



EUROPEAN
REGIONAL
DEVELOPMENT
FUND

The memorandum on cooperation with MSP processes

BalticRIM internal report - GoA 5.1

Magdalena Matczak, Jacek Zaucha, Joanna Witkowska,

Illustration: Daniel Zwick



Gdańsk, September 2020



Table of content

1. Introduction.....	4
2. Regional MSP processes and their relation to MCH issues	6
2.1 North Sea Region.....	6
2.2. Mediterranean Sea Region.....	7
2.3 Baltic Sea Region	8
MSP cooperation – VASAB and HELCOM	8
MCH cooperation - Baltic Region Heritage Committee	9
3. The activities in the project towards the communication of BalticRIM results to the MSP processes.....	12
4. The life after BalticRIM.....	17
Memorandum on cooperation with Helcom-VASAB WG on MSP	17
Annex 1.....	21

1. Introduction


This report, as an internal document of the BalticRIM project, provides an input to the final report of the BalticRIM. It is based on the discussions conducted under the various meetings of the BalticRIM Project. The meetings were different starting from small sector-oriented ones and crowned with a panel discussion at the MSP Baltic and EU Forum in Riga in 2019 attended by more than 100 persons. All these meetings proved that Maritime Cultural Heritage (MCH) is an important marine topic both from the planning and the governance perspective. Both of them must be orchestrated, i.e. planning must take into consideration the mandate of the MCH authorities responsible for MCH governance whereas MCH officers should understand the specificity of Marine-/Maritime spatial planning (MSP) with regard to MCH and in particular its holistic and cross-sectoral approach. Another key issue resulting from those discussions is an importance of multi-governance framework for tackling MCH problems. For proper addressing them, there is a need of engagement into the MCH discussions various types of governments (local, regional, national ones) including various national agencies as well as pan-Baltic organizations that are important for long term preservation and sustainable use of MCH.

According to the findings of PartiSEApate project that stay, in line with the BalticRIM experience, MCH should be engaged in the aforesaid orchestrated processes and discussions mainly at the national, cross-border and transnational level. At the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) level, i.e. at Baltic transnational level, one of the key actors that provides a practical frame for MSP is HELCOM-VASAB Working Group on MSP (see the description of the role and the mandate of this body in the second chapter of this report). This WG has already been mentioned as an important Baltic actor in terms of MSP by the PartiSEApate analysis. Since 2013 its role has been even increased as the key initiator of the debates and discussions on all MSP relevant transnational topics. The BalticRIM discourse proved that MCH problems must be raised at the BSR level since the coherent approach to this issue is missing and various BSR countries attach different importance to preservation and sustainable use of MCH. Also, international marine law and conventions signed by the BSR countries regulate the MCH issues in a general way referring mainly to axiological arguments.

Discussing MCH at the BSR level (in addition to the national and cross-border ones) therefore makes sense. Key risk is, that ongoing MSP processes that have been accelerated recently in all BSR countries due to the requirements of the EU MSP Directive, might create unfavourable circumstances for preserving of MCH and its sustainable use in a long-run unless properly briefed with regard to MCH specificity and its spatial manifestation. The main risks are lack of knowledge, data and awareness of planners. The BalticRIM reports point out that MSP planners are not properly equipped yet to take MCH into consideration in their plans. There is a need of a common BSR MSP denominator towards MCH, covering such issues as preservation of not yet recognised MCH, impact of MSP on MCH located at the coast, dilemma of point versus areal approach to MCH, recognition of economic (developmental) potential of MCH including multi-use options, as well as understanding that MCH should not be limited to the underwater cultural heritage such as wrecks or remains or ancient ports. From this point of view, HELCOM-VASAB WG on MSP might be seen as a promising forum of a permanent dialogue between MSP and MCH authorities with regard to the aforesaid general and strategic problems. In particular MCH is very close to the core of the VASAB work on so called

“patches”¹. In the Background Synthesis Report to the VASAB LTP published in 2009, maritime landscapes are mentioned among key sea potential. Those landscapes (seascapes in contemporary planning language) are identified in this report as genuine, transnational issue requiring BSR vision, goals and actions. Thus, it seems that HELCOM-VASAB WG on MSP is intellectually ready to incorporate MCH into its MSP Roadmap.

As the result of such a dialogue that will complement BSR wide co-operation among the MCH authorities themselves there is a hope for augmenting the only emerging common BSR approach to MCH. Since MCH should be considered as a joint heritage of the mankind, i.e. its beauty and attractiveness is important not only for the citizens of the countries where it is located (please see previous reports of BalticRIM highlighting this issue), such BSR approach, even in the advent of formal legal regulation (i.e. approach based on gentlemen agreements, common understanding of the nature of the problem and mutual trust in addressing MCH) should be seen as an important step forward in preservation and sustainable use of MCH.




The illustration was prepared within the framework of the BalticRIM project and will be used for future communication with MSP processes.

Author Daniel Zwick, State Archaeology Department of Schleswig-Holstein, 2020.

¹ "Vision and Strategies around the Baltic Sea 2010", the so called Tallinn report of 1994 describes spatial structures as three basic elements: the system of cities and urban settlements (called "pearls"), the interlinking infrastructure networks (called "strings"), and selected types of land uses (called "patches") in non-urban (rural) areas.

2. Regional MSP processes and their relation to MCH issues

2.1 North Sea Region



North
Commission
(CPMR)²

Sea



The North Sea Commission is a cooperation platform for regions around the North Sea and one of the six geographical commissions of the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions (CPMR).

