of environment legally creates the park and specifies its perimeter, its main goals and its governance system. The MNP is managed by a council comprised of various local stakeholders: professional organizations (fishers, shellfish farmers, farmers), environmental organizations, local state representatives, territorial authorities, etc.

The Regional Nature Park is a discussion arena that involves the general public as well as local authorities. Indeed, the creation of the RNP is led by regional and city councils. In order for the park to be created, cities must approve and sign the charter project. Their willingness to participate in the park's actions is paramount in the creation process.

When the park is officially established by a national decree, the board of directors decides which management actions should be taken. As the board is elected by territorial local authorities and is composed of representatives from the region, the county and the member municipalities, it is a good example of deliberative and participatory governance. Moreover, many stakeholders from the general public such as environmental organizations or professional associations are involved in the park's decisions.

Stakeholder Engagement

The Coastal Conservatory is one of the most important stakeholder representations regarding marine natural and cultural heritage. It participates actively to sustainable development actions.

The Regional Nature Park has a specific governance framework. Communities participate in order to decide action programs. A great number of stakeholders are involving in the park's governance, such as local state administration, youth organizations, scientific organizations, etc.

The [Coastal Development Scheme \(SMVM\)](#) is currently being revised, in order to be approved by the end of 2019. A number of working documents were made available on the internet as for example the public survey carried out in March 2019. The new SMVM seems to be much more comprehensive than the 2006 version. It includes many issues that were until, now, not taken into account. One of the measures is to “protect and enhance the importance of landscapes as a remarkable and popular cultural heritage for tourists”. An inventory of maritime heritage will be carried out by local state authorities and the PNRGM. The development of the SMVM is under the authority of local state authorities, but not all actions included in the scheme are carried out by the state. Many of them are carried out by other stakeholders such as the PNRGM. The elaboration process for the SMVM involves many of the local stakeholders such as professional organizations (for example, shellfish farmers, fisheries) or environmental associations during its creation and revision process.

Delivery and Monitoring

The [Coastal Development Scheme \(SMVM\)](#) contains a report of the present situation, and sets specific sustainable development orientations for the geographical area. It specifies the vocation of different areas and regulates measures to protect maritime environment, and sometimes maritime cultural heritage. The regulation contained in the SMVM must be written out in regional and local urban development plans (SCOT-PLU). It is revised once every 10 years.

For Marine Nature Parks, the council puts together a management plan maximum 3 years after the establishment of the park, in order to have a framework for upcoming actions. The plan is revised once every 15 years. The park management council does not have the legal competence to vote rules and regulations, however if a specific activity may have a significant impact on the park's environment, the council has a right to veto.

4.5 Policy formation in other PERICLES cases

Aveiro, Portugal

New policies are designed to be integrated with existing policy. In recent years, inter-sectorial consultation boards and stakeholder committees are being involved in the design and development of policies, to promote approaches that are more integrated. In Portugal, top-down approaches prevail in policy making, particularly at the national scale. At the national and regional levels, policy is typically led and dominated by the relevant governmental departments, often in response to European legal or policy requirements.

The policy analysis indicates that participatory approaches are still scarce in Portuguese policy making. When participatory governance in policies occurs it is usually only in the public consultation stages, after plans have been shaped. Participatory meetings usually do not take place early in the policy process at the design phase, nor in the policy monitoring and evaluation stage.

[The Situation Plan \(PSOEM\)](#) has gathered inputs from a Stakeholder Committee, which has included an institution representative from the Ministry of Culture dedicated to cultural heritage (DGPC). This Plan has undergone two public consultation stages and is about to be published as a Decree-Law. It includes a section on underwater cultural heritage, but there is no specific mention of coastal and maritime cultural heritage, nor consideration to intangible cultural heritage.

