Special session 21 – Maritime spatial planning (msp) in Europe: challenges in transition

Conceptual approaches of Maritime Spatial Planning. Principles and Planning Parameters

Mary Rampavila[1], Prof. Sophia Avgerinou – Kolonias[2],

[1] Department II Urban and Regional Planning, School of Architecture, National Technical University of Athens, 10682, Athens, Greece, email: rampavila@yahoo.com
[2] Department II Urban and Regional Planning, School of Architecture, National Technical University of Athens, 10682, Athens, Greece, email: skolonia@arch.ntua.gr

Abstract: Maritime Spatial Planning is a fairly new process that offers a useful and valuable context for the sustainable development of the seas. Various international organizations and institutions of international cooperation (UNESCO, UNEP, EU, VASAB etc) approach MSP through their scope, define it, implement it. Every organization chooses an approach that fits its purpose. Characteristic of this is even the name of MSP. Should it be called Marine or Maritime Spatial Planning? Could these terms be used interchangeably as if they give the same meaning to the process? Examining various definitions of MSP, approaching those conceptually, highlighting similarities and differences, this paper seeks their link to the discipline of spatial planning that was focusing on coastal areas and was rather ignoring maritime areas up until recently. Sectoral policies were applied extensively, as if they were the unique user of the sea, ignoring or giving little importance to spatial impacts. Spatial planners were constantly choosing not to plan the sea, facing it as a landscape, significant for its aesthetic value and environmental importance. Has this absence of spatial planning discipline at the beginning of the process caused spatial planning discipline background gaps? There are considerations over MSP implementation. There seems that most marine/maritime spatial plans already elaborated don't have a spatial planning approach but rather a sea use approach. But if the sustainable development of the seas is what is needed, it can be attained through strategic marine/maritime spatial planning instead of sea use plans, a multi-level spatial planning process and various levels of marine/maritime spatial plans. Planning principles and major parameters will be approached in an effort to set the framework of spatial planning process.

Keywords: Maritime/Marine Spatial Planning (MSP), international organizations, spatial planning principles, spatial planning parameters

Introduction

Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) is a process chosen to implement the objectives of various intergovernmental institutions regarding the sea. Having different perspectives they choose MSP as a tool of implementation, acknowledging that sectoral approaches were proven unsuccessful. Analyzing the various definitions met, there is the need to find similarities and differences in order to understand whether the different beginning of each one of them leads to a different end. There is also the need to find the spatial planning discipline in them, making the key assumption that the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers of Spatial Planning (CEMAT), European Union (EU) and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) documents on spatial planning principles could be the basis for such a quest. The main MSP principles documents come from the EU, the Conference of Ministers "Visions and Strategies around the Baltic Sea" (VASAB) and the United Nations Environment Programme Mediterranean Action Plan (UNEP MAP) as forerunners, but also as approaches of European interest. Stocktaking on this, there will be an outline of principles and parameters found on MSP documents based on spatial planning documents of international interest.

Conceptual approaches to MSP

There is the need to make a conceptual approach to MSP, to analyze the definitions met in institutional work and academic bibliography in order to detect individual features, principles and important elements of spatial planning, taking into consideration that regulation and arrangements of maritime activities and uses, in whichever form, has been an informal form of unconscious planning. Coastal and maritime spatial planning has become a conscious process some decades ago in Northern America, Western Europe and Australia and a bit later from international institutions, such as UNESCO and the EU. (Beriatos, 2016)

An important first step: the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP)

The United Nations system, showing great interest in coastal and marine environment, launched the Regional Seas Programme in 1974. It has been considered since, as one of the major achievements in the environment, as the only legal framework protecting seas at regional (multinational) level. Regional Seas Programme was based on the 1972 Stockholm Conference outcome. All conventions are subject to ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.

The Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution (Barcelona Convention) was signed in 1975 and was adopted in 1976, by the Conference of the Coastal States for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea. It adopted the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP). The Barcelona Convention refers to fighting pollution in the Mediterranean Sea, naming its geographic coverage that extends in the Mediterranean waters including gulfs and seas and excluding internal waters, except if there is a different prevision in its protocols. The main objectives of the Convention are the assessment and control of marine pollution, the assurance of sustainable management of natural marine and coastal assets, the incorporation of the environment into the social and economic development, the protection of the marine environment and coastal areas through the prevention and diminution of pollution and the elimination of land or sea-based pollution, the protection of national and cultural heritage, the enforcement of solidarity of Mediterranean coastal states and the quality of life improvement. The objectives are carried out through the 7 Protocols that address specific aspects and complete the MAP legal framework.

