

# SWAN MARINE STRATEGY FRAMEWORK DIRECTIVE (MSFD) ENGO WORKSHOP REPORT

Dublin, Wednesday 29<sup>th</sup> January, 10.00 – 16.00

Attendance: Jade Berman, Conor Bush (Ulster Wildlife), Laetitia Beschus, Erin Bucci, Karin Dubsky, Rory Keatinge, Roslyn Nicholson, Michael Walsh, (Coastwatch), Kenny Bodles (NI Marine Task Force), Eoin Brady (Client Earth), Marie-Terese Conere, David Lee, William deTuncq (CEF), Enda Conneely, Maria Conneely (FIE), John Crudden (Angling Council of Ireland), John Daly, Johnny Woodlock (ISS), Pádraic Fogarty (IWT), Nuala Freeman & Sinead O’Brien (SWAN), Shay Fennelly (IWDG), Annabel Fitzgerald (An Taisce), John Niven (Save the Swilly), Geoff Nuttall (Celtic Seas/WWF), Sarah Twomey (Coastal and Marine Research Centre)

Facilitation: Harriet Emerson

---

## Background

Last year SWAN published the report ‘*The Marine Strategy Framework Directive in Ireland: Requirements, Implications & Opportunities for Environmentally Sustainable Management of Our Marine Waters*’<sup>1</sup>. It was published as a working document due to lack of a budget to hold a workshop with SWAN members and other eNGOs to discuss and refine the recommendations. This was the role of this workshop. The particular focus is on sharing experiences and expertise with our eNGO colleagues from Northern Ireland and exploring options for cross-border collaboration at official & NGO level.

The following is a report of the Workshop, including the relevant recommendations from SWAN’s original Working Document, and outputs from the plenary and smaller group discussions where a number of pre-determined questions (***bold italics***) were addressed. Where parallel discussions occurred, the outputs have been combined below.

Copies of the presentations given, which are listed below according to the agenda item, can be found at [www.swanireland.ie/resources/documents-to-download/swan-archive/](http://www.swanireland.ie/resources/documents-to-download/swan-archive/)

---

## PRESENT CONCERNS

### 1. Introduction & Immediate Challenges

#### Presentations:

**The MSFD: a brief overview** (*Ms Sinead O’Brien, SWAN*) Sinead outlined what the Marine Strategy Framework Directive sets out to do, the tasks involved and the prescribed timeline.

**MSFD to date in Northern Ireland and Opportunities for an All-Ireland approach** (*Dr. Jade Berman, Ulster Wildlife*) Jade explained the progress in relation to MSFD implementation in Northern Ireland, and the eNGO involvement in this, particularly through the Marine Task Force. She also touched on some possible options for an all-Ireland approach to delivering MSFD objectives.

**Inadequate process so far: Initial Assessment, setting environmental targets & public participation** (*Ms Sinead O’Brien, SWAN*) Sinead outlined the serious shortcomings identified in the Initial Assessment submitted to the EU by the Republic, and with the manner of its production. This included significant failings in undertaking public participation as set out in the Directive, which in turn limited the ability of the eNGO sector to make input.

**Unsatisfactory indicators & the eNGO response** (*Ms Karin Dubsky, Coastwatch*) Karin reported that the Commission has identified a number of Member States’ Initial Assessment reports as inadequate. However, they have determined to accept them on the condition that the Member States concerned complete and upgrade them as information becomes available.

#### Discussion outputs:

Based on the information on the Commission’s position reported by Karin, It was agreed that it is still worthwhile for eNGOs to critique Ireland’s Initial Assessment, and submit feedback to the Department of Environment,

---

<sup>1</sup> Available on the SWAN website here: [www.swanireland.ie/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/SWAN-MSFD-Report4.pdf](http://www.swanireland.ie/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/SWAN-MSFD-Report4.pdf)

Community and Local Government (DECLG). This should be done as speedily as possible. It was further agreed that SWAN and the Environment Pillar (EP) Marine Working Group should write to the DECLG requesting that:

- a) there be eNGO representation on the Working Group(s) continuing to consider Indicators that are missing in the Initial Assessment submitted to the EU and which have yet to be determined, and
- b) that the Department set a reasonable date by which the eNGO sector may make feedback on the contents of the Initial Assessment submitted to the EU, and undertake that this feedback will be taken into account in the revision and amendment of the document, which it is understood that the EU will expect to be carried out given the shortcomings of the existing document.

