

# Integrated analysis of planning projects and their ICZM compliance as a basis for ICZM concept development - DE

## 1. Policy Objective & Theme

- ADAPTATION TO RISK: Integrating coherent strategies covering the risk-dimension (prevention to response) into planning and investment
- SUSTAINABLE USE OF RESOURCES: Sound use of resources and promotion of less resource intensive processes/products

## 2. Key Approaches

- Integration
- Technical

## 3. Experiences that can be exchanged

The EU countries have decided to implement ICZM in their future development concepts for coastal regions. This case study analysed existing policies, procedures and tools that implement ICZM elements already.

## 4. Overview of the case

According to the evaluation of existing planning procedures recommendations for policies were developed as a basis for the development of an ICZM concept. It revealed deficits, that require action. Several sectoral experts were involved in the analysis to integrate the different views.

## 5. Context and Objectives

### a) Context

The German coast is a highly populated and used area and its ecosystems have been under high pressure for years. The pressures are caused by long-term effects (i.e. subsidies for fisheries, protected areas, economic tendencies, population development) or quickly impacting influences such as large infrastructure projects. At the time of the analysis study no ICZM concepts had been developed. Concepts for ICZM needed to be developed according to the EU guidelines and based on existing legislation and procedures. EU legislation on ICZM, the Water Framework Directive, and Agenda 21 provide frameworks for national implementation of ICZM. The federal nature protection legislation and the spatial planning legislation build a good basis for ICZM.

### b) Objectives

The aim was to analyse the current planning procedures and tools for compatibility with ICZM, reveal potential deficits, and recommend adjustments of the implementation of ICZM. The main focus was on procedures. An aim of the analyses was to develop recommendation for definitions, structures, and implementation of ICZM in existing planning operations, policies, and tools. The timescale was one year.

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

## **a) Management**

Scientific and planning experts from sociology, ecology, geography, economy, and law were involved in the analysis. Involved institutions were: University Bremen: Institute for Ecology and Evolution, the Research Centre Sustainability (artec), and the Department of Justice, Research Centre European Environmental Law, as well as BioConsult Schuchardt & Scholle GbR, Bremen and Gnarrenburg.

## **b) ICZM tools**

The analysed planning projects covered major infrastructure projects aiming at transport and mobility, coastal protection, economy (industry and tourism), and energy, affecting land, river basin, and offshore areas in all German coastal states, North and Baltic Sea coast and the Exclusive Economic Zone in the North Sea (EEZ). With the help of an indicator list, compliance and deficits in the current planning procedures considering sociological, economical, and ecological aspects as well as legal foundations would be revealed.

First of all an ICZM indicator list in terms of “good ICZM practise” for the evaluation of 10 large-scale coastal planning projects was developed. Seventeen criteria with 55 indicators were chosen based on EU ICZM publications. Experts from all relevant disciplines were integrated in the dispute to decide upon criteria and indicators. Planning practise and the underlying legal tools were evaluated based on the project documentations.

The legal planning framework in Germany was seen as sufficient for ICZM but substantial deficits were identified. Adaptations and extensions of planning tools are necessary. Particularly, regional planning tools and procedures need to be strengthened, as well as participation opportunities extended. The ecological aspect of sustainability and territorial integration have to be reinforced in the general governmental and political decision-making system. Strengths and deficits are listed here, that may be found in other country's planning procedures and legalisation as well.

**Strengths:** Stakeholder participation was well established in large-scale planning procedures. Vertical and horizontal participation was managed flexibly. Ecological impact assessments were well established, as were the negative impact reduction that is desired; compensations for large impacts are usually adequate. NGOs were given the right to initiate law suits to check compliance with ecosystem issues.

**Deficits:** Sub-division of large projects into sectoral sub-projects, especially in offshore areas. Public participation is hampered by: short time frames, lack of access to unbiased information, lack of resource equality between stakeholders, not enough conflict resolution by the negotiation process, deficit in concepts, and learning processes. Unbalanced interests when project submitter is identical with the authorising entity. Shared competences for authorisation and hearing authorities. Examination of needs and alternatives is lacking. Predominance of economical versus social and ecological aspects. Lack in regarding cumulative impacts of earlier pressures. Insufficient long-term ecosystem impact analysis monitoring, whether project induced or not. Insufficient consideration of low-level ecological impacts. Insufficient resource analysis (except in terms of space). Insufficient compliance with the Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats. Insufficient consideration of life quality standards that are not regulated by laws. Lack of socio-economic impact analyses and communication of such impacts. Weak implementation of spatial planning as an instrument for comprehensive planning. Too many early permissions of projects and early starts. Too many restrictions for legal control by NGOs.

## **7. Cost and resources**

The work was financed by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF); the budget is not known.

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

Experts with different expertise defined a list of indicators for ICZM compliance of existing legislation and procedures. Several aspects met ICZM claims but deficits were revealed. Recommendations focus on an improved participation process, and the early application in spatial planning procedures. Some recommendations aim at more general aspects of policies for ICZM e.g. the strengthening of ecological sustainable aspects and improved territorial integration.

## 9. Success and Fail factors

A common evaluation of ICZM by experts with different backgrounds was hampered by the different views and special languages used by the sectors. A broad public dispute about ICZM is seen as necessary to overcome such communication difficulties. Documentation of the evaluated projects was usually very detailed and contained background information on the whole planning process including case histories but for 5 of the projects access to project documentation was not possible.

## 10. Unforeseen outcomes

None so far

## 11. Prepared by

Priv.-Doz. Dr. habil. Gerald Schernewski & Dr. Susanna Knotz, Leibniz Institute for Baltic Sea Research

## 12. Verified by

B. Schuchardt, BioCosult Schuchart & Scholle GbR

## 13. Sources

- Retrospektive Analyse größerer Planverfahren in der Küstenzone unter der Perspektive "IKZM-Tauglichkeit" (2004). Schuchardt, B., Bildstein, T., Lange, H., Lange, J., Lee, C., Pestke, S., Osthorst, W., Schirmer, M., Wille, D., and G. Winter. Schernewski, G. (ed.) Coastline Reports 3 2004, pp. 1-118
- [www.retro.uni-bremen.de/](http://www.retro.uni-bremen.de/)



retroendbericht (779.47 KB)