The most recent protocol, the Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) Protocol, goes further and introduces the necessity of integrated planning for uses and activities in coastal areas, covering a land – sea area, with the sea area extending to territorial waters. It is a tool focusing on land-sea interaction, pressure and conflict management in favor of the environment. ICZM is based on principles, considering the hydrological, ecological, socio-economic and cultural elements in an integrated manner, in order not to surpass the coastal area carrying capacity, emphasizing also on economic activities. It manages possible conflicts between various sectoral policies, taking into account the fact that many marine environmental resources, important for human activities, gather in coastal areas, but also the fact that maritime activities start and finish in coastal areas and demand for space and resources. (Avgerinou - Kolonias and Rampavila, 2017) The Contracting Parties (CPs) to the ICZM Protocol decided in 2017 (COP 20) that they need to introduce a guiding document "Conceptual Framework for Marine Spatial Planning" to facilitate the introduction of MSP, as a management tool, into the Barcelona Convention framework, stepping on the work already done by UNESCO IOC and the EU on MSP. This action aims at supporting the achievement of Good Environmental Status (GES) of the Mediterranean Sea and Coasts, investigating in more details connections between land and sea areas, and proposing coherent and sustainable land and sea-use planning frameworks relating with key economic sectors and activities that may affect the coastal and marine resources. Its objectives are to introduce MSP in the framework of the Barcelona Convention, and in particular link it to ICZM, considering MSP as the main tool/process for the implementation of ICZM in the marine part of the coastal zone and specifically for planning and managing maritime human activities according to ecosystem approach (EcAp) goals and to provide a common context to the contracting parties (CPs) for the implementation of MSP in the Mediterranean Region.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (UNESCO IOC)

UNESCO IOC is considered to be an international pioneer of MSP. Ehler and Douvere (2009) as MSP pioneers in UNESCO IOC, in their step-by-step approach define Marine Spatial Planning *as "a public process of analyzing and allocating the spatial and temporal distribution of human activities in marine areas to achieve ecological, economic, and social objectives that are usually specified through a political process"*. Their original choice of the term marine spatial planning for MSP is based on the role chosen by the United Nations system on the environment preservation and protection, and on the approach chosen for MSP as a process to safeguard GES. There is a focus on the analysis and spatial – temporal distribution of human activities in the maritime areas and especially on the result of spatial planning and not on the strategic approach of maritime areas, according to theories of spatial planning. The choice of the distribution of human activities in the sea isn't

the spatial implementation choice of one or more objectives, but rather a management choice of good neighborhood. It is not approached as a process with scientific background but rather as a mapping tool resolving neighborhood conflicts. This is a common issue in many definitions, starting probably from the rather empirical approach of MSP, due to the plethora of professionals, regardless of scientific discipline, that work on MSP. The choice of mentioning the distribution of human activities in the sea includes the element of delimitation in the maritime spatial plans (MSPlans) following the marine boundaries and not the administrative boundaries, inherent element of terrestrial spatial planning (TSP). It is a substantial choice aiming at approaching the ocean as a sum of various interfacing and coexisting marine ecosystems. It is an important choice, taking into account that MSP needs to be specified at regional seas level, exclusive economic zones (EEZ) and various regional sub seas, in order to cover the spatial planning needs at national level and specify them in lower levels of spatial planning, so as to assure the needed specification and a more meticulous approach.
Nevertheless, at the UNESCO IOC internet site on MSP there is now a wider, more prescriptive and more elaborated definition. *"Marine spatial planning is a public process of analyzing and allocating the spatial and temporal distribution of human activities in marine areas to achieve ecological, economic, and social objectives that usually have been specified through a political process. Characteristics of marine spatial planning include ecosystem-based, area-based, integrated, adaptive, strategic and participatory. Marine spatial planning is not an end in itself, but a practical way to create and establish a more rational use of marine space and the interactions among its uses, to balance demands for development with the need to protect the environment, and to deliver social and economic outcomes in an open and planned way."* The experience gained, as MSP attracts the interest of the countries helps in better defining the content and framing a "good" MSP process. Of course, we should admit that the more the definition is enriched the more the lack of theoretical background is evident. Many inherent elements of spatial planning, self-evident to every spatial planner, are described with a specific reference, in an effort to clarify the term, for those that are not acquainted with the spatial planning scientific discipline. The specific feature of this definition is the chosen analytic and descriptive form, preserving the initial definition given by Ehler and Douvere as a first part. The more elaborate definition focuses on the process of analysis and spatial – temporal distribution of human activities in the sea. It emphasizes as elements of MSP, the ecosystem-based, spatial, integrated, adaptive, strategic and participatory approach. The second part of the definition states that MSP is the means to the end of the spatial vision to be implemented.

