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Introduction

In this deliverable first an inventory of indicators of governance best practice relating to interactions between aquaculture, fisheries and other sectors based on available literature is presented (paragraph 1). Secondly, in paragraph 2, a differentiation has been made between (a) the spatial planning process and (b) the implementation process. Appropriate governance indicators are selected and described in more detail for the spatial planning process. The inventory from paragraph 1 will later, in work package 4, be used to select indicators to evaluate the implementation process (based on case study specific marine spatial management objectives). The governance indicators that were selected in paragraph 2 will be used in work package 4 to evaluate the spatial planning process. The indicators included in the inventory are a combination of 1) Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management governance indicators; 2) EU good governance criteria; and 3) the EU key principles for Marine spatial planning. In the fusion of indicators and principles of governance best practice in paragraph 2 the terms Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management (ICOM), Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) and Good Governance (GG) are not replaced by a new term. Since the ICOM indicators form the core of these indicators of best governance practice the term ICOM will be used to refer to this blending of indicators.

1. Definitions and inventory

In order to develop an inventory of indicators of governance best practice it is necessary to understand what is, ‘governance’ and ‘good governance’; what are ‘governance indicators’ and what is meant by ‘indicators of governance best practice’. Governance is defined in the Coexist glossary as the whole of public as well as private interactions taken to solve problems and create societal opportunities. It includes the formulation and application of principles guiding those interactions and care for institutions that enable them (Kooiman et al., 2005). Of course there are more definitions of governance. Two examples of governance definitions: The process by which policies, laws, institutions and decision-makers address the issues of concern to a society. Governance questions the fundamental goals and the institutional processes and structures that are the basis of planning and decision-making (Belfiore et al., 2006 in the ICOM handbook); Governance means the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented) (UN, undated). From the last two definitions it becomes clear that governance is not always ‘good’, and can be questioned because, for instance, decisions are not implemented. Good governance is measured along criteria of good governance, the United Nations formulates 8 criteria of good governance, while the EC underpins EU governance with five principles. According to the EU good governance criteria are: 1) openness, 2) participation, 3) accountability, 4) effectiveness and 5) coherence (EC COM 2001/428). Governance indicators measure the progress and quality of the governance process, the extent to which a programme is addressing and solving the issue(s) that led to the creation of the programme.

1 Good governance according to the UN is participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive and follows the rule of law.
Governance indicators should take into account criteria of good governance. The selection of governance performance indicators should be based on a number of criteria:

- Relevance to the policy and management needs;
- Analytical soundness;
- Easy to understand and communicate;
- Responsiveness to institutional development and changes;
- Monitoring cost-effectiveness;
- Suitable for aggregation at the national level;
- Contribution to monitoring of progress in implementing international and regional commitments; and
- Contribution to reporting obligations under international and regional agreements.

The selected indicators should satisfy as many criteria as possible; poorly defined indicators may hinder a proper assessment of Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management (ICOM) progress. Numerous indicators for which data sources are not readily available would make their measurement costly or impractical. On the other hand, indicators based solely on available data may not be very useful for a thorough assessment of progress (Belfiore et al., 2006 in the ICOM handbook). In the ICOM handbook (2006) 15 governance indicators are distinguished:

1. Existence and functioning of a representative coordinating mechanism for ICOM
2. Existence and adequacy of legislation enabling ICOM
3. EIA\(^2\), SEA\(^3\) and CCA\(^4\) procedures for plans, programmes and projects affecting coastal zones
4. Existence and functioning of a conflict resolution mechanism
5. Existence, status and coverage of ICOM plans
6. Active management in areas covered by ICOM plans
7. Routine monitoring, evaluation and adjustment of ICOM initiatives
8. Sustained availability and allocation of human, technical and financial resources for ICOM
9. Existence, dissemination and application of ICOM-related scientific research and information
10. Level of stakeholder participation in, and satisfaction with, ICOM decision-making processes
11. Existence and activity level of NGOs\(^5\) and CBOs\(^6\) supportive of ICOM
12. Incorporation of ICOM into educational and training curricula and formation of ICOM cadres
13. Use of technology, including environmentally friendly technology, to enable and support ICOM
14. Use of economic instruments in support to ICOM