Its mission is to strengthen partnerships between regional authorities which face the challenges and opportunities presented by the North Sea, by promoting common interests through dialogue and formal partnerships.

There are three main objectives that the North Sea Commission takes as main:

1. **To promote** and create awareness of the North Sea region as a major economic entity

within Europe

2. **To be a platform** for developing and obtaining funding for joint development initiatives
3. **To lobby** for a better North Sea region

Cooperation focuses on 4 main themes and involves policy development and political lobbying, development of transnational projects and exchange of knowledge and best practice, in the areas of:

- Marine resources
- Transport
- Energy and climate change
- Attractive and sustainable communities

The maritime spatial planning can be found under the Managing Maritime Space Priority, led by the Marine Resources Working Group. The key action area is to use maritime spatial planning (MSP) as a tool to promote dialogue between different governmental levels and stakeholders and to ensure sustainable and innovative exploitation of marine resources

The cultural heritage aspects could be found under another Priority: Attractive and Sustainable Communities, where one of the key actions to support the tourism sector in order to develop cultural heritage, nature, outdoor and health tourism in coastal areas. However the records are general, of strategic character and mainly directed to land and coastal areas, no mentioning the UCH.

² <https://cpmr-northsea.org>

Examples of national MSP processes in the North Sea Region

country	MSP related websites
Netherlands	https://www.noordzeeloket.nl/en/policy/noordzeebeleid/beleidsnota-noordzee/
Belgium	https://www.health.belgium.be/en/environment/seas-oceans-and-antarctica/north-sea-and-oceans/marine-spatial-plan
England	https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/marine-plan-areas-in-england
Scotland	https://www.gov.scot/policies/marine-planning/

2.2. Mediterranean Sea Region

Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP)³



Mediterranean
Action Plan
Barcelona
Convention

MAP was established in 1975 as a multilateral environmental agreement in the context of the Regional Seas Programme of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). It was firstly created to address marine pollution issues and includes now integrated coastal zone spatial planning (ICZM) and ecosystem-based management. Within ICZM and EBM, it promotes MSP. The 20th Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, held in December 2017 in Tirana (Albania), adopted the “[Conceptual Framework for Marine Spatial Planning](#)” in the Mediterranean Sea. The Conceptual Framework for MSP is recognized as a guiding document to facilitate the introduction of this management tool into the implementation of ICZM through the relevant regional framework and within the system of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols. MSP-related aspects are also addressed, for example through the [Coastal Area Management Programme](#) (CAMPs) managed by PAP/RAC. Moreover, SPA/RAC is active in the field of MSP with some joint actions with the EC to promote establishing SPAMIs (Special Protected Areas of Mediterranean Interest) in open seas, including deep seas (Meropenem project). In addition to that, it is involved in other actions targeting the definition of EBSAs (Ecologically and Biologically Significant Areas) in the Mediterranean, under the framework of the Convention for Biological Diversity (CBD).

The maritime spatial processes in the Med countries vary significantly. Somehow, the Integrated Coastal Zone Management concept is more developed here than MSP. Many countries are on the initial phase of MSP, still their coastal plans/strategies cover large parts of their sea areas. MCH as a vivid element of Mediterranean region is taken into account in these processes as a resource.

Examples of national MSP processes in the Mediterranean Region.


country	MSP related websites
Croatia	https://www.zpu-zadup.hr/prostorno-uredjenje#1 http://pap-thecoastcentre.org/projects/coastal_plans.html#skc
France	https://www.ecologie.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/17094_National-Strategy-for-the-Sea-and-Coastal_EN_fev2017.pdf http://www.geolittoral.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/strategie-de-facade-maritime-mediterranee-a1086.html
Greece	https://www.msp-platform.eu/sites/default/files/download/greece-ficheapproved-20200421_.pdf

³ <https://www.unenvironment.org/unepmap/>

Italy	http://adriplan.eu/ https://www.msp-platform.eu/sites/default/files/download/20181029_italy_0.pdf
-------	--

2.3 Baltic Sea Region

MSP cooperation – VASAB and HELCOM



In the Baltic Sea Region, there are two, important intergovernmental bodies active in the MSP field: VASAB⁴ and Helsinki Commission (HELCOM)⁵. Since 2010, these two organisations joined forces in one Helcom-VASAB Working Group on MSP⁶.



VASAB is an intergovernmental multilateral co-operation of 11 countries of the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) on spatial planning and development and HELCOM - The Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission is an intergovernmental organization and the governing body of the “Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area”.

VASAB history in MSP is long, starting with the ICZM recommendations in 1996 and then stating in Gdansk Ministerial Declaration (2005) that “sea use planning as a tool to prevent conflicts in intensively used offshore areas”. Its current work is guided by the 2009 “VASAB Long-Term Perspective for the Territorial Development of the Baltic Sea Region”, a strategic document, which considers MSP as a key instrument for the alleviation of potential sea use conflicts.

In parallel, the 2007 HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan (BSAP) introduced MSP as a process aiming at more coherent management of various human activities taking place in the Baltic Sea. BSAP required contracting parties to jointly develop by 2010, in cooperation with other relevant international bodies, broad-scale, cross-sectorial, MSP principles based on the Ecosystem Approach.