The ICZM Strategy for Portugal (Estratégia Nacional para a Gestão Integrada da Zona Costeira - ENGIZC) is operationalised through [Litoral Action Plan XXI \(Plano de Ação Litoral XXI\)](#), published in 2017, which contains an action plan. This will be monitored using indicators and evaluated in order to determine the results achieved, correct any deviations and know the physical and financial execution by type of intervention and area of operation, as well as to update or adapt it whenever the territorial dynamics or planning instruments require. Monitoring is supported by Sistema de Administração do Recurso Litoral (SIARL), a collaborative platform concerned with increasing knowledge and monitoring of the coastal zone.

Wadden Sea, the Netherlands

The Wadden Sea is an internationally renowned intertidal system which is on the UNESCO World Heritage list of UNESCO since 2009. In line with requirements and guidelines from UNESCO, the Trilateral Wadden Sea Cooperation between the Netherlands, Germany and Denmark provides an overall framework for integrated conservation and management of the area. The Trilateral Monitoring and Assessment Programme (TMAP) is the joint monitoring programme, aimed to support management of the Wadden Sea as a single ecological entity.

Policies in the Dutch Wadden Sea area have become more nature-oriented over the last decades, yet present generally a holistic view on conservation and use. Economic activities like fisheries and tourism are accepted if employed as “sustainable co-use”. [Programma Rijke Waddenzee \(Program Rich Waddensea, PRW\)](#) is a key policy in this respect. PRW has been initiated by the Dutch government. Covenants - negotiated voluntary agreements between government, and economic and civil society actors – are most important policy instruments, allowing stakeholders to have a voice and participate in policy-making. The government has a coordinating and facilitative role. Science-informed discussions and science-based policies are important prerequisites prescribed by UNESCO regulations and to Dutch policies covenants – however scientific disagreement, for example on the impact of mussel fisheries, causes different policy narratives and tense stakeholder interactions. In the last years, cultural heritage, also related to fisheries, of the Wadden Sea area has gained interest and attention on local and national level. However, the closely linked conservation of natural heritage and nature-based tourism of the area, as promoted by UNESCO and nature policy, is not easily connected with the “lived heritage” by Wadden Sea fishers and related communities, as stakeholders seem to remain in their own – often opposing – ‘camps’.

Pärnu Bay, Estonia

The intangible heritage of local communities in the Estonian small islands is integrated in the [Estonian Maritime Spatial Plan](#), and workshops with local NGOs and village communities have helped to pick out those places or areas. The [Estonian Maritime Spatial Plan](#) is currently at the draft stage. The lead agency is the Estonian Ministry of Finance and incorporated stakeholders are local municipalities, ministries, boards, NGOs and businesses connected to maritime areas. The National Heritage Board is actively participating in the process of maritime spatial planning to ensure the preservation of cultural heritage in the best terms possible.

At the national level, production of the draft for the [Estonian Maritime Spatial Plan](#) involved cooperation with local communities to mark places of leisure and local intangible heritage. At the local level, for the [Pärnu County Maritime Spatial Plan](#) there were workshops with stakeholders and compilation of the environmental impact assessment program. Then the first draft of the plan was sketched and publicly displayed, after which the draft was amended and published again. After the third version of the draft was amended and coordinated with all stakeholders, it was implemented in March 2017.

The activities planned in the maritime area were based on a table of synergies and conflicts. The plan defines areas suitable for different maritime activities, with those areas having been chosen based on previous analysis. All research that has to be conducted in those areas before starting an offshore activity is mentioned in the spatial plan and the developers can have information before they start developing.

5. Next Steps

This policy analysis has suggested there is a prevalence of government or organisation led policy, based on top-down structure with limited public participation. PERICLES will interlink public participation, public deliberative democratic deliberation, and stakeholder deliberation and participation to enable an effective broad scope approach that ensures both inclusion of specific interests and broad democratic representation of citizens. The PERICLES concept of participation will underpin an effective multi-actor framework for assessing risks and opportunities, and the adaptation and integration of existing techniques as well as development of novel techniques that can enhance recognition of cultural heritage in key appraisal venues and planning arenas for the marine environment and coastal landscapes.