\(^2\) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).
\(^3\) Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).
\(^4\) Carrying Capacity Assessment (CCA).
\(^5\) Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs).
\(^6\) Community-Based Organisations (CBOs).
15. Incorporation of ICOM into sustainable development strategy

In 2007, the European Commission adopted the “Blue Book” proposing an Integrated Maritime Policy (IMP) for the EU. Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) is a key instrument for the IMP. It helps public authorities and stakeholders to coordinate their action and optimises the use of marine space to benefit economic development and the marine environment. The Roadmap for Maritime Spatial Planning: Achieving Common Principles in the EU (EC COM 2008/0791) sets out key principles for MSP and seeks, by way of debate, to encourage the development of a common approach among Member States. MSP is a tool for improved decision-making. It provides a framework for arbitrating between competing human activities and managing their impact on the marine environment. Its objective is to balance sectoral interests and achieve sustainable use of marine resources in line with the EU Sustainable Development Strategy. MSP should be based on the specificities of individual marine regions or sub-regions. It is a process that consists of data collection, stakeholder consultation and the participatory development of a plan, the subsequent stages of implementation, enforcement, evaluation and revision. The key (10) principles are (EC COM 2008/0791):

1. Using MSP according to area and type of activity
2. Defining objectives to guide MSP
3. Developing MSP in a transparent manner
4. Stakeholder participation
5. Coordination within Member States — Simplifying decision processes
6. Ensuring the legal effect of national MSP
7. Cross-border cooperation and consultation
8. Incorporating monitoring and evaluation in the planning process
9. Achieving coherence between terrestrial and maritime spatial planning — relation with ICZM
10. A strong data and knowledge base

The indicator lists of ICOM, EU MSP and EU good governance principles (see also annex 1) is an inventory of governance indicators. Here the ICOM governance performance indicators that meet or are complemented with the five EU good governance principles and the ten key EU MSP principles are considered indicators of governance best practice. This set of indicators (or a selection) will later be used (in work package 4) to evaluate the spatial planning process and the governance practice in each Case Study.

2. Indicators of Governance best practice

Pomeroy (Pomeroy et al., 2005) proposes the following steps to evaluate a marine management process: (1) select the appropriate indicators, (2) plan and prepare for the evaluation, (3) collect and analyse data for the selected indicators, and (4) communicate and use evaluation results to adapt the management.

---

7 Pomeroy et al. paper is concerned with marine protected area management.
Henocque and Denis (2001) distinguish 4 phases in an Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management process (ICOM): 1) preliminary identification phase; 2) preparation phase; 3) implementation phase and 4) consolidation, replication and expansion phase.

Below appropriate governance indicators are selected for the preliminary identification and preparation phase of the marine management and governance process. Henocque et al. (2001) distinguish within each four phases of an ICOM policy cycle several governance indicators (in Belfiore et al., 2006 in the ICOM handbook). These governance indicators will be used for the preliminary identification phase and preparation phase of the management process while taking into account the EU good governance criteria and the EC’s 10 MSP principles, as far as not already has been done by Henocque et al. (2001) and as far relevant for the two phases under consideration. The selected governance indicators are considered indicators of governance best practice.

Throughout the ICOM handbook the phases, indicators, questions and underlying definitions and concepts are described, if relevant for these two phases these are also used in the description below. The terms Integrated Coastal and Ocean management (ICOM), Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) and Good Governance (GG) are referred to as ICOM, since the ICOM indicators form the heart of these governance best practice indicators.

**Phase I: Preliminary identification**

Phase I focuses on the initial conditions that prompt the initiation of an ICOM intervention (e.g., an environmental crisis), as well as the spatial context.