The VASAB Long Term Perspective for the Baltic Sea Region (LTP) envisages that in 2030 the Region should have integrated land and sea space planning, the understanding is reached that sea is a common asset and a development resource of all the countries, and the MSP alleviate the potential sea use conflicts.

⁴ www.vasab.org

⁵ www.helcom.fi

⁶ <https://vasab.org/theme-posts/maritimespatial-planning/helcom-vasab-msp-wg/>

HELCOM-VASAB Maritime Spatial Planning Working Group

The 7th conference of Baltic Sea Region ministers responsible for spatial planning and development held in Vilnius on 16 October 2009 in its Declaration stated that a common Baltic approach for Maritime Spatial Planning should be discussed and tools and methods of such planning developed. Enhanced co-operation is necessary in the field of capacity building actions to ensure exchange of experience, to promote education and to increase competence in Maritime Spatial Planning. The ministers underlined that a close co-operation with HELCOM with regard to environmental aspects and with other relevant actors is essential. The first meeting of the joint HELCOM-VASAB MSP WG took place on 21-22 October 2010 in Helsinki.

The Working Group ensures cooperation among the Baltic Sea Region countries for coherent regional MSP processes in the Baltic Sea. Meetings of the joint HELCOM-VASAB MSP Working Group take place up to three times a year. The Working Group is co-chaired by HELCOM and VASAB-nominated co-chairs and deputy co-chairs. The HELCOM-VASAB MSP Working Group follows and examines as well as makes use of the outcomes and findings of regional project activities relevant to MSP, such as PartiSEApate, Battleplan and Plan Bothnia.

In December 2010, the Joint VASAB-HELCOM Maritime Spatial Planning principles were adopted by VASAB CSPD/BSR and HELCOM HOD. These principles address however the process side more than the content and do not relate to the subject of maritime cultural heritage.

Also, in the Long-Term Perspective, there is nothing related to the subject of the maritime cultural heritage.

The HELCOM-VASAB Maritime Spatial Planning Working Group prepared also three guiding documents, still related more to the process side of the MSP:

- Guidelines for the implementation of ecosystem – based approach in Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) in the Baltic Sea area (2015)
- Guidelines on transboundary consultations, public participation and co-operation (2016)
- Guidelines on transboundary MSP output data structure in the Baltic Sea (2018).

More information on Baltic Sea Region countries MSP processes can be found in BalticRIM 2.4 report.

MCH cooperation - Baltic Region Heritage Committee



The cooperation towards the protection of maritime cultural heritage was already described in the BalticRIM status report WP 2 GoA 2.1 on how *to transmit Maritime Cultural Heritage (MCH) knowledge for MSP processes*.

Here the report is recalled to better describe the desired regional cooperation.

The third Conference of Baltic Sea States (BSS) Ministers for Culture in 1997 stated that cultural heritage is an essential part of the environment and an important factor for economic and social development. The Ministers stressed the importance of strengthening the common identity in the Baltic Sea region (BSR). Culture was seen as a uniting element in this massive but necessary task. Special attention should be given to cultural heritage cooperation that could balance the development gaps of management and generate common heritage approaches.

The Ministers addressed respective national heritage agencies to identify, launch and coordinate regional activities on cultural heritage. The Baltic Region Heritage Committee (then the Monitoring Group on cultural heritage in the Baltic Sea States, MG) was nominated. The Committee in turn selected the underwater heritage and coastal culture as central thematic topics for close expert cooperation.

The Working Groups on Underwater Heritage and on Coastal Heritage were formally established in 2000. Regular professional networking and cooperation between heritage experts continued ever since in form of sharing data, policies and best practises as well as creating new ones by common projects.

As a result of these roundtable discussions special projects have been developed. The Rutilus project, which was an effort to get a grip on the whole underwater heritage sector, was our last major cooperation. The list of the 100 most interesting underwater sites is one of the most important results of this project. In cooperation with the Monitoring Group we produced, from our periodical meetings, the Code of Good Practice for the Management of Underwater Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region (COPUCH). It is a professional, non-controversial set of guidelines for both experts and decision-makers.

Three main topics dominate the future agenda of the Underwater Heritage Working Group⁷:

- increasing efforts for educating and informing the public about underwater archaeology;
- better professional media and strategies for storage, exchange and presentation of data on underwater heritage and
- More concentrated efforts on raising the status of underwater heritage.

In 2008 **the Code of Good Practice for the Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region (COPUCH) has been published**, as an outcome of the discussions of the Underwater Heritage Working Group. It is a regional code of practice for underwater heritage protection and management specially adapted for the Baltic Sea Region, as non-binding and without any legal authority and as an interpretation of the practical intentions and ideas of existing international conventions and declarations.

Preamble

1. The overall objective of COPUCH is the management and preservation of the unique Underwater Cultural Heritage (UCH) in Baltic Sea. Therefore, the delimitation of the Baltic Sea is defined by the parallel of the Skaw in the Skagerrak at lat. 57 44.43' N, which is in accordance with Article 1 of the Helsinki Convention (Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area, 1992).

COPUCH is an agreed set of principles that seeks to establish:

- a) a common ground for the protection, recognition, understanding and management of the UCH in the Baltic Sea Region,
- b) that archaeological surveying and excavation are undertaken in a scientific manner,
- c) the prevention of any unprofessional interference or excavation of the UCH.