PERICLES will also provide policy advice to improve the integration of cultural heritage in key marine and environmental policies and the implementation of associated EU directives. This will be based on the findings of this desk study, along with the analysis of the semi-structured policy and practice stakeholder interviews, synthesis of Demos, and policy good practice workshops.

In addition, PERICLES will develop opportunities for sustainable exploitation of cultural heritage, particularly as a tourism asset, generating local benefits through cultural heritage based blue growth. Of key importance will be the improved recognition of heritage, and in particular intangible heritage, as a resource in coastal and marine policies, alongside the tools and methods to harness it in a sustainable and socially beneficial manner.

Appendix 1 Stakeholders Identified

Case Region	Stakeholders
Galway, Ireland	EU; Government of Ireland; (particularly Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht; Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government); Heritage Council; Galway County Council; Galway City Council; Local Councils; Community groups; Tourism industry; Communities; Other industries relating to coastal and marine areas, such as fishing; Marine planners; Heritage managers; Protected areas.
Belfast and the North Coast, Northern Ireland	EU; UK Government; Northern Ireland Executive (particularly Department of the Environment, Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs and Department for Regional Development); Local Councils; Community groups; Tourism industry; Communities; Other industries relating to coastal and marine areas, such as fishing; Marine planners (Marine Plan Authority); Heritage managers; Protected areas.
Malta	EU; Maltese Government; Malta Tourism Authority; Culture Directorate; Malta environment and planning authority; Heritage Malta; Superintendence of Cultural Heritage. At fisheries and marine planners level we have also relevant stakeholders: Ministry for the environment, sustainable development and climate change; Minister responsible for maritime transport, Authority of Transport in Malta. Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture; Fishermen cooperatives. ENGOs and heritage experts; Communities.
Gulf of Morbihan, France	Ministry of Ecological Transition; Ministry of Culture; Ministry of Environment; French National Architects; Regional Councils; City Councils; County Councils; Regional Park Board of Directors; Youth Organisations; Scientific Organisations; Fishers; Shellfish Farmers; Farmers; Environmental Organisations; Marine Nature Parks; General Public.
Aveiro, Portugal	Portuguese Environmental Agency (APA-ARH); Ministry of the Sea; Directorate of Natural Resources; Security and Maritime Services (Ministério do Mar - DGRM); Institute for Nature Conservation and Forests (ICNF); Centre Regional Coordination and Development Commission (CCDR-C); Association of Municipalities of Aveiro Region (CIRA); Coastal Municipalities of the Ria de Aveiro Region (Aveiro, Ílhavo, Vagos, Murtosa, Ovar); Port of Aveiro (APA).
Wadden Sea, The Netherlands	At different levels policymakers are involved, from Supranational – UNESCO; EU (DGMARE, DGENV: MSFD, Natura 2000, CFP); trilateral Common Wadden Sea secretariat (Germany, Denmark, Netherlands); national (Netherlands: Min LNV, Min I&M, Min Onderwijs (The cultural heritage Agency of the Netherlands), Rijkswaterstaat); provinces (Friesland, Noord Holland, Groningen), municipalities (gemeenten; o.a. de Marne). ENGOs, MSC (certification body), fishers – different fisheries* (and their organisations)*, heritage experts, communities. One group of fishers are the mussel fishers, they come from Zeeland (another province) – perhaps necessary to involve that region (and communities there). Researchers: Groningen University, Wageningen University, NIOZ, WMR, Waddenacademie, ICES. Fisheries*: mussel fisheries, oyster gathering, shrimp fishing, cockle gathering, static gear fisheries, spisula fisheries, mechanical pierenvisserij, dragnet fisheries. Fisher organisations*: (cooperative) producer organisations – organised within Visned and Vissersbond and one stand alone: PO Rousant; Visnetwerk (for small scale fishers); the Cooperative fishers organisation; foundations (visserijverenigen Ons belang, Visserijvereniging Hulp in Nood, Helderse Redersvereniging, Visserijvereniging door eendracht tot vooruitgang, vereniging op handkracht verder, vissersvereniging noordwest, stichting verduurzaming garnalenvisserij, stichting duurzame garnalenvisserij, stichting geïntegreerde visserij, stichting goede vissers, stichting wadvissersgilde), fish trade organisations (Brancheorganisatie Garnalen). Erfgoed Academie (Heritage Academy).
Pärnu Bay, Estonia	Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Economy and Communication; Ministry of Environment; Environmental Board; Maritime Administration; MTÜ Liivi lahe kalanduskogu (NGO fishing community of Liivi Bay); MTÜ Pärnumaa Omavalitsuste Liit (NGO Association of Pärnu county municipalities); Estonian Fund for Nature, Estonian Marine Institute; Pärnu College (University of Tartu); MTÜ Eesti Tuuleenergia Assotsiatsioon (NGO Estonian Wind Energy)