- **Step 0: Initialisation conditions.**

Identification of the players involved in the ICOM process (e.g., the existence of a pioneer group) and the overall political, institutional, economic and social context. A short description of the situation that prompted the initiation of an ICOM intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator A (G1, K3, K4, GG1, GG2, GG3): Existence and functioning of a representative coordinating mechanism for ICOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any lead agency or informal group or coalition promoting an ICOM process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there cross-border cooperation and consultation, if relevant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a coordinating body for ICOM and with what mandate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the coordinating body representative and to what extent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underlying definitions and concepts:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A coordinating body for ICOM may be characterised by the following features:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves a high political level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is representative of both governmental and sectoral interests;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a defined mandate and authority;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ ^8 \text{G1, G2 etc. direct to Governance indicators used in ICOM handbook. K1, K2 etc. refer to EU Key MSP principles, GG1, GG2 etc. refer to EU good governance principles.} \]
Addresses in a comprehensive way the integrated management and sustainable development of coastal and marine areas and their resources;
Involves consultation with different administrative levels and the most relevant stakeholders;
Operates in a transparent way and is accountable for its decisions;
Ensures regular and transparent communication and information exchange;
- Is influential on policies and programmes affecting coastal and marine resources;
- Results in operational decisions concerning the sustainable development of coastal and marine resources.

**Indicator B (G10, K4, GG2): Stakeholder participation**

**Question:**
Have issues at stake and relevant stakeholders been identified and scoped?

**Indicator C (G11): NGO and Community based activities (CBO)**

**Questions:**
Is clear how many and what are the characteristics of NGOs and CBOs (community-based organisations) active in fields related to ICOM;
Is clear what activities are carried out by the NGOs and CBOs in support of ICOM (participation in meetings, advocacy and awareness raising, field projects, etc.);
Is clear what the degree of influence is of these activities on the advancement of ICOM?

- Step 1: Feasibility.

The feasibility of implementation of the ICOM process is determined, and the available resources (human, technical, financial and scientific information) as well as a task force representative of all the stakeholders and interests groups (institutional, disciplinary and geographic) identified. In this step the task force supervises the preparation of a fact-finding report (on existing environmental and socio-economic conditions), main issues, players concerned and possible solutions in the form of economic, environmental and land-use plans). This report should be regularly submitted to all the players for validation in the course of the process.

**Indicator D (G8) Availability of human, financial and technical resources**

**Questions:**
Is there an adequate number of formed/trained and performing staff available to prepare, implement and follow up management activities and interventions?
Are there adequate and sustained financial resources allocated and readily available to support management activities and interventions?
Are there adequate and regularly maintained facilities and equipment available to carry out activities and interventions?

**Indicator E (G9, K10) The existence and application of scientific research in the ICOM process**
Questions:
Is there scientific knowledge available relevant to ICOM?
Are there mechanisms to enhance the communication between scientists and managers?
Is the scientific knowledge applicable and used by ICOM managers?

Indicator F (G12, K10) Educational and training curricula

Questions:
What university programmes exist specifically targeting ICOM or incorporating ICOM in their curricula;
What training courses exist, be they for unemployed or employed people, incorporating ICOM in their syllabi.

Indicator G (G1, GG2, K4) Coordinating mechanism (task force)

Question:
Is a task force representative of all the stakeholders and interests groups (institutional, disciplinary and geographic) identified?

Indicator H (G1, K5, K7, GG5) Administrative functions defined

Questions:
Is coordination within the Member State arranged?
Is cross-border cooperation and consultation relevant and applied?

Underlying definitions and concepts:
ICOM simplifies decision making and speeds up licensing and permit procedures, for the benefit of maritime users and maritime investment alike. Coordinated and cross-cutting plans need a single or streamlined application process and cumulative effects should be taken into account. The internal coordination of maritime affairs within Member States proposed in the Guidelines for an Integrated Approach to Maritime Policy should also benefit the implementation of ICOM. Developments in the Member States (e.g. UK and Scottish Marine Bills) demonstrate that national authorities are keen to reap these benefits through the establishment of a coordinating administrative body. Cooperation across borders is necessary to ensure coherence of plans across eco-systems. It will lead to the development of common standards and processes and raise the overall quality of ICOM.

Indicator I (G2, K6) Legislation enabling ICOM

Questions:
-What law(s) are applicable for ICOM?
-Do specific laws for ICOM exist?
- Are these laws adequate in content and enforcement?

Indicator J (G4) Prioritisation of problems

Question:
Is a clear timeframe and planning framework established at the start of the planning process?