⁷ <https://baltic-8326.wilhelm-osl.servebolt.cloud/working-groups/underwater-cultural-heritage/>

Subsections:

1. "Underwater cultural heritage" means all cultural, historical and/or archaeological traces of human existence which have been under water for at least 100 years, or which otherwise are regarded as historically significant or protected by heritage legislation.
2. COPUCH is applicable to the entire Baltic Sea, including internal and territorial waters.
3. The UCH in the Baltic Sea is recognised as an invaluable source for knowledge, experience and understanding.
4. Preservation in situ of the UCH shall be considered as the first option. Other alternatives shall be motivated and actions, if taken, professionally performed.
5. By professional performance is meant such action that is conducted and led by educated and trained underwater archaeologists.
6. Professional competence in the engagement with the UCH is essential to ensure the proper recording of its cultural, historical and archaeological information.
7. All professional action regarding the UCH shall be done within a proper project design. This project design may vary between nations, but should include research objectives, expected results, planned efforts, means of documentation, treatment of eventual artefacts and publication measures. It is also recommended that it should include a budget, the means of financing, a timetable and an occupational health and safety plan.
8. Activities directed at the UCH shall avoid physical interference that is not motivated by the research objectives. Non-destructive methods shall be preferred before actions that affect or disturb a site or an object and/or its context.
9. In the management of the UCH, preventive planning and other efforts shall aim at avoiding or minimizing destructive interference.
10. Public access to good and relevant information and experience of the UCH is an important goal and shall be promoted.

Monday, 10 March 2008

3. The activities in the project towards the communication of BalticRIM results to the MSP processes

PanBalticScope Planners Forum in Helsinki

The PanBalticScope project has been a successful cross-border cooperation in the Baltic Sea with the aim of bringing better maritime spatial plans⁸. Standing on a solid base of previous maritime spatial planning-related projects in the Baltic Sea region, most notably the Baltic SCOPE project, the project was performed through the 12 activities in three thematic groups:

1. Cross-border collaboration to support national maritime spatial planning where planners and researchers cooperated in five activities.
2. Implementation of the Ecosystem-Based Approach and Data Sharing created methods and tools to support maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea.
3. Integration of Land-Sea interaction into maritime spatial planning connected to both themes and explored the concept of Land-Sea Interaction.

The central platform for the collaboration on specific planning issues identified by the planning authorities and regional organisations was a **Planning Forum**, attended by the Baltic planners responsible for current planning processes.

During the Planning Forum on 27th September 2019 in Helsinki, the draft report of BalticRIM WP 2 - *The Baltic Maritime Heritage – spatial atlas* was presented. The draft report was warmly welcomed and a short discussion was held on the countries' problems with including the cultural aspects in national MSPs. The main conclusion was that the planners are aware of its importance but the main problem is lack of reliable data and lack of clear messages of how spatial planning could support the wellbeing of the MCH. The obvious solutions are the awareness, safeguarding (even protection when feasible) and sustainable use. But of course, this remains general and conditions vary. The need of "positive approach", meaning the synergies with economic sectors (tourism) was underlined. There was a suggestion made to present the results of the project during the nearest MSP Forum in Riga.



Photo: ©Marta Konik, Maritime Office in Szczecin

⁸ <http://www.panbalticscope.eu/about-us/>

MSP FORUM in Riga

Thanks to the contacts between BalticRIM and VASAB Secretariat it was finally decided on the project involvement in the MSP FORUM in Riga. The BalticRIM project was given a dedicated session on *Tools, Processes and Concepts for Integrating Maritime Cultural Heritage Into MSP*, which was prepared and conducted in cooperation with FHA and GMUMI (FHA prepared the application, which included the program, and reporting of the event), moderated by Jacek Zaucha from GMUMI. <http://www.panbalticscope.eu/mspforum/workshop-session4/>

The workshop aim was to support the BalticRIM approach, that new spatial concepts such as underwater landscape or areas of high historical potential could act as new kind of tools for underwater heritage management and MSP planning. The workshop tried to help to understand what kind of tools are used in other countries, outside the BalticRIM partnership, or outside the EU member states for the integration of Maritime Cultural Heritage (MCH) into MSP. In terms of multiuse and MCH, which sectors have the potential to form synergies? It facilitated the two-way communication between the MSP planners and MCH experts. It promoted good working practices, both as knowledge-sharing tools and as MSP tools.

Presentations were held by:

- Maritime Cultural Heritage in MSP – International Approach & Case Studies
Arturo Rey da Silva, Escuela Española de Historia y Arqueología en Roma EEHAR -CSIC
- Maritime Cultural Heritage in the Finnish MSP approach – tools, practices and challenges so far
Mari Pohja-Mykrä, Finnish MSP Cooperation
- Maritime Cultural Heritage in MSP –Examples of the BalticRIM project
Sallamaria Tikkanen, Finnish Heritage Agency / BalticRIM project

The following three questions have been discussed:

1. The ways of including MCH into MSP
2. Readiness of MSP to deal with MCH
3. Necessary changes both of hard (law) and soft nature (mentality)


The questions are presented below

QUESTIONS for the Workshop 11:

1. What does it mean to include maritime cultural heritage in MSP?
2. To what extent is MSP ready for accommodating cultural heritage needs & claims?
3. Which way forward? Changing legislation? Changing minds of planners?