	Association); Pärnu Yacht Club; Port of Pärnu; Local municipalities of Pärnu county; National Heritage Board; Agricultural Board; Estonian Police and Border Guard Board; Estonian Rescue Board; local municipalities; ministries; boards; NGOs; businesses connected to maritime areas.
--	--

Appendix 2 Policy Documents Identified

Case Region	Relevant Policy Documents
Galway, Ireland	<p>Relevant policies analysed include those relating to the marine environment, heritage, tourism, climate change and development, as well as county plans.</p> <p><u>Global</u>: UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO, 2003).</p> <p><u>EU</u>: Directive 2014/89/EU Establishing a Framework for Maritime Spatial Planning (EC, 2014); COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS A European Strategy for more Growth and Jobs in Coastal and Maritime Tourism /* COM/2014/086 (EC, 2014); Integrated Maritime Policy (EC, 2007); European Parliament resolution of 29 October 2015 on new challenges and concepts for the promotion of tourism in Europe (2014/2241(INI)) (European Parliament, 2014); European Parliament resolution of 8 September 2015 towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe (2014/2149(INI)) (European Parliament, 2014); COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS Europe, the world's No 1 tourist destination – a new political framework for tourism in Europe (EC, 2010).</p> <p><u>National</u>: Investing in our Culture, Language & Heritage 2018-2027 (Government of Ireland – Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht); Conserving Ireland's Maritime Heritage (Heritage Council, 2006); Heritage Ireland 2030: Public Consultation (Government of Ireland, Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, 2018); An Integrated Marine Plan for Ireland: Roadmap (Government of Ireland, 2012); National Climate Change Adaptation Framework (Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, 2012); Coastal Zone Management (Spatial Planning Unit, Department of the Environment and Local Government, 2001); National Marine Planning Framework: Baseline Report (Government of Ireland – Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government, 2018); 20-year Strategy for the Irish Language 2010-2030 (Government of Ireland); Tourism: An Industrial Strategy for Growth to 2025 (Irish Tourism Industry Confederation, 2018).; National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage (Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, 2019).</p> <p><u>Regional/Local</u>: Galway County Heritage & Biodiversity Plan 2017-2022 (Galway County Heritage Forum); Galway City Council Climate Change and Sustainability Update (Galway City Council, 2018); Galway Heritage Plan 2015/2021 (The Heritage Council); Galway County 2040 (Galway County Council, 2017); The Connemara Coast & Aran Islands Visitor Experience Development Plan (prepared on behalf of Failte Ireland by a project team comprised of Team Tourism and Rethink Tourism, 2018); Galway County Development Plan 2015-2021 (Galway County Council).</p>
Belfast and the North Coast, Northern Ireland	<p>Relevant policies analysed include those relating to the marine environment, heritage, tourism, climate change and development, as well as local plans for coastal areas.</p> <p><u>National</u>: UK Marine Policy Statement (UK Government, 2011).</p> <p><u>Regional</u>: Planning Policy Statement 2: Natural Heritage (Department of the Environment, 2013); Towards an ICZM Strategy for Northern Ireland 2006-2026 (Department of the Environment, 2016); Draft Marine Plan for Northern Ireland Public Consultation (Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs, 2018); PPS 16: Tourism (Department of the Environment); PPS 6: Planning, Archaeology and the Built Heritage (Department of the Environment, 2013); PPS 23: Enabling Development for the Conservation of Significant Places (Department of the Environment, 2014); A Prospectus for Change: A Strategic Framework to Unlock the Potential of Heritage-led Tourism in Northern Ireland (Tourism Northern Ireland, 2017); Regional Development Strategy RDS 2035 (Department for Regional Development, 2012); Northern Ireland Climate Change Adaptation Programme (Department of the Environment, 2014).</p>