The European Union (EU)
The EU following the UN Conventions and the Lisbon Treaty for sustainable, inclusive and smart growth has set the pace for policy developments in the EU, affecting the coastal zone, starting with the Blue Book on Integrated Maritime Policy (IMP), the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD), the Limassol Declaration, the Common Fisheries Policy, the Marine Knowledge Document, the Directive on a Framework for Maritime Spatial Planning, the Communication on Innovation in the Blue Economy: realizing the potential of our seas and oceans for jobs and growth, but also, early in the procedure, the Recommendation on Integrated Coastal Zone Management.
IMP focuses on developing integrated decision making, aiming at the integrated maritime governance, implementation of integrated strategies per sea basin and further development of intersectoral tools, such as MSP. The main strategic objectives set for IMP are integrated maritime governance, development and application of integrated strategies in sea basins, further development of intersectoral tools, such as MSP for ameliorating the synergies and coordination of existing policies and means. It is of crucial importance to gather all existing data and knowledge, to achieve the collaboration of all stakeholders, to ensure the protection and sustainable use of maritime resources. The Roadmap for MSP identified 10 key principles for MSP, in order to achieve a common approach by the Member States. The one that could be quoted is that we need to define the objectives to guide MSP achieving TSP – MSP coherence. In this way the EU has chosen to define spatial planning of the seas as maritime spatial planning, instead of marine spatial planning, acknowledging that it is a tool for the accomplishment of Blue Growth and facing the challenges, in order to achieve greater trust and safety for investments. (Lukic et al, 2018) However Ehler, Zaucha and Gee (2018) argue that the practice of planning does not always confirm a semantic.
MSP, according to the Directive 2014/89/EU, is a *"process by which the relevant Member State's authorities analyze and organize human activities in marine areas to achieve ecological, economic and social objectives"*. It is a rather poor MSP definition, result of the needed balance among the EU Member States (EU MSs), in order to reach an agreement on the MSP Directive. EU aims at providing MSs with a planning process in order for them to pursue the achievement of sectoral policies' objectives in their marine areas. It is incorporated into the wider Europe 2020 strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. Ivarsson et al (2017) consider that ecosystem services are not fully taken into account in the MSP Directive and that, on the contrary, the EU Strategy 2020 on Biodiversity calls for the implementation of recording and assessing of the state and the value of the ecosystem services. Through MSP, EU MSs should focus at developing maritime energy, shipping,

fishing and aquaculture, preservation, protection and improvement of the environment, climate change resilience, as well as sustainable tourism and sustainable exploration of raw materials. The specific reference of these sectors comes from the competences given to the EU by the EU MSs, according to the EU Conventions, and the need to respect the subsidiarity principle. All MSs remain sovereign and independent states and have decided to delegate some of their decision-making powers to the EU, so that they take decisions of common interest together.

Joint efforts of UNESCO IOC and EU

UNESCO and the EU have a different start line. UNESCO has a humanitarian approach seeking to build peace through international cooperation in education, sciences and culture. It sets the pace but it cannot set binding regulation and it lacks implementation experience. The EU makes policy and can enforce its implementation, resulting on practices and restrictions. However, the different start line of UNESCO IOC and the EU does not affect the result (Platias and Rampavila, 2018). Both the EU and UNESCO IOC have common targeting, based on the need to manage activities in the marine areas in a way that will not create conflicts and will prevent or at least moderate the negative effects, helping achieve ecological, economic and social objectives. The definition elaborated by UNESCO IOC, seems more complete, incorporating as major principles for the MSP process the ecosystem-based, spatial, integrated, adaptable, strategic, stakeholder involvement procedure. Directive 2014/89/EC refers to the MSP process characteristics in an analytic way, in articles 9 and 14 and as footnote in article 6. However, MSP refers to strategic planning, having as main characteristics the spatial dimension, the integrated territorial approach, the revision of the plans and public participation. Probably, the need to encompass all these characteristics in the definition comes from the fact that for UNESCO IOC, MSP is a sub-unit of marine management and the rather sectoral interest of the EU.

Lately, the EU and UNESCO IOC acknowledged the need to cooperate and establish a common approach organizing International Conferences and an International Forum on MSP. The main output of this cooperation is the "Joint Roadmap to accelerate Maritime Spatial Planning processes worldwide" (2017). This document aims at improving cooperation or capacity building to cover the needs of different levels of implementation of MSP processes in the world, including regions where MSP is in its infancy or regions where arrangements for MSP may exist but a strategic approach to facilitate coordination would be beneficial.

Other components of the UN system of interest for MSP

There are many cases where MSP is considered as the means to objective fulfillment and is encompassed as a sub-process in already existing processes. The need to protect and manage the marine environment is inherent in the UN system. Starting from the Agenda 21 (Earth Summit, Rio de Janeiro, 1992) and all the way to Agenda 2030 and the SDGs, the need to protect and manage the marine and coastal environment in a planned way is one of the main concerns. The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) held in Rio in 2012, adopting the document "The future we want", launched the process to develop a set of SDGs. This document highlights that the UN aims at conserving and sustainably using the oceans, the seas and their resources, emphasizes the importance of area-based measures.