The discussions proved the correctness of the BalticRIM approach. It was clear that MCH cannot be limited to wrecks. Emotional bond is important when dealing with MSP (e.g. a case of “taboos” or hit maps). Finnish experience (see picture below) illustrates how emotionally meaningful places can be mapped. Also seascapes should be seen as a prominent part of MCH. Proper addressing MCH can also boost local development. There are many cases that local people care about MCH and are able to engage many resources in order not to lose MCH they care of. Many innovations with regard to preserving MCH such as floating museums. It seems that maritime cultural heritage is a broad term extending from the seabed to the coast, and through land uplift in places deep inland and the challenge is how to map it. The Finnish response is to use general MCH registers to create an overall picture, and

- ❖ Emotionally meaningful places
 - ✓ 12,7 % of respondents in Satakunta mentioned cultural heritage (13,7% mentioned nature values)
 - ✓ 28,4 % of respondents in Åland mentioned cultural heritage (31,1 % mentioned nature values)
 - ✓ Aesthetic values
 - ✓ **Social relations and values** (memories, family, friends, childhood)
 - ✓ Recreation and refreshment
 - ✓ Relaxing/peaceful place
 - ✓ Spiritual values
 - ✓ Negative feelings





The discussion at this panel was recorded and can be retrieved from <http://www.panbalticscope.eu/mspforum/watch-online/>.

Project platform Capacity4MSP: Strengthening the capacity of MSP stakeholders and decision makers⁹.

One of the project's activities is to elaborate a Synthesis report. It will be based on outcomes of the relevant MSP-related projects in correlation with ongoing MSP processes and activities in the BSR. It will gather achievements from projects and national and macro-regional MSP initiatives and identify additional focus areas for regional collaboration and cooperation for the future MSP cooperation agenda after 2020, as well as indicate possible MSP cooperation project themes for the next EU financial perspective 2021-2027. The Synthesis report additionally will include policy pointers for further macro-regional MSP policy development. One of the topics analysed is the maritime cultural heritage, with BalticRIM as a main contributor. Other projects analysed with in relation to MCH was Baltacar, PartiSEApate and Land Sea Act.

The main conclusion is quite general but important. There is a need to enhance the change of MSP approach towards MCH. The smaller UCH/MCH categories such as shipwrecks, lighthouses or the archaeological sites on a given area should be connected and analysed in order to define a protected underwater or maritime landscape area, also connected and analysed together with such issues like culturally and emotionally valuable areas. For development of this theme, governance component will play a crucial role in the future.

⁹ <https://vasab.org/project/capacity4msp/>

On the basis of the analyses, the thematic seminars will be organised by the project, to discuss relevant results. One of the seminars will be devoted to the Maritime Cultural Heritage. It should be held in the first quarter of 2021.

Helcom-VASAB Working Group on MSP

It was decided during the BalticRIM course, to present project results and draft memorandum during the Helcom-VASAB WG on MSP, which was planned to be held at the beginning of April 2020 in Warsaw. Unfortunately, due to the pandemic situation, the meeting was cancelled. Still GMUMI and sPro representatives negotiated to have a questionnaire on project results and potential forms of collaboration distributed among the H-V WG members. Such questionnaire was prepared and distributed at the beginning of April 2020. The text of the questionnaire is in the annex 1. The responses were used in internal BalticRIM analyses.

It was decided to further push on the topic and the contacts with the Working Group were kept. Due to the online and shorter formula of the next H-V WG meeting, it was decided to organise a separate, also online meeting dedicated only to BalticRIM results and potential cooperation with WG on MSP. Finally, the seminar was organised on 30th July 2020 and the H-V WG was represented by its Chair Joachim Johansen (Sweden), representatives of Poland, Germany and Finland as well as VASAB Secretariat. Mr Andrzej Cieślak, the former co-Chair of the H-V WG, also attended the meeting.

The discussion on projects finding was vivid and interesting.

During the discussion, Joacim Johannesson Project leader of the Swedish MSP-project, Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management and Co-chair of the Joint Helcom-VASAB Working Group on Maritime Spatial Planning, stated that:

- MCH should be included on the HV WG agenda; it is too early to predict the level of involvement of the WG. The next WG meeting is 13 November 2020, Joacim will facilitate to have the MCH topic on to the agenda.
- The WG requires professionals on MCH to provide input
- BalticRIM ideas could be updated to the HV Roadmap, and to the Baltic Sea Action Plan. This requires personal contacts between the WG and MCH experts – the WG can cooperate with the BSR Heritage Committee. Ideas as principles rather than guidelines.
- A Swedish point of view to the inclusion of MCH into MSP: the process failed in transforming the dot-based data into areal information on MCH. The issue is, how to use all the knowledge that exists, and how to integrate it with planning, and also how planning can support MCH?

Andrzej Cieślak, former H-V WG Chair, now the consultant at Maritime Office in Gdynia, Gdańsk, Poland supported strongly the possibility to include MCH in the H-V WG agenda. In his opinion, this should have a form of some kind of a semi-political agreement.

Elina Veidemane, Deputy Head of VASAB Secretariat declared that she can support the addition of MCH to the HV WG agenda.