There was also general agreement that:

- eNGOs should pursue membership of DECLG MSFD technical working groups, and
- eNGOs should share information on existing cross-border collaborative initiatives relevant to the MSFD. (*see section at the end of this document*)

## 2. Monitoring

Presentation:

**MSFD requirements for monitoring** (*Ms Sinead O'Brien, SWAN*) Sinead set out the key requirements for monitoring in the MSFD, including Annex V details. She then outlined the monitoring recommendations set out in SWAN's Working Document and described these as setting out straightforward, necessary, requirements for high quality, fit-for-purpose, monitoring, and included the incorporation of citizen monitoring involving relevant stakeholders. (See below)

SWAN's initial recommendations

1. The monitoring programme must be developed in strict compliance with the requirements of the Directive, in particular the Annex V list, and sufficiently comprehensive to provide a full picture of the environmental status of our marine waters for all the Directive's listed descriptors and characteristics.
2. Development of the required comprehensive marine monitoring programme is a significant and challenging technical task. The relevant public authorities must be provided with the staff and technical resources necessary. These should be delivered in-house and not contracted to private sector consultants, in order to build necessary capacity.
3. Monitoring data from all sources including all public bodies, academia and NGOs should be aggregated and made publicly available on a web-platform.
4. In order to support the Marine Institute, a marine citizen monitoring programme should be developed as part of the monitoring programme, for appropriate descriptors, in consultation with relevant stakeholders e.g. fishermen, environmental NGOs.

Discussion, Questions and Outputs:

Those present were supportive of SWAN's initial proposals on monitoring for MSFD implementation (above). The following two discussion questions were then posed and the outputs are set out below.

***a) What different institutions are collecting/ hold data that could be useful for the MSFD marine monitoring programme?***

The organisations below were identified as sources of useful data for MSFD monitoring requirements.

State agencies

- Bord Iascaigh Mhara (BIM) - for fish, shellfish, black box and mussel boats data)
- Dept. of Agriculture, Food & the Marine (DAFM) – for monitoring data on aquaculture, seafood landings, foreshore licensing
- Marine Institute (MI) – esp. the Marine Atlas which is a key tool. Gaps in this should be identified and this data targeted.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) – the 4 yearly assessment of the Irish environment needs to include the marine

- National Parks & Wildlife Service (NPWS) - Red Data Books
- Sea Fisheries Protection Authority (SFPA) – for geospatial monitoring and enforcement data
- Local authorities discharge licensing monitoring data
- Inland Fisheries Ireland (IFI) – salmon and eel data (ICES)
- Harbour Authorities
- National Biodiversity Data Centre (NBDC)\* / CEDAR (NI) - while the NBDC currently does not hold marine data, it would be compatible with its remit to do so. Moreover, the NBDC is familiar with working with data submitted by citizens and could help develop wider citizen engagement in monitoring activities. However, it was acknowledged that for the NBDC to start to collect data the Dept. of Agriculture, Food and the Marine would have to be willing for this to happen, and that this is likely to be a significant challenge. NBDC's role in marine data would be supported if marine life were protected under the Wildlife Act, a move that would be supported by those present at the Workshop.

#### Other organisations

- Comhairle Fo-Thuinn / Irish Underwater Council – for information from divers\*
- Angling Council of Ireland & anglers (for club level catch data)\*
- eNGOS (IWDG, ISS, Coastwatch, An Taisce, etc.)\*
- Fisheries, e.g. Delphi
- Academia – new system to allow easy identification of data held in dissertations/ theses, Marine Atlas
- EIA/SEA Reports – and possibly other private sector information, although this is likely to be complicated by confidentiality and financial sensitivities.