In 2015, a landmark year for international policy shaping, "Transforming our World: the 2030 agenda for sustainable development" was adopted at the UN Conference in New York. The post-2015 development agenda consisted of two processes coming out of the 2010 Millennium Development Goals (MDG) Summit, the Johannesburg Implementation Plan and the 2012 Rio+20 outcome documents that resulted, among others at the incorporation of MSP into Agenda 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). SDG 14, which is the marine goal, stresses the need to "conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development" and its implementing targets, regarding marine pollution, management, protection and rehabilitation of marine and coastal ecosystems, acidification of the seas, fisheries sustainable development, preservation of 10% of marine and coastal areas etc, promoting the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) implementation. Evidently, MSP is the necessary precondition for the achievement of SDG 14, as a policy tool, that can resolve spatial conflicts. However, MSP is the main tool for the implementation of Agenda 2030, as it can be the main linking tool of SDG 14 with all the other Agenda 2030 SDGs and especially SDG11, the TSP goal.

Additional to the interest of the UN system, there is another very important definition resulting from the need to enlarge the definition of MSP, already stated by the CPs of the Biodiversity Convention in 2012. According to the definition set out at the technical study "Marine Spatial Planning in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity" (2012), *MSP is a framework and a means to the improvement of decision making*. In this way it frames the limit of action and sets the way of action, setting the terms for better decision making.

Visions and Strategies around the Baltic Sea (VASAB)

VASAB was founded at the 1992 Ministerial Conference that decided on the need for a long term vision and transnational spatial planning at the Baltic Sea Region based on the document "Visions and Strategies for the

Baltic Sea Region 2010" and the outcome of the final report "VASAB 2010: Towards a Framework for Spatial Development in the BSR" (Talinn Report) – the common actions are being coordinated by the Committee on Spatial Development in the BSR. The EU Commission, recognizing the focus on strengthening and harmonizing of national and regional spatial policies and highlighting it as a best practice, supports the implementation of the VASAB action programme, securing EU fund and programmes.
Early on, VASAB, being based on both UN Regional Seas Conventions Programmes and EU Macroregional Strategies has created a joint working group with HELCOM on MSP (HELCOM VASAB MSP WG) to discuss a common Baltic approach for MSP and develop tools and methods of such an approach. The Declaration of the 7th Conference of the Baltic Sea Ministers seeks to enhance cooperation and among others increase MSP competence in close cooperation with HELCOM regarding environmental aspects and other essential relevant actors. It is an important case study area, since it is the more advanced macroregion of the EU, in terms of cooperation, governance and cohesion. Following the broad scale spatial planning principles that we analyze in the MSP principles section, they have already implemented a transnational strategic spatial planning document on territorial integration "Long-term perspective for the territorial development of the Baltic Sea Region in 2030" (2009), which leads to territorial cohesion in the Baltic Sea Region. It promotes integrated land-sea spatial planning in order to protect the Baltic Sea environment, ensure the sustainable use of marine resources and make it a model region for the implementation of EU maritime policy.

EU Strategy for the Adriatic and the Ionian Region (EUSAIR)
EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian region (EUSAIR) on the other hand, is a fairly new macroregional policy with regards to VASAB macroregion. Both the Strategy and the Action Plan were adopted in 2014 by the EU Council. It will be coordinated by a Governing Board and the implementation level will be at 4 Thematic Steering Groups (TSGs) (one per each pillar according to the Action Plan). It faces great difficulties, since the acquis communautaire doesn't apply to all, but 4 countries. However MSP has raised increased interest and it has been incorporated in 2 (blue growth and marine environment) out of the 4 pillars of cooperation as a tool of implementation of the Action Plan. For Pillar 1 (Blue Growth) MSP represents the tool to a proper joint governance framework for the sustainable and transparent use of maritime and marine resources. For Pillar 3 (Environmental Quality), Integrated Coastal Area Management (ICAM) and MSP are considered to be the tools that will ensure the sustainable use of marine and maritime resources.
There aren't many results at the time, since it's a newborn macroregional strategy, but all countries and the EU expect a lot in the future. It is strongly believed that EUSAIR will be the guiding body to implementing transboundary MSP in the Adriatic and Ionian Seas. At the moment there is an effort to synchronize the work done for pillars 1 and 3 on MSP and define in common possible MSP and ICZM projects.