4. The life after BalticRIM

Memorandum on cooperation with Helcom-VASAB WG on MSP

PREAMBLE:

- Having regard to the respective mandate of the HELCOM-VASAB Working Group on Maritime Spatial Planning;
- Having regard to the respective mandate of the Baltic Region Heritage Committee and its Working Group on Underwater Heritage and the Working Group on Coastal Heritage;
- Having regard to the Code of Good Practice for the Management of Underwater Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region (COPUCH, 2008);
- Having regard to the VASAB-HELCOM Guidelines on transboundary consultations, public participation and co-operation, in particular their part on co-operation;
- Having regard to the results of the BalticRIM project, which recognized the potential of maritime cultural heritage in the Baltic Sea, its importance for blue growth, consequences for spatial planning, identified gaps and challenges;
- In line with the findings of the previous transnational projects covering Marine Cultural Heritage (MCH), the PartiSEApate project in particular;
- Having in mind that the EU MSP Directive (DIRECTIVE 2014/89/EU) encourages member states to include underwater cultural heritage as an important topic of their maritime spatial plans, whereas broader notion of MCH is still waiting to be included in this document;
- Being aware that the current Roadmap on BSR MSP of the HELCOM-VASAB Working Group insufficiently covers the recognized MCH challenges;
- Taking note of the internet services/data&information sources/ produced by the BalticRIM project, namely:
 - BalticRIM DataPortal, <https://balticrimdataportal.eu/>
 - BalticRIM WIKI for terminology, [Dokuwiki.balticrim.eu](http://dokuwiki.balticrim.eu)
 - BalticRIM homepage, <https://www.submariner-network.eu/balticrim>.
- Recognizing Maritime Cultural Heritage importance in building regional identity and its fragility and vulnerability to changing environment and physical destruction;
- Recognizing the role of MCH role in creating and enhancing well-being, quality of life, identity, sense of place, social capital, and Blue Growth ;
- Being aware that MCH as a source of aesthetical values for coastal societies, needs preservation and maintenance and simultaneously as a source of development stimuli enhancing blue growth, sustainable high quality tourism in particular , it requires intensification of exploitation;

- Recognizing growing pressures that might negatively affect MCH in the BSR in particular noting growing competition for maritime space;
- Recognizing the role of MSP in strengthening its protection and boosting synergy with other sectors;
- Being aware of the need of common BSR MSP approach to MCH and important benefits out of transnational coordination of MCH at BSR level;
- Acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure
- Whereas:

[1] MCH is a cultural heritage that is formed by material and immaterial remains of seafaring and the use(s) of sea located on dry land and under water therefore the underwater heritage should be seen as a part of a larger maritime cultural heritage;

[2] MCH is constituted by both tangible and intangible elements i.e. visible elements located at sea or land (e.g. maritime cultural landscapes, single architectural monuments etc.) and emotions and values raised by them;

[3] General MCH knowledge among MSP planners and other sectors needs strengthening in order to include MCH into MSP processes in a decent way, otherwise the planning solutions might be insufficient in order to strengthen preservation and sustainable use of the MCH in the BSR;

[4] Narrowed concept of MCH still dominates among MSP planners and sectoral officers: underwater cultural heritage is limited mainly to wrecks, many other cultural heritage assets are neglected;

[5] The MSP approach to MCH varies among the BSR countries. Some MCH sites are marked as points and other as areas, depending on different legal protection status and reliable data accessibility;

[6] Objective criteria for the identification of the MCH areal sites (MCH as an area not as a single object i.e. paleo-landscapes) are missing;

[7] Effective guidelines and structures for safeguarding cultural heritage are missing;

[8] International law that provides bases for protection of maritime cultural heritage (also related to the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) has so far been insufficiently implemented in the BSR countries i.e.:

- authority responsible for MCH in the EEZs is missing in some BSR countries
- Convention for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage of Europe (Valletta, 1992), has been implemented inconsistently in the BSR, in particularly regarding the underwater heritage
- the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage has been ratified only by Lithuania thus other ways to adopt these principles on BSR scale are needed;

- [9] The information on BSR MCH is incomplete due to great number of water areas and coasts and high costs of MCH exploration in particular in the water areas. Therefore there is a need for identification not only MCH objects but also potential areas of their possible existence. To this end scientific knowledge and knowledge from neighbouring countries should be used in order to detect areas with high probability of the MU appearance (e.g. battle fields or stone-age settlements);
- [10]MSP planners should be aware of the diversity and versatility of MCH. MSP should take into considerations not only wrecks but also key seascapes and historic sites such as large sea battlefields, ship cemeteries, natural harbors, maritime recycling areas, wreck parks, historic sea routes, prehistoric underwater settlement areas and ensure /provide site-specific conditions for safeguarding them;
- [11] Due to the scale of MCH one should strive towards flexible protection therefore rather rules than zones for MCH. Zones make sense only in case of large archaeological sites. But rules should be enforceable;
- [12] Considering land sea interactions is vital for proper inclusion of MCH under MSP. In particular the influence of MSP plans on the MCH terrestrial objects should become a MSP planning routine;
- [13] MSP should encourage preparedness' i.e. spatial measures necessary since MCH can appear any time and place and not everywhere it can be protected in situ. So under MSP there is a need for adequate solutions i.e. how to change planning activities due to sudden discovery of MCH or what to do if MCH cannot be protected in situ (e.g. fairways, port areas);
- [14]Within a MSP process, exchange of MCH knowledge between neighbouring countries should be ensured, in particularly taking into consideration states with confidential underwater heritage registers;
- [15]MSP should help to detect areas with high probability of areal MCH appearance cross border, and to exchange good practices
- [16] There is also a need to secure that MCH survey precedes investment processes as a planning rule or planning solution for maritime governance;
- [17] MCH should be considered as very relevant sector to promote the multi-use concept at sea;

THE BalticRIM PROJECT PARTNERS HAVE ADOPTED THIS MEMORANDUM OF COOPERATION ON MCH WITH VASAB-HELCOM WG ON MSP IN CONSIDERATION OF THE BENEFIT OF THE COMMON GOOD – THE MARITIME CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE REGION.