	<p><u>Local</u>: Antrim Coast & Glens ANOB Management Plan (Antrim Coast & Glens AONB, 2008); Ards and Down Area Plan (Ards and Down Area Plan, 2009); Belfast Harbour Local Plan (1990-2005) (The Town and Country Planning Service of the Department of the Environment); Belfast Tourism Strategy 2015-2020 (Belfast City Council and the Northern Ireland Tourist Board, 2014); Banbridge/Newry and Mourne Area Plan 2015 (Department of the Environment, 2013); Causeway Coast AONB Action Plan 2013-2018 (Causeway Coast & Glens AONB, 2013); Causeway Coast and Glens Local Development Plan 2030: Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report (Shared Environmental Service in conjunction with Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council, 2018); Community Plan for Causeway Coast and Glens 2017-2030 (Causeway Coast & Glens Borough Council, 2018); Mourne AONB Action Plan (Northern Ireland Environment Agency (DofE) and the Mourne Heritage Trust, 2013); Mourne AONB Management Plan (Mourne Heritage Trust on behalf of the Northern Ireland Environment Agency (DofE), 2010); Northern Area Plan 2016 (Department of the Environment, 2015); Larne Area Plan 2010 (Department of the Environment, 1998); Draft East Bank Development Strategy (Belfast City Council, 2018).</p>
Malta	<p>Policies are related to fisheries, marine spatial planning, local development, tourism and cultural heritage.</p> <p>IZCM protocol (Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Trade Promotion, 2019); Strategic Plan for Environment and Development (SPED) (Environment and Planning Authority (MEPA), 2015-2020, national); Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution (Foreign Affairs and Trade Promotion, 2019, EU and national); Litter Scheme (Ministry for the Environment, Sustainable Development and Climate Change, Secretary for Agriculture, Fisheries & Animal Rights, 2018, national); Boat Restoration Scheme (Ministry for the environment, sustainable development and climate change, 2018, national). Chapter 445 Cultural Heritage Act (Ministry for Cultural Heritage, 2002, national); National Tourism Policy 2015-2020 (national); Subsidiary legislation 499.23 Commercial vessels regulations, last edit 2014, national); Subsidiary legislation 499.52 Small ships regulations, last edit 2010, national); Subsidiary legislation 499.01 Port Regulations, last edit 2012, national); Subsidiary legislation 499.35 Port security regulations, last edit 2012, national); Subsidiary legislation 552.27 Maritime spatial planning regulations, 2016, national); Subsidiary legislation 441.08 Business hours regulations, 2017, national); Subsidiary legislation 441.07 Trading licences regulations, 2018, national).</p>
Gulf of Morbihan, France	<p>Historical Monuments Statute; Natural Monuments Protection Act; Remarkable Heritage Spaces; Regional Nature Parks; Marine Nature Parks; National Parks; Coastal Conservatory; French Coastal Act (Loi Littorale) 1986; Territorial Urban Master Plans (SCOT); Local Urban Plans (PLU); Coastal Development Scheme (Schema de Mise en Valeur de la Mer – SMVM); Sea Basin Strategy Document (DSF).</p>
Aveiro, Portugal	<p>National:</p> <p>The National Ocean Strategy was published by the Ministry of Defense in 2009. Preparations for the development of the MSP started in January 2009.</p> <p>The ICZM Strategy for Portugal (Estratégia Nacional para a Gestão Integrada da Zona Costeira - ENGIZC) was approved in 2009 (Resolução do Conselho de Ministros n.º 82/2009, de 8 de setembro). Cultural heritage is included in this Strategy. In the sequence of ENGIZC, a Litoral Working Group (Grupo de Trabalho do Litoral - GTL) was set in 2014 - Despacho 6574/2014, de 20 de Maio. ENGIZC is now operationalised through Litoral Action Plan XXI (Plano de Ação Litoral XXI) published in 2017.</p> <p>Additionally, the Law 17/2014, published in April 2014, established the Basis of the Policy for Marine Spatial Planning and Management (MSP Law) of the National Maritime Space. It created a new framework for the implementation of a maritime spatial plan for the Portuguese marine waters. The Decree-Law 38/2015, published in March 2015, developed important aspects of the Law and transposed the EU MSP Directive. It defines two sets of spatial planning instruments, the Situation Plan (PSOEM - Plano de Situação do Ordenamento do Espaço Marítimo) and the Allocation Plans (AP - Planos de Afetação). PSOEM identifies the spatial and temporal distribution of existing and potential uses and activities to be developed under a private use permit, as well as the natural and cultural values of strategic importance for environmental sustainability and intergenerational</p>