MSP principles or spatial planning principles?
The UN system and the EU have made important contributions to the MSP principles area with three very important documents: "Roadmap for Maritime Spatial Planning: Achieving Common Principles in the EU", "Baltic Sea Broad Scale Spatial Planning Principles" and "Conceptual Framework for Marine Spatial Planning". They all seek to achieve their conventional goals and policies by establishing a common context for the implementation of MSP, taking into account that countries show great differences in MSP systems, describing MSP as a tool, an instrument and a process. The EU MSP roadmap builds on existing EU instruments aiming at implementing IMP. The VASAB document seeks to achieve better coherence of MSP systems, being concerned that MSP is not carried out on a whole-Baltic scale, in a way that safeguards the marine and terrestrial biodiversity. The UNEP MAP conceptual framework seeks to strengthen MAP activities in the field of MSP in order to contribute to GES, linking it to ICZM.
In table 1, it is evident that all documents stress the importance of an *area-based approach*, which is a redundancy regarding spatial planning – the scientific discipline that shapes places. However it is being stressed in various ways as the need to plan according to characteristics and special conditions of an area or to plan efficiently. The *strategic approach* to planning, evident in all documents, could be also considered a redundancy. Planning processes, whether they are spatial or not, are strategic, including goal setting, indicator setting, evaluation, and adaptation. *Public participation* wasn't integrated into spatial planning for long, but now one cannot think of spatial planning without stakeholder involvement and consultation. It is interesting, though, that UNEP MAP refers only to cross-border consultation and not on general public participation. The *ecosystem-based approach*, despite the fact that it seems absent as a principle, it is omnipresent since in all documents it is considered something in between a goal and an overarching principle. The *integrated approach,* which is inherent to spatial planning, is specifically mentioned in order to highlight the need for MSP to be coordinated with TSP in coastal areas.

Table 1: MSP Principles in the 3 documents on principles adopted by EU, VASAB and UNEP MAP

PRINCIPLES	EU "Roadmap for Maritime Spatial Planning: Achieving Common Principles in the EU" (2008)	VASAB HELCOM WG "Baltic Sea Broad Scale Spatial Planning Principles" (2010)	UNEP MAP "Conceptual Framework for Marine Spatial Planning" (2018)
Area-based approach (Spatial planning)	• *using MSP according to area and type of activity*	• *planning adapted to characteristics and special conditions at different areas*	• *multi-scale approach* • *suitability and spatial efficiency*
Strategic approach principle	• *defining objectives to guide MSP* • *incorporating monitoring and evaluation in the planning process*	• *long term perspective and objectives* • *continuous planning*	• *adaptive approach*
Participatory approach principle	• *stakeholder participation* • *cross-border cooperation and consultation* • *developing MSP in a transparent manner*	• *participation and transparency* • *transnational coordination and consultation*	• *cross-border cooperation*
Ecosystem-based approach principle	• *ecosystem approach*	• *sustainable management* • *ecosystem approach* • *precautionary principle*	
Integrated approach principle	• *achieving coherence between terrestrial and maritime spatial planning — relation with ICZM* • *coordination within Member States — simplifying decision processes*	• *coherent terrestrial and maritime spatial planning*	• *land-sea interaction* • *integration* • *connectivity*
Data	• *a strong data and knowledge base.*	• *high quality data and information basis*	• *knowledge-based project*
Dimensions			• *four dimensions on MSP*
Legal effect	• *ensuring the legal effect of national MSP*		

Source: relevant official texts processed by the authors

All MSP principles' documents tend to emphasize on the needs of the decisive bodies and the contracting parties, creating a rather distorted image of MSP. They are mainly oriented in economic and ecological aspects, *downgrading social and cultural aspects of spatial planning*. There is no defined will to achieve territorial cohesion (which fortunately was incorporated for the first time in the MSP strategy 2030 document of VASAB). MSP is approached more as a maritime activities' organizational plan, like land use plans, than a spatial planning approach. It follows the same process but it lacks in abiding with major spatial planning scientific discipline principles. It seems a lot like spatial planning in its beginnings, lacking a planned approach or a clear spatial vision. (Wassenhoven, 2017)

There are certainly a lot of similarities between TSP and MSP that were made obvious during the analysis of the MSP definitions. However there are also a lot of differences that make MSP a more difficult attempt than TSP. Among the differences we count the four-dimensionality of MSP, the continuous mobility of many maritime activities and species of ecosystems, the lack of private property, (EU/DG MARE, 2008) the up-until-now sectoral approach, the fragmented approach in case MSP is implemented regardless of ecosystem integrity. Due to the different physical characteristics and the inability to delimitate dangers met by the marine environment, marine organisms are quite volatile to water circulation, marine pollution, alien species.