It has been agreed to:

- Take up the maritime cultural heritage higher in the HELCOM-VASAB WG on MSP agenda as an important part of Baltic countries identity which should be strengthen by MSP;
- Consider the maritime cultural heritage as one of the points in the HELCOM-VASAB Roadmap on MSP in particular in a form of bi-annual debates on MCH initiated by the HELCOM-VASAB WG on MSP (e.g. in a framework of biannual BSR MSP Fora)

- Establish the permanent cooperation between the HELCOM-VASAB Working Group on MSP and the Baltic Region Heritage Committee and its Working Group on Underwater Heritage;
- Establish the permanent cooperation between the HELCOM-VASAB MSP national contacts points with adequate national cultural institutions;
- Maintain the BalticRIM data portal as a part of the HELCOM-VASAB WG effort on MSP data;
- Establish the HELCOM-VASAB expert group (contacts) on MCH;
- Utilise experience and structures of the HELCOM-VASAB WG on MSP for dissemination of the BalticRIM project results and recommendations as well as success stories of inclusion of MCH into MSP by the BSR countries and in the long run all other MSP relevant information on MCH;
- Integrate the MCH into ongoing work on the green infrastructure of the HELCOM-VASAB WG on MSP;
- Address all BSR countries with a plea of the HELCOM-VASAB Working Group on MSP to give duly attention to their MCH under the MSP process and in particular to make use of an integrated and holistic approach to that end;
- Stimulate education, information, and interactions discussing comprehensive ways to recognise MCH under MSP.

Annex 1.



EUROPEAN
REGIONAL
DEVELOPMENT
FUND

EUROPEAN UNION

Questions to the members of the Helcom-VASAB Working Group on MSP

The EUSBSR PA Culture flagship project BalticRIM (BSR INTERREG, 2018-2020) aims to integrate cultural heritage resource management in the Baltic Sea, using the opportunity of the current MSP processes across all BSR countries. In collaboration with MSP experts and institutions, maritime cultural heritage (MCH)¹⁰ experts draw on existing MCH databases and mapping, to provide quality information and planning evidence on MCH assets and areas to the MSP processes. Through a series of cross-sector dialogues and based on assessments in selected pilot areas, the project develops tools to structure decision-making processes and criteria leading to compatible planning solutions to be integrated into the MSPs to come.

The project ends in September 2020 and project partners coming from MCH and planners' side, derived of 7 countries (DE, DK, EE, FI, LT, PL and RUS), are very interested whether the results achieved so far and still under development are relevant for planning experts. We would be therefore very much appreciated if you as planner of the HELCOM-VASAB WG MSP could answer the following questions to improve the BalticRIM outputs.

I. GENERAL PLANNING QUESTIONS:

1. Are you taking as planner MCH (for definition of MCH see point II.1) into account during the national/regional MSP processes?
 - a. If yes, could you describe how?
 - b. If not, could you say why? Please choose:
 - ☐ I have no guideline how to do it,
 - ☐ MCH has no priority so far,
 - ☐ I have no information from MCH experts regarding sites, maps, other data,
 - ☐ Other reason, please explain shortly
2. Have you taken into consideration the MCH located on land and its impact on usage of the sea space, e.g. undisturbed view of the lighthouse or fortress from the sea?
 - a. If yes, could you describe how?
 - b. If not, could you say why? Please choose:
 - ☐ I have no guideline how to do it,
 - ☐ Terrestrial MCH cannot be covered in MSP in my country (lack of mandate),
 - ☐ I have no information from MCH experts regarding sites, maps, other data,

- ☐ Other reason, please explain shortly
.....

3. Did you discuss in your country how to link MCH to blue economy aspects or how to align stronger with stakeholder groups relevant for the topic (nature conservation, tourism, shipping, fisheries)?
- a. If yes, could you describe how?
- b. If not, could you say why? Please choose:
- ☐ The is no recognition of such relation;
- ☐ It is not planning role
- ☐ Other reason, please explain shortly
4. Do you need more assistance when incorporating MCH into planning? E.g. maps, data, guidance in form of a step-by-step approach, good practices etc.?
.....
5. In your opinion – does MSP could play an important role in maritime cultural heritage protection?
.....

II. Preliminary BalticRIM findings

1. BalticRIM project introduced two definitions of the Maritime Cultural Heritage:

BalticRIM definition of MCH related to UCH and MSP:

Underwater Cultural Heritage (UCH) can be linked by its nature to the planning scope of MSP. But also, coastal zones with their historical aspects should be considered. The term Maritime Cultural Heritage reflects the linkage between MSP and integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) as well as regional land planning.

BalticRIM definition of MCH:

- Maritime cultural heritage is both tangible and intangible, and is associated with the connections people have with the sea and the resources originating from the different maritime communities in the past.
- Maritime cultural heritage refers to the traces of people and the elements in the natural environment; the remains of the everyday lives of human beings living in interaction with nature constrained to maritime areas such as the coast, archipelago and open sea, and the elements, objects and places that are either terrestrial or partly or fully under water.
- Maritime cultural heritage refers to both concrete traces of maritime cultural heritage in the landscape as well as skills and beliefs, habits and practices related to maritime issues passed from generation to generation and extended to different communities in order to present, construct and maintain their identities.
- Maritime cultural heritage is associated with the settlement of coastal areas and archipelagos, seafaring and navigation, fishing and other hunting cultures by the sea, diving, and habits and beliefs related to maritime issues that connect humans to marine features and landscape, among others.