*\* Citizen inputs are important for these bodies.*

It was agreed as important that:

- standardisation of data is needed (for use in GIS layers, etc.)
- raw (original) data needs to be made accessible for independent scrutiny
- data must be proactively disseminated
- data must be supplied in a timely manner
- the monitoring programme must be adequately funded
- the Aarhus Convention and Freedom of Information legislation could and should be used to access information

#### ***b) What direct citizen engagement in monitoring could be undertaken?***

A range of existing monitoring activities undertaken by citizens related to the marine environment were identified. It was agreed that the data generated by these should be made full use of by the regulatory agencies in fulfilling MSFD monitoring requirements. These included Coastwatch surveys, The Shore Thing initiative, information logged by IWDG, ISS, An Taisce, etc. In a number of cases, these initiatives could be amended in order to optimise their monitoring potential, or extended to an All-Ireland basis where this is not already the case (i.e. The Shore Thing).

New monitoring initiatives are also possible amongst eNGOs such as Coastwatch, IWDG, ISS, BWI, etc. all of whom collect, or have members that collect, field data. Similarly other NGOs involving relevant stakeholder groups, such as divers, anglers, farmers, and other marine recreational groups often also already collect useful data, and may be open to taking on specific monitoring roles. The wider public can also be encouraged and facilitated to assist with data collection through the availability and use of mobile apps. that permit the recording, identification and reporting of species, litter and other phenomena of interest. It was felt that the involvement of the National Biodiversity Data Centre (NBDC) /CEDAR in collecting marine data would support this type of initiative.

It was noted that citizens are likely to have specific ability to contribute to monitoring in relation to certain indicators, such as:

- Eutrophication – general public, eNGOs (other marine water user groups as suggested above, etc.)
  - Litter – general public, eNGOs (Coastwatch, An Taisce, etc.)
- 

## **FUTURE MARINE MANAGEMENT**

### **3. Public Participation**

Presentation:

**What SWAN is proposing (in light of public participation requirements in the MSFD Directive)** (*Ms Sinead O'Brien, SWAN*) Sinead reviewed the requirements in the MSFD Directive for the consultation and active involvement of the public in MSFD implementation. In light of these, she introduced SWAN's proposed initial recommendations, which represent fundamental elements of effective engagement with citizens.

SWAN's initial recommendations:

#### **Public Awareness**

1. A public awareness campaign highlighting Ireland's marine environment, its benefits, the issues posing a threat, the MSFD and its implications should be conducted nationwide, involving social media, local media and community groups and NGOs.

#### **Access to Information**

2. Both the DECLG and the Department of the Taoiseach should make available on a publically accessible internet portal all information in relation to the implementation of the MSFD, in addition to Harnessing Our Ocean Wealth, including information on the current state of the marine environment in addition to all work outputs of the national Marine Co-ordination Group and the MSFD Technical Working Group.
3. All relevant information regarding the "coherent and representative network of marine protected areas" must be made publicly available this year [2013] in order to inform stakeholder participation in site designation. (Note: This hasn't happened yet).

#### **Public consultation & Active Stakeholder Involvement**

4. All consultation documents and background resources must be actively disseminated and should be made readily available in an accessible format, with adequate time provided for stakeholders to respond meaningfully.
5. The early and effective participation of interested parties in the implementation of the Directive as provided under Article 19(1) must remain a separate and additional exercise building on the consultation process provided under Article 19(2).
6. A programme for public participation and active stakeholder engagement in MSFD implementation should be developed by experts and implemented as soon as possible. This should include:
  - a. A firm commitment from relevant decision-makers to allow stakeholders involved to meaningfully influence outcomes;
  - b. The identification and inclusion of all stakeholders and the parameters of engagement;
  - c. The use of appropriate means and techniques, of involving all interested parties, including specially trained professionals;
  - d. The initiating of public involvement as early as possible, including planning ahead to ensure that stakeholders have the capacity to participate when the opportunity is provided.
7. The draft Initial Assessment and related tasks must not be finalised until a comprehensive process providing for the effective participation of interests parties has been conducted.
8. Statutory Stakeholder Advisory/ Management Councils should be established, with clear terms of reference regarding the role of the council and that of its members and the mechanisms through which it can influence decisions.

9. Dedicated staff should be appointed to facilitate and provide ongoing support for public participation in MSFD implementation.

#### Discussion, Questions and Outputs:

There was general acceptance of SWAN's initial recommendations (as set out above). The following three discussion questions were then posed and the outputs are set out below.