All efforts aimed at highlighting the principles that would help elaborate MSPlans, overcoming specific difficulties. But what about the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) (1999), is it included in the MSP effort or is it faced as something completely different? ESDP seeks to pave the road to establishing a balanced and sustainable development of the EU territory, long before the enlargement and a series of other international and EU developments, setting 4 policy aims: *spatial orientation of policies, polycentric spatial development, parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge, wise management of natural and cultural heritage*. We can derive the conclusion that only spatial orientation of policies and wise management of natural heritage are included in the MSP principles documents. It should be a spatial planning research area whether

there could be a maritime polycentric spatial development. Parity of access and cultural management are completely absent. There is some literature on how to include social and cultural aspects in MSP. But we should consider that social and cultural aspects are inherent elements of spatial planning. They should be integral parts of MSP and not add-ons. Society interacts with the sea. The sea is part of our culture and at the same time hosts cultural assets. We need to integrate them in MSP, if we want it to be real spatial planning.
Spatial planning, according to CEMAT Torremolinos charter (1983), *gives geographical expression to the economic, social, cultural and ecological policies of society. It is at the same time a scientific discipline, an administrative technique and a policy developed as an interdisciplinary and comprehensive approach directed towards balanced regional development and the physical organization of space according to an overall strategy.* Once again, we can verify that in all MSP principles' documents there is no mention on social and cultural policies of societies. Nevertheless, the concept of geographical expression to the economic and ecological policies of societies is present. At this point, we need to highlight the fact that MSP *documents consider MSP as a tool or an instrument and not as a scientific discipline or policy, downgrading its scientific substance*. Moreover, all MSP definitions lack a regional development approach, focusing on the spatial allocation of activities.
UN Habitat in 2009, following a process of wide consultation with major stakeholders, published the commonly agreed "International Guidelines on Urban and Territorial planning". Despite the fact that is refers to inhabited areas, representing SDG11, it is interesting to look at the set of principles it has outlined, since we need to keep SDG11 and SDG14 in a common scientific discipline approach:

- Spatial policy and governance: participatory decision-making process linked to a strategy, inclusion, transparency, accountability.
- Social development: adequate standards of living and working conditions, equitable distribution of costs, opportunities and benefits of development, social inclusion and cohesion.
- Sustained economic growth: inclusive economic growth, better connectivity at all territorial levels.
- Environmental protection: integrated and sustainable development, environmental and socioeconomic resilience, enhanced adaptation.
- Planning components: continuous and iterative process, enforceable regulation, synergies between territories.
- Implementation: political leadership, continuous monitoring, periodic adjustments.

Seeking these principles in the MSP guidelines documents, it is clear that the principles regarding spatial policy, governance and implementation are fully taken into account, while the principles on social development are completely absent. The principles regarding sustained economic growth and environmental protection are more or less taken into account. *MSP should incorporate all spatial planning principles and not some of them. The differences of MSP and TSP should be treated as specific planning parameters.*
The need to achieve the ecological, economic and social objectives is the necessary "parameterization" of spatial planning according to the spatial planning discipline. However, after the Rio 1992 Summit, the triptych of economic growth, social development and environmental protection and management are considered the 3 basic pillars of development, followed by the cultural pillar, recognized by the Johannesburg Declaration (2002). Taking into account the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) that governs maritime delimitation, it is clear that the *geopolitical dimension* is really strong. The geopolitical dimension should be included in the MSP definition, since it is one among the initial reflections made by anyone dealing with MSP issues. The maritime zones' delimitation, despite the fact that the procedure is already prescribed in the UNCLOS, provokes tensions in the bilateral and multilateral relations of the countries.

MSP parameters
Having in mind that TSP and MSP have common principles and are subject to the same political and social framework referring to the society of a country or of a group of countries, we need to identify a set of extra parameters for MSP, adding to TSP parameters. The extra parameters, following the documents analyzed, could be: *delimitation of planning areas* and *four-dimensionality.* Ensuring legal effect, lack of data and lack of private property are significant differences of MSP, but they cannot be considered as special MSP parameters. They could be faced as special parameters in a case-by-case approach, regardless of MSP or TSP.
TSP abides with the traditional administrative boundaries in order to define planning areas regardless of the ecosystem boundaries, since the administrative boundaries are usually outlined by rivers, lakes or contours. Choosing the ecosystem-based approach, which is absent from the UNCLOS zone delimitation, as an integral part of MSP, we cannot elaborate MSPlans following the administrative boundaries. A major element of this approach is governance and especially who holds the administrative jurisdiction. Crowder and Norse (2008) consider that an important step to zone delimitation is to identify concentrations of marine organisms and map human activities in the area, socioeconomic overlaps and existing political and institutional arrangements. UNEP MAP Decision IG. 17/6 (2008) acknowledges that the progressive implementation of the ecosystem

approach in human activities management that could affect the marine and coastal Mediterranean environment is a CPs commitment, in order to achieve a real change of the marine and coastal environment of the Mediterranean, while with the Decision IG. 20/4 (2012) decided on the implementation of an EcAp roadmap for MAP, describing a seven step procedure. At EU level, there was selected the coordination and unification of monitoring indicators and measures. MSFD, being the environmental scale of IMP, seeks to achieve GES in EU marine waters until 2020. (WWF Greece, 2015)
Four-dimension planning is a completely new parameter in planning. It raises a lot of concerns on the technical ability to implement it, since it is a quite difficult effort, facing a lot of mapping uncertainties. Spatial analyses tools need to be developed to work with multidimensional data and the visualization of 4D models needs to progress. It is to be seen in practice, testing various mapping tools in a case-by-case approach to find what fits the purpose of legible, informative, clear and specific MSP maps.