Do you find these definitions:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Interesting | <input type="checkbox"/> Infeasible |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Useful | <input type="checkbox"/> Incomprehensible |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Feasible | <input type="checkbox"/> Useless |

Please explain why you may use one definition more than the other:

.....

2. Main challenges identified

There is lot of challenges identified by the project, it can be the scale - how to protect MCH in such plans like the Polish (scale 1:200000) or the Swedish; lack of regulations - lack of necessary legal instruments to protect UCH in EEZ (e.g. Germany); lack of data/knowledge about MCH (nearly all).

MSP is expected to do more that it can in practice. The key role for MSP is to identify the MCH regarding problems and relate them to the MSP planning solutions. People associated with MCH should feel encouraged to take part in the MSP process. Here are the main challenges identified, please mark the 5 most accurate for you:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Undiscovered heritage - lack of knowledge, the marine waters are not sufficiently surveyed with regards to the archaeological objects; | <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness-raising among MSP authorities regarding MCH sites. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wrecks in coastal waters – how to sustain them? | <input type="checkbox"/> Easy accessible and exchangeable databases of MCH sites for stronger collaboration between MSP authorities. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> The MCH and ports developments. | <input type="checkbox"/> General and automatic consideration of MCH sites in national maritime spatial plans. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Designation of transnational cultural areas and routes. | <input type="checkbox"/> Using knowledge from neighbouring countries for locating multi-uses (MU). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Underwater museums. | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-border archaeological sites – how to cooperate? | |

3. Main messages towards maritime spatial planning

The project defined preliminary planning principles.

- Definition what is MCH as a key prerequisite for protecting MCH via MSP.
- In situ protection if possible.
- Due to the scale of MCH one should strive towards flexible protection. Therefore, rather rules than zones for MCH are appropriate. Zones make sense only in case of large archaeological sites. But rules should be enforceable. This is a challenge.
- Information matters – not only identification of MCH objects but also potential areas with possible existence of MCH.
- Preparedness, i.e. spatial measures necessary since MCH can appear any time and place and not everywhere it can be protected in situ. Currently, MCH is mainly taken into account during SEA processes. However, a general guidance of planners through their national and cross-border processes is lacking in many BSR countries. Therefore, under MSP there is a need for adequate

solutions i.e. how to change planning activities due to sudden discovery of MCH, how to secure that MCH search precede investment processes or what to do if MCH cannot be protected in situ (e.g. fairways, port areas).

- Pay attention under MSP to the Multi-Use issue as a potential sector encouraging multi-use at sea.
- Use scientific knowledge and knowledge from neighbouring countries in order to detect areas with high probability of the MU appearance (e.g. battle fields or stone-age settlements).

Do you find them:

☐ Interesting

☐ Infeasible

☐ Useful

☐ Incomprehensible

☐ Feasible

☐ Useless

Please explain why:

.....

4. Regional cooperation between MCH and MSP

The project would like to recommend some actions towards Helcom-VASAB Working Group (a memorandum), such as:

- a) Taking up the maritime cultural heritage higher in the MSP agenda as an important part of Baltic countries identity which should be strengthen by MSP;
- b) Establishing permanent cooperation with the Baltic Region Heritage Committee;
- c) Establishing the cooperation between the H-V MG MSP national points with national cultural institutions;
- d) Maintenance of the BalticRIM Data Portal;
- e) Establishing the H-V expert group (contacts) in MCH;

Do you find them:

- ☐ Interesting
- ☐ Useful
- ☐ Feasible

- ☐ Infeasible
- ☐ Incomprehensible
- ☐ Useless

Please explain why:

.....

5. Integration of maritime cultural heritage assessments into environmental assessments.

The project analysed different approaches, based on case studies.

- DAPSI(W)R(M) problem structuring framework (extended from the DPSIR framework)
- MCH Bow-tie analysis for MSP (to structure varied and multi-faceted information)
- MCH cumulative risk analysis for MSP (to identify areas of highest risk based on likelihood and magnitude of MCH vulnerability and cumulative pressures)

Do you apply one of these approaches?

Please explain why:

.....

Do you have other approaches in mind or already tested when considering MCH during environmental assessments?

Please shortly explain:

.....

6. Improved identification of needs of planners to integrate maritime cultural heritage into MSP.

The project analysed different improvements.

- ✓ Importance of MCH background materials like Review on Finnish maritime cultural history".
- ✓ Availability of on-line information easily downloadable in form of GIS shapes,
- ✓ Advancing studies on sustainable exploitation (not only protection) of MCH and soft values of marine space,
- ✓ Advancing value mapping that helps to identify potential areas of conflict (e.g. cultural interest vs. economic interest) and potential synergistic areas,
- ✓ Advancing research on MSP in particular LSI.

Do you think this approach is sufficient?

- ☐ Interesting
- ☐ Useful
- ☐ Feasible

- ☐ Infeasible
- ☐ Incomprehensible
- ☐ Useless

Please explain why:

.....

Do you have other approaches in mind or already tested when considering MCH during environmental assessments?

Please shortly explain - Thank you for your responses!