#### ***In order to ensure "effective" participation in MSFD implementation:***

##### ***a) What existing structures should eNGO representation be secured on?***

- Dept. of Environment, Community & Local Government Working Groups for MSFD Descriptors, and other MSFD-related working groups.
- Board membership should be sought within
  - Bord Iascaigh Mhara (BIM)
  - Marine Institute (MI)
  - Inland Fisheries Ireland (IFI)
  - Sea Fisheries Protection Authority (SFPA)
- Loughs Agency Advisory Committee
- Harnessing Our Ocean Wealth – it was considered unlikely that eNGO requests for participation at this high level implementation group would be successful. However it was thought unacceptable that there is no opportunity for stakeholder participation. It was recommended that a stakeholder forum be sought, which would work alongside the implementation group and be consulted on proposals.
- Local Authority Strategic Policy Committees (SPCs) – specifically Environment SPCs
- Regional Advisory Committees (RACs) – established under Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) reforms. Although it was recognised that eNGOs have a relatively low capacity to attend such international forums, as there are membership costs, as well as time, travel and subsistence expenses which are a barrier to participation.
- Fisheries Local Action Groups (FLAGS) (under BIM) – it was agreed that eNGOs should seek to participate in these, but also that they should seek to have the operation of the Groups reviewed and reformed in order to deliver what the EU intended rather than the BIM agenda.
- Maritime Spatial Planning Committees (once established)
- Invasive Species Ireland (if re-instated)
- The NI Coastal and Marine Forum is a diverse grouping of interested stakeholders involving members of state agencies, academics and NGOs, and which eNGOs would benefit from participating in.

##### ***b) What form should public engagement structures take for Ireland/ with Northern Ireland?***

- The public could be engaged through an All-Ireland Marine Forum, operating at a high, strategic level, for which expenses and a stipend for participation are provided, and including eNGO representation as a matter of policy.
- However, the question of identifying appropriate scale for public engagement structures was seen as challenging, given issues of capacity (personnel, time, funding, expertise, etc.), and relevance (active local groups vs national policy groups), etc.
- It was felt that stakeholder engagement needs to be facilitated through social media, TV (talk shows to get the message across, etc.) and that DECLG needs to develop a public communication strategy. Such a strategy is necessary for both jurisdictions, and should involve a travelling exhibition on MSFD and a poster that can be tailored to specific interest groups.
- A DEFRA/DECLG MSFD website could be useful.

### ***c) What kind of active citizen engagement initiatives/ projects on the marine could be undertaken?***

It was felt that existing citizen actions (Coastwatch surveys, Clean Coasts & Symposium, etc.) need to be recognised, valued and resourced. It may be necessary to clarify the specific MSFD focus of individual projects. However, once this work (and the data gathered) is seen to be recognised, it was felt that this will encourage further involvement, and enhanced, extended actions, which are sustainable and enduring.

Other citizen groups need to be encouraged to feed in, and may be more interested in and relevant to certain descriptors than others. For example divers, anglers and other recreational water users are likely to have specific interests and arenas for action.

Suggestions such as the use of mobile phone App(s) by members of the public to record/report relevant issues, and which encourage simple and quick involvement by the non-expert, should be explored (see Monitoring section above).

## **4. Proposal for a Marine Management Agency (MMA)**

### Presentation:

**Background to Marine Management Agency proposal** (*Mr Eoin Brady, Independent Consultant*) Eoin explained the reasoning behind SWAN's initial proposal for a Green Paper which would allow discussion on appropriate governance for the marine environment, and specifically the idea of a single Marine Management Agency (MMA). He explored the current administrative framework, existing and upcoming EU requirements, and examples of experience from elsewhere, before outlining suggestions as to how such a structure as the proposed MMA might work.

### SWAN's initial recommendations (summary):

1. The government should establish a Marine Management Agency which would oversee the ecosystem based management of all human activities in the Irish marine environment. A Green Paper setting out proposals on this should first be published to stimulate stakeholder discussion.
2. The new Marine Management Agency should be legally mandated to ensure that the environmental requirements of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive are delivered, through its regulation of all human activities in the Irish marine environment.
3. Pending the establishment of the Marine Management Agency, the DECLG should implement interim arrangements by establishing appropriate links between the various State agencies which are members of the MSFD Technical Working Group in order to facilitate the eventual transfer of functions to the Marine Management Agency.