Conclusions

During this attempt to highlight the conceptual approach of MSP and to outline some MSP principles and parameters, we tried to pinpoint the different beginnings but common interests of the intergovernmental institutions involved, the pioneers and the important outcomes from their efforts. Trying to highlight the MSP principles, we really consider it important to *think of MSP from the spatial planning scientific discipline point of view*, following the really strenuous efforts on behalf of CoE, UN and the EU to set a common approach on spatial planning. There was made an effort to note that MSP cannot be considered as a process different from TSP. MSP needs to borrow from the experience gained into the years from theoretical research, best and worst planning practices and the general mentality of spatial planners. Building on that, MSP can be differentiated based on the special conditions and needs raised and in this regard, there is a need to set the adding parameters that will ensure the viability and the effectiveness of MSPlans.

References

Avgerinou – Kolonias, S., 2017, The sea: a new horizon for Greece? (In Greek) speech in the Meeting "The sea: a new horizon for Greece?", (Athens, Greece: Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences), date of access: 01/06/2019, http://www.sd-med.org/images/SOFIA_AVGERINOU_KOLONIA_7_2_17.pdf .

Avgerinou – Kolonias, S., 2018, On Maritime spatial planning sense (in Greek). In Maritime Spatial Planning, edited by K. Serraos and D. Melissas (Athens – Thessaloniki, Greece: Sakkoulas), ISBN: 978-960-568-846-2.

Avgerinou – Kolonias, S., Rampavila, M., 2017, Coastal urbanization as a result of the absence of an integrated maritime spatial planning approach. Proceedings of the International Conference on Changing Cities III: Spatial Design, Landscape and Socio-economic Dimensions, Syros – Delos – Mykonos, Greece, 2135 – 2147, ISBN: 978-618-5271-12-1.

Avgerinou – Kolonias, S., Beriatos, El., Papageorgiou, M., Toufegopoulou, An., Sakellariou, St., Spyropoulos, I., 2018, Evaluation of the spatial planning process, Deliverable C1.4. of Supporting maritime spatial Planning in the Eastern Mediterranean (SUPREME) project. Date of access: 31/25/2018, http://www.msp-supreme.eu/files/c-1-4-evaluation.pdf .

Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission - Helsinki Commission Maritime Spatial Planning Working Group, 2010, Baltic Sea Broad-scale Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) Principles, (Stockholm, Sweden: HELCOM-VASAB/MSP WG), date of access: 20/04/2019, http://www.helcom.fi/Recommendations/Rec%2028E-9.pdf .

Beriatos, El., 2016, Between land and sea.: A critical approach to spatial planning of coastal and marine areas (in Greek). In: Maritime spatial issues: Maritime dimensions of territorial cohesion – maritime spatial planning – sustainable blue growth (in Greek), edited by St. Kyvelou (Athens: Kritiki), 63-76, ISBN 978-960-586-112-4.

Bliss-Guest, P. A., Keckes, S., 1982, The Regional Seas Programme of UNEP. In *Environmental Conservation.* Cambridge University Press, 9(1), pp. 43–49. doi: 10.1017/S0376892900019494.

Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning and Development, 1994, Vision and Strategies around the Baltic Sea 2010. Towards a Framework for Spatial Development in the Baltic Sea Region (VASAB 2010), 3rd Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning and Development, Tallinn, 20-21 August.

Council of Europe Conference of the Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning, 1983, European regional / spatial planning charter: Torremolinos Charter, (Strasbourg, France: CoE CEMAT).

Crowder, L., Norse, E., 2008, Essential ecological insights for marine ecosystem-based management and marine spatial planning. *Marine Policy* (32) 772-778.

Ehler, C. & Douvere, F., 2009, Marine Spatial Planning: a step-by-step approach toward ecosystem-based management, Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission and Man and the Biosphere Programme. IOC Manual and Guides No. 53, ICAM Dossier No. 6. (Paris, France : UNESCO).

Ehler, C., Zaucha, J., Gee., K., 2018, Maritime Spatial Planning at the Interface of Research and Practice. In Maritime Spatial Planning: past, present, future, edited by J. Zaucha and K. Gee, 1-22, (Palgrave Macmillan), ISBN 978-3-319-98696-8 (eBook), doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-98696-8.

European Commission/ Directorate General of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, 2008, Socio-economic studies in the field of the Integrated Maritime Policy of the European Union - Legal aspects of maritie spatial planning: Summary report, (Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Commission).

