

Measuring the progress of ICZM implementation – Greece & the rest of Europe

1. Policy Objective & Theme

- SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH: Balancing economic, social, cultural development whilst enhancing environment

2. Key Approaches

- Integration
- Participation

3. Experiences that can be exchanged

The use of an indicator to measure the progress of ICZM implementation by Member States with a specific example from Greece. The indicator will allow Member States to determine the extent of their national, regional and local implementation of ICZM and compare the progress over time spans. Used together with indicators to measure sustainable development of the coastal zone, this Progress Indicator will determine whether there is any correlation between the ICZM decision-making process and improvement in the sustainability of coastal communities and coastal ecosystems and biodiversity.

4. Overview of the case

An indicator to measure the progress of implementation of ICZM in Member States has been developed. It shows the level of implementation at different administrative levels and can point to areas where further effort is needed.

5. Context and Objectives

a) Context

The growing concerns about the environmentally, socio-economically and culturally deteriorating state of the European coast have prompted the European Commission and Member States, since 1996, to introduce a range of measures to halt the trend. It is the intention that these will lead to a sustainable development of the whole European coast in the future. One of these measures has been the development and use of comparable indicators to assess the degree to which an integrated system of coastal management is being implemented around the European littoral zone.

b) Objectives

To enable Member States to measure the progress of ICZM at their national, regional and local levels.

6. Implementation of the ICZM Approach (i.e. management, tools, resources)

a) Management

The evaluation of the progress of implementing ICZM can best be achieved by relevant staff responsible for ICZM at national,

regional and local levels.

b) ICZM tools

The indicator set developed shows the level of progress being made in the implementation of ICZM. It takes the thinking of the complex, ICZM management cycle towards much more simplified comparative analysis by evaluating the progress using qualitative and semi-quantitative criteria. Thus, it recognises that the ICZM cycle can be broken down into a series of discrete, ranked actions. These actions, 31 in total grouped into four phases, are not completely exhaustive but are comprehensive enough to allow progress in ICZM to be measured. They show what is needed, using a straightforward, step-wise methodology, to pass from a situation where no ICZM is being used to one where it is being fully implemented, by being grouped into a series of four, discrete, ordered and continuous phases.

Discussing the Progress Indicator in a workshop setting is the most effective way of determining the outcome. However, it is the most costly both in terms of people's time and travel budgets. The work can just as effectively be done by email, one-on-one discussions or telephone. In the case of Greece, the information was collected on the basis of bilateral contacts between colleagues from different competent authorities. For technical reasons, there was no possibility of organising a meeting of stakeholders. However, given the fact that legislation and physical planning are to a very great extent decided at a central/governmental level, it was felt that there was no risk to miss important information that would change the replies about the indicator on the current situation simply because no such meeting had been convened.

7. Cost and resources

If a workshop is held, it takes about two to four hours to make an assessment. In such cases, travel and time are the main costs.

8. Effectiveness (i.e. were the foreseen goals/objectives of the work reached?)

Use of the indicator has accurately demonstrated the implementation of ICZM in Greece. It shows that Greece is managing its coast at all three levels of governance but, significantly, more appears to be being done at national level than at local level. It is also clear that there are more positive values at all levels in 2006 than was perceived to have been the case in 2000 showing that there is some progressive trend already taking place.

The Progress Indicator is able to distinguish between different implementation levels at national, regional and local levels throughout the different areas of Europe where it is being used. Analysis from tests conducted around Europe show good evolution in aspects of coastal planning and that management, although still largely sectoral, now has a greater tendency towards integration. In terms of having an efficient, adaptive and integrative process embedded in all levels of governance, some progress has been made but it is largely ad hoc i.e. small or no trends are present in the EU. Any improvements have been largely determined by priorities set by each country.

9. Success and Fail factors

The actions identified in the Progress Indicator provide a simplified 'road-map' for a complex, dynamic and adaptive process. The advantages of this Progress Indicator are that:

- it allows the trend in the progress of implementation in any one country to be compared over a time period,
- it allows a comparison between countries to be determined,
- it will determine if the levels of governance are in synchrony with each other,
- it identifies a problem area that needs attention,
- it is easy to complete and the colour coding gives an at-a glance judgement. Although the results can only be considered semi-quantitative at best, there is normally real agreement (or disagreement) about the Actions under discussion.
- it is visually versatile in terms of displaying the results e.g. it can also show different geographical, administrative entities within a country, the pooled results from all the respondents in a country or region, the pooled results within each phase.

There has been general agreement that the binary scale was not sensitive enough and there should be some sort of semi-quantitative breakdown. There can be sensitivity to the publication of the answers. There are still some concerns about the language used in some of the questions.

10. Unforeseen outcomes

There has been a consistent feeling that the process itself, of completing the questionnaire in a workshop setting, is of enormous benefit in bringing together different, but relevant, stakeholders to discuss the ICZM process. Persons dealing with ICZM on a daily basis are not often given the opportunity to discuss ICZM issues with persons from other departments or fields of work.

11. Prepared by

A. H Pickaver, Coastal & Marine Union, Netherlands

12. Verified by

A. H Pickaver, Coastal & Marine Union, Netherlands

13. Sources

- An indicator set to measure the progress in the implementation of integrated coastal zone Management in Europe. (2004). Pickaver, A. H., Gilbert, C. and Breton, F. Ocean & Coastal Management 47: 449-462. (not available electronically).
- EU Policies and ICZM implementation in Europe: Measuring sustainability at the coast. (2008). Pickaver, A. H., Salman, A. H. P. (2008). Proceedings of the 9th international conference Littoral 2008 A Changing Coast: Challenge For The Environmental Policies. Venice 2008. (not available electronically).
- Further testing of the approved EU indicator to measure the progress in the implementation of integrated coastal zone management in Europe. (2008). Pickaver, A. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Integrated Coastal Zone Management, 10 - 14 June 2007, Arendal, Norway. Dahl. E., Moksness. E., and Støttrup. J. Editors. Blackwell Publishing. (not available electronically).
- Ministry Of The Environment, Physical Planning And Public Works. (2006). Report Of Greece
- OECD. 2003. OECD Environmental Indicators: Development, measurement and use pp 1-37. OECD Publications. Available from
- www.oecd.org/env/
- Report on the use of the ICZM indicators from the WG – ID: A contribution to the ICZM evaluation. (2006) Breton F. European Environmental Agency.



Report on the use of the ICZM indicators from the WG-ID (2.22 MB) 