	<p>solidarity. The AP aims to assign space to new uses and activities that are not included in the Situation Plan.</p> <p>Regional: Polis litoral Ria de Aveiro - Integrated Requalification and Valorisation of the Coastal Border, carrying out a set of operations to requalify and valorise risk areas and degraded natural areas located on the coast. The area of intervention was 37,000 ha in 11 municipalities (Resolution of the Council of Ministers n.º 90/2008).</p> <p>Coastal Zone Programs/Plans (POC's) are part of the National Law for Land-Use Planning (Lei n.º 31/2014, de 30 de maio). In Portugal there are 5 POC's covering the coastal territory in the country. Our Case Study region is covered by POC-OMG (Programa de Orla Costeira Ovar – Marinha Grande), which was approved by a Council of Ministers Resolution (Resolução de Conselho de Ministros n.º 112/2017, de 10 de Agosto).</p> <p>Another Land–Use Planning Instrument (currently under development) to consider in our Case Study region is the Vouga Estuary Plan – one of the four in the Country. Estuary Plans (POE) are elaborated by Portuguese Environmental Agency (APA-ARH).</p> <p>Municipal Master Plans (PDM's) – These Plans set the land-use development strategies for municipalities.</p> <p>Legal Protection: The Ria de Aveiro lagoon is an important wetland integrated in the Natura 2000 Network, classified as Special Protect Area (SPA) under Directive birds (79/409/CEE) in 1999 and as a Site of Community Importance (SCI) under Directive habitats (42/92/CEE) in 2014. Urban Canals regulation protects cultural heritage relating to traditional boats.</p>
Wadden Sea, The Netherlands	<p>Policies are related to fisheries (CFP, Visserijwet), good environmental status, Natura 2000 birds and habitats directive, marine spatial planning, local development, tourism and cultural heritage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Programma Rijke Waddenzee (Program Rich Waddensea): multi annual plan supporting policy, connecting parties, initiatives and knowledge, spurring innovation, creating policy support. - Covenant shrimp fisheries and nature ambition Rich Wadden Sea (VisWad): agreements for ecological and econ sustainable development of shrimp fishing, with as goal a Rich Waddensea in 2026. - Convent transition mussel sector and nature restoration Waddensea. - VIBEG: agreement on fishing in protected areas. - CFP - Sand supplementations - Seagrass restoration Waddensea - Fish migration river - Wind parks in Danish and German waters <p>https://www.waddenacademie.nl/organisatie/publicatie-lijst/publicatie-detail/visserij-op-de-waddenzee-in-vogelvlucht-update</p>
Pärnu Bay, Estonia	Maritime Spatial Plan for the Pärnu county maritime areas (2017), Estonian Maritime Spatial Plan.