European Commission/ Directorate General of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, 2008, Communication on "Roadmap for Maritime Spatial Planning: Achieving Common Principles in the EU" COM (2008) 791 final.

European Commission/ Directorate General for Regional and Urban Policy, 2018, Study on Macroregional Strategies and their links with Cohesion Policy. Data and analytical report for the EUSAIR, (Luxembourg: EU), ISBN: 978-92-79-80344-4, doi: 10.2776/9.

European Commission, United Nations Educational and Scientific Organisation, 2017, Joint Roadmap to accelerate Maritime Spatial Planning processes worldwide, 2nd International Conference on Maritime Spatial Planning. (Paris, France), date of access: 03/06/2018 http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/ MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SC/pdf/Joint_Roadmap_MSP_v5.pdf .

European Parliament and Council, 2014, Directive 2014/89/EU establishing a framework for maritime spatial planning. Official Journal of the European Union, L 257/135.

European Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region, Preamble, Date of access: 19/05/2019, https://www. adriatic- ionian. eu/about-eusair/ .

European Union Informal Council of Ministers, 1999, ESDP European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union, (Potsdam, Germany: EC).

Harris, M., Pinoncely, V., 2014, Thinking Spatially: Why places need to be at the heart of policy-making in the twenty-first century. Planning Horizons (1).

Ivarsson, M., Magnusson, K., Heiskanen, A.-S., Navrud, S., Viitasalo, M., 2017, Ecosystem services in MSP: Ecosystem services approach as a common Nordic understanding for MSP (Denmark: Nordic Council of Ministers), date of access: 05/01/2018, doi: 10.6027/TN2017-536 .

Lukic, Iv., Schultz – Zehden, Ang., Fernandez, X., Pascual, M., Nigohosyan, D., Maarten de Vet, J., 2018, Maritime Spatial Planning for Blue Growth – Technical Study, (Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union), doi: 10.2826/04538.

Platias, Ch., Rampavila, M., 2018, Maritime spatial planning. Environmental concerns and demands for policy and governance (in Greek), 16th Conference for ERSA-GR "Strategies for local and regional development: modern challenges", Athens, 22-23 June.

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel —GEF, 2012, Marine Spatial Planning in the Context of the Convention on Biological Diversity: A study carried out in response to CBD COP 10 decision X/29, Montreal, Technical Series No. 68.

United Nations Educational and Scientific Organisation Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commision, About Marine Spatial Planning, date of access: 18/05/2019, http://msp.ioc-unesco.org/about/marine-spatial-planning/ .

United Nations Environment Programme/Mediterranean Action Plan, 2008, Implementation of the ecosystem approach to the management of human activities that may affect the Mediterranean marine and coastal environment, Decision IG 17/6, date of access: 20/05/2019, https://wedocs.unep.org/rest/bitstreams/10310/retrieve .

United Nations Environment Programme/Mediterranean Action Plan Priority Action Programme Regional Activity Center, University of Thessaly, 2015, Paving the road to Marine Spatial Planning in the Mediterranean, (Athens, Greece: UNEP/MAP-PAP/RAC), date of access: 20/04/2019, https://www.pap-thecoastcentre.org/pdfs/MSP%20Med%20Final%20Report.pdf .

United Nations Environment Programme/Mediterranean Action Plan, 2018, Conceptual Framework for Marine Spatial Planning in the Mediterranean (Athens: UNEP/MAP-PAP/RAC), date of access: 01/06/2019, http://iczmplatform.org/storage/documents/0B6IMs5OoB2hItiMDEnkTd1E1NyLx4yXRQm1isYG.pdf .

United Nations General Assembly, 2014, Report of the Open Working Group of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development Goals A/68/970, date of access: 01/06/2019, https://undocs.org/A/68/970

United Nations General Assembly, 2015, Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Resolution A/RES/70/1, date of access: 01/06/2019, https://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E .

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), 2015, International Guidelines on Urban and Territorial Planning, (Nairobi, Kenya: UN-Habitat), date of access: 19/05/2019, https://unhabitat.org/books/international-guidelines-on-urban-and-territorial-planning/ .

Visions and Strategies around the Baltic Sea Secretariat, 2010, Long-Term Perspective for the Territorial Development of the Baltic Sea Region: Towards better territorial integration of the Baltic Sea Region and its integration with other areas of Europe, drafted by Wiktor Szydarowski and edited by VASAB Committee on Spatial Development (Latvia: McAbols Poligrafija Ltd).

Wassenhoven, L., 2017, *Maritime Spatial Planning. Europe and Greece,* (in Greek) (Herakleion, Greece: Crete's University Press), ISBN 978-960-524-482-8.

WWF Greece, 2015, Blue growth in the Mediterranean: the good environmental status challenge, (in Greek), date of access: 01/07/2018, http://www.wwf.gr/images/pdfs/MedTrends_final_report.pdf .