Eoin's presentation was followed by a plenary discussion which focused on the initial reaction to the Marine Management Agency proposal.

### Discussion outcomes:

While it was felt by some that such a comprehensive administrative approach was both desirable and long overdue, it was apparent from the discussion that further work is needed to reach agreement on both the nature and details of any structures proposed by SWAN, and also on the strategic approach to putting forward its recommendations. There were a number of questions which raised areas of concern and other points of information.

(In cases where questions were posed, and possible answers given, the answers are presented immediately following the question but *in italics*, with a bullet point to separate question and answer.)

- Where will the resources for this agency come from? ● *A taxation system involving stakeholders that benefit financially from use of marine resources could be developed to fund the necessary functions. (More detail on this may be found in SWAN's working document.)*
- Is the MMO (Marine Management Organisation) as good a model as the presentation suggests? ● *It is suggested that we take the positive experience from models such as the MMO, not that any single model is copied.*

- Is adding another agency an answer? ● *It is proposed to amalgamate others that are currently in existence, such as the SFPA, not simply to add a further agency.*
- Would the MMA include control of mineral extraction also? ● *It could, but this is not pre-determined, the proposal is for a Green Paper to allow development of the idea with open discussion on how to create a fit for purpose, lean, organisation.*
- What about the possible reconstitution of a Department of the Marine, possibly even on an All-Ireland basis? ● *It was suggested that the proposals made should not be too frightening (for government/the authorities).*
- The Marine Task Force (NI) commissioned a report into a single marine agency in Northern Ireland (with information on costings). This did not receive a positive response in political circles. An attempt at an all-Ireland approach is likely to prompt both positive and negative responses from political parties in NI.
- Government re-organisation, following the resolution of present proposed local government changes in the Republic, may be a better occasion to promote a new agency or other significant change.
- There is potential to increase the Loughs Agency role and remit.
- Marine Spatial Planning seems likely to become a requirement under European legislation. It is unclear who would be responsible for developing the necessary plans, but if the function is reserved in-house to a single department, this is likely to have an impact on a range of economic sectors and the problem of impartiality then arises. This should also be considered in the debate on desirable structures for governance of the marine.
- eNGOs need to aim for the administrative arrangements that they consider optimum, as any outcome obtained from government is likely to fall significantly short of this. In Northern Ireland, the eNGOs went in with the most ambitious objectives, and gained some benefit and a step forward, if not all that was hoped for.
- It may be possible to use the Maritime Area and Foreshore (Amendment) Bill to secure an enabling clause to allow for the setting up of a new administrative body. ● *It was pointed out that this approach did not work in Northern Ireland. ● However, the Joint Sub-Committee on Fisheries report on Sustainable Rural and Coastal Communities, that refers to the need for socio-economic considerations to be taken into account (see pt above) could be used to support this proposal.*

## 5. North/ South Co-operation

### Presentations:

**What SWAN is proposing** (*Ms Sinead O'Brien, SWAN*) Sinead indicated that SWAN's initial proposal for cross-border co-operation in relation to MSFD is limited to the potential for an enhanced mandate for the Loughs Agency. She expressed the hope that the Workshop would identify additional potential opportunities for North-South co-operation at an institutional level and amongst eNGOs.

**Options for enhanced cross-border collaboration** (*Mr Geoff Nuttall, Celtic Seas Partnership/WWF*) Geoff outlined the reasons that cross-border collaboration is imperative, the challenges involved, and touched on some of the ways in which it may be facilitated.

### SWAN's recommendation:

1. Consideration should be given to extending the legislative mandate of the Loughs Agency to express provision for co-operation between both jurisdictions in relation to the MSFD, Maritime Spatial Planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management.

### Geoff Nuttall raised the following further possible actions:

- A complete audit of cross-border/ potential cross border activities of sectors by 11 descriptors should be conducted.
- A full exploration of all the possible roles the NGO sector can play; engaging the public, monitoring (research), design of measures, implementation of measures, and so forth, should be carried out.
- It would be helpful to identify cross-sector links (descriptor/measure partnerships) that could be built on to deliver MSFD objectives.

- It is important to consider both the statutory cross-border arrangements, but also more specific voluntary arrangements that are possible between NGOs and between multiple sectors.

#### Discussion outcomes:

##### **a) What are the views on the Loughs Agency recommendation?**

There was broad agreement with SWAN's recommendation for the Loughs Agency, but it was felt that SWAN should seek the Loughs Agency's engagement on all descriptors. This may be problematic in relation to devolved powers, and also as the Loughs Agency is already stretched and facing its own capacity issues.

It was suggested that perhaps a proposal for an agency covering all Irish waters may be over ambitious. The proposal could be limited either in geographical scope or function. For example that the authority control activities in Marine Conservation Zones.

##### **b) What options could be considered for enhanced cross-border initiatives between regulatory authorities?**

- The North-South Ministerial Council could extend its existing area of co-operation concerned with the environment to include marine issues. This would enable the agreement of common policies and approaches within the two jurisdictions.
- An MSFD Joint (cross- border) Working Group could be established.
- The NPWS and Northern Ireland Environment Agency (NIEA) could collaborate on marine biodiversity, including All-Ireland Species Action Plans and Red Data lists, extending their remit to other bio-diversity descriptors. This would require adequate resources.
- The Celtic Seas Partnership Observer Board may provide an opportunity for wider MSFD co-ordination.
- There may be potential for a Marine Institute-(NI) Dept. of Environment (Marine Division) MSFD Working Group.
- An all-Ireland "Good Shore" initiative was supported. However, it was pointed out that the existing model needs some work to address existing limitations in NI, so that it is extended to the whole coastal zone, and particularly identifies the supports and capacities needed for local authorities. This latter concern is seen as a problem in the Republic also and this common need may represent an opportunity to foster a cross-border approach.
- The Irish Coastal Network (ICoNet) has sought the engagement of all coastal stakeholders but had low take up from eNGOs. This was felt to reflect capacity issues for the eNGO sector, which limit the ability to engage.

##### **c) What options could be considered for enhanced eNGO cross-border initiatives?**

It was felt that there is a need for **funding** for eNGO participation; time and personnel in MSFD. Specifically of eNGO-led bottom-up actions related to MSFD, that are both effective and cost-effective. Possible sources of funding included the plastic bag levy in NI, although this seems already to have been promised as a source of support for an unrealistic number of projects. It was suggested that SWAN seek funds for cross-border work on MSFD.

The new SWAN website, which is to be launched shortly, will include a members' forum, which can function as an **information exchange** on events, etc. The NI Marine Task Force is the equivalent on marine issues.

Further use could be made of the **EP Marine Working Group** (RoI).

It was suggested that **focussed eNGO actions** (project or issue based) could foster cross-border collaboration and development of greater links (and new projects) between eNGOs. For example, an attempt could be made to extend across the border the Species Action Plan for native Oysters that exists in Northern Ireland.

It was recognised that there is a need to know the geographical and thematic remit of eNGOs, as well as contact names and details. While the Environment Pillar database holds a list of contact details, it was suggested that a brief email questionnaire be circulated (by SWAN) to ascertain this information as well as a brief indication of the MSFD-related projects that organisations are engaged in and/or planning. This **audit of eNGOs concerned with MSFD** would make it easier to identify potential opportunities for collaboration, and facilitate effective communication, such as potentially between Coastcare, Tidy NI and Coastwatch.

It was proposed that an **annual all-Ireland eNGO event** be established

A cross-border **marine environment roadshow** was also proposed.

The Irish Sea Maritime Forum (ISMF) has a strand concerned with MSFD which eNGOs might benefit from participating in. Contact: Sue Kidd (Univ. of Liverpool). It may be possible to dial in to participate in meetings if resources do not permit eNGOs to travel to meetings.

It was recognised as important that eNGOs look at ways to include the general public, and to work with other sectoral interests also.

Celtic Seas Partnership (CSP) cross-border events were also proposed.

---

## OTHER INFORMATION SHARED DURING THE WORKSHOP

There is significant funding being provided for aquaculture development. At present there are no forums to engage stakeholders on aquaculture policy and development, equivalent to the Fisheries Regional Advisory Councils (RACs). It was suggested that this situation needs careful monitoring by eNGOs as a probable aquaculture boom takes off.

4<sup>th</sup> Feb 2014: Marine Law & Aarhus Meeting, 4-7pm Dublin, Looking at ways to ensure that Aarhus is applied fully in the area of marine law. Contact Karin Dubsy for more information.

24<sup>th</sup> March 2014: Marine Protected Areas meeting (cross-border), Dublin. Contact Karin Dubsy for further information.

25<sup>th</sup> & 26<sup>th</sup> March 2014: [EU Fisheries] North Western Waters Regional Advisory Committee meeting, Dublin. Contact Johnny Woodlock for further information on attending as an observer.

### Current Cross-border collaborations identified during the Workshop:

- Celtic Seas Partnership (LIFE+)
- IBIS (led by Loughs Agency)
- Marine Renewable Industry Assoc. (All- Ireland)
- Commissioner of Irish Lights
- Transboundary Planning in the European Atlantic (TPEA – DG Mare funded)
- An Taisce
  - Cross-border Symposium on Clean Coasts
  - Cross-border Regional Seminars
  - Blue Flag
  - Clean Coasts, Tidy NI
- For a Report on all MSFD-related projects and initiatives in Celtic Seas and beyond, see report commissioned by WWF – Twomey & O’Mahony (2013) [s.twomey@ucc.ie](mailto:s.twomey@ucc.ie)
- SCATS/ Eco-Unesco website
- “Afloat” Magazine
- “Nationwide” RTE
- Coastwatch survey

### Suggestions/proposals:

- Online forum to share information (i.e. BIM's refusal to share Mussel data with RPS working on Initial Assessment), so that all interested eNGOs may stay informed and follow up or take action as they consider appropriate.
- Each eNGO should share by email their calendar of events for 2014 (2015 where available) to see where there may be potential for collaboration.
- Straight territorial baselines – problem/advantage? Esp. West and South coasts.

### **Information on agencies and initiatives referred to in the report**

**The Coastal and Marine Forum (NI)** was initially set up in 2006. The overall aim of the forum is to bring together organisations with an interest in the management, use, development and protection of a sustainable coastal and marine environment for Northern Ireland. The Forum will advise Government (DoE) on how best to manage the impact of competing human activities on the coastal and marine environment. For more information see <http://www.doeni.gov.uk/>

**Inshore Fisheries Conservation Authorities (IFCAs)** in the UK replaced Sea Fisheries Committees in 2011. They are Committees or Joint Committees of local authorities that fall within the IFCA District. They are constituted under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 and are tasked with the sustainable management of inshore sea fisheries resources in their local area. The Committees are made up of representatives from the constituent local authorities (who provide funding for the IFCAs) along with people from across the different sectors that use or are knowledgeable about the inshore marine area, such as commercial and recreational fishermen, environmental groups and marine researchers, who offer their time voluntarily. The Marine Management Organisation, Environment Agency and Natural England also each have a statutory seat on the IFCA. For more information see <http://www.marinemanagement.org.uk/about/ifcas/>

**Marine Management Organisation: (MMO)** was established in 2010 to make a significant contribution to sustainable development in the marine area and to promote the UK government's vision for clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas. The MMO is an executive non-departmental public body (NDPB) established and given powers under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009. For further information see <http://www.marinemanagement.org.uk/>

**Northern Ireland Coastal and Marine Forum** was set up primarily to provide a mechanism for integration of management activities relevant to the coast. It acts as an aid to the implementation of ICZM. For Further information see <http://www.coastalmarineni.com/>

**The Shore Thing** is an initiative of the Marine Life Information Network, working with schools and community groups to collect information on the marine life of rocky shores around Britain. All the information collected by volunteers will be made available online and will help to build a picture of the present state of UK rocky shores and measure change in the future. For more information see [http://www.mba.ac.uk/shore\\_thing/](http://www.mba.ac.uk/shore_thing/)

**The Irish Coastal Network (ICoNet)** ICoNet aims to promote good practice in coastal management by bringing together coastal practitioners, policy makers, researchers and the general public with an interest in the sustainable development of Ireland's coast. ICoNet represents the Irish component of ENCORA - the European platform for sharing knowledge and experience in coastal science, policy and practice. ENCORA comprises sixteen national coastal networks from Europe and North Africa, and thematic networks. <http://iconet.ucc.ie>