**Phase II: Preparation of the management process and plans**

The goal of this phase is not necessarily to produce a detailed diagnostic. There are 3 steps in this phase:

- **Step 2: Social and environmental assessments**

**Indicator K (G9, K3, K10) Scientific research and information**

**Questions:**
- Does the planning agency consider the science and is it able to integrate it with economic, social and political considerations to develop option(s) that meet goals and objectives? (Cf. Osmond et al., 2010)
- Do scientists recognise that ultimately ecological and socio-economic trade-offs will be made to achieve a politically acceptable outcome? (Cf. Osmond et al., 2010)
- Is local knowledge incorporated? (K3)

**Indicator L (G3, K10): EIA, SEA and CCA procedures and assessments**

**Questions:**
- Do statutory procedures exist for environmental impact assessment (EIA) for projects relevant to coastal and marine areas?
- Do statutory procedures exist for strategic environmental assessment (SEA) for policies, plans and programmes relevant to coastal and marine areas?
- Do procedures exist for carrying capacity assessment (CCA)? Have assessments (EIA, SEA, CCA) been conducted, which one(s)?

**Indicator M (G1, GG1, GG2): Awareness and mobilisation of players**

**Question:**
- Are stakeholders informed and consulted?
- Do stakeholders participate in decision-making processes and activities related to ICOM through appropriate mechanisms?

- **Step 3: Development of desirable and possible scenarios, identification of institutional and social and environmental conditions, resources and data available.**

**Indicator N (G9, K10): Scientific research and information**

**Question:**
- Is relevant scientific research planned or available in the ICOM process?
**Indicator O (G4, K2): Conflict resolution mechanism**

**Questions:**
Are coastal conflicts been assessed in an adequate way?
Do agreed procedures and mechanisms for the resolution of conflicts over coastal resources exist?

**Indicator P (G3, K1): EIA, SEA and CCA (scenarios)**

**Questions:**
Have different ICOM scenarios been developed and do these take into account the findings from the impact assessments?
Is ICOM designed according to area and type of activity?

**Underlying definitions and concepts:**
ICOM operates within three dimensions, addressing activities (a) on the sea bed; (b) in the water column; and (c) on the surface. This allows the same space to be used for different purposes. Time should also be taken into account as a fourth dimension, as the compatibility of uses and the “management need” of a particular maritime region might vary over time.

**Indicator Q (G5, K2, K9, GG5): Shared vision, prioritisation of goals and objectives, and course of action**

**Questions:**
Is there a shared long term vision for the marine/coastal area?
Is coherence achieved between terrestrial and maritime spatial planning?

- Step 4: Preparation of a management plan based on ICOM principles, goals and objectives.

Communication is a key element of this phase, through the production of reports of inventories and social and environmental assessments that should be presented to the players for use in evaluation. An important aim of this phase is to make explicit basic facts about the players (e.g. in relation to the environmental problems, their participation in decision-making and their contribution to the ICOM process, as well as their activities and operations).

**Indicator R (G5, K2, K3, K8, GG1, GG2, GG5): Integrated management plans**

**Questions:**
Has a management plan been formulated addressing all the key issues in the coastal area?
Is there adequate support from the stakeholders for the management plan?
Is ICOM management plan developed in a transparent manner?
Is monitoring and evaluation in the planning process incorporated?
Underlying definitions and concepts:
Transparency is needed for all documents and procedures related to ICOM. Its different steps need to be easily understandable to the general public. This will allow full information to all parties concerned and therefore improve predictability and increase acceptance (EU MSP key 3).

3. Summary

Governance indicators measure the progress and quality of the governance process, the extent to which a programme is addressing and solving the issue(s) that led to the creation of the programme (Belfiore et al., 2006 in the ICOM handbook). The above described governance indicators for the preliminary identification and preparation phase of the marine management and governance process are listed in table 1) and form a checklist for governance performances in processes pertaining to integrated marine spatial planning, management and governance. The indicators are a mix of three lists of indicators of governance best practice (see inventory in annex1). If the indicators are checked (e.g. by a researcher or the process coordinator) with reality the indicators will be indicating a ‘no’ or a ‘not relevant’ and in other situations a ‘yes’. Several of these indications may indicate that certain criteria of governance best practice are not fulfilled. This provides an insight into how to improve future questions pertaining to ICOM.

Table 1: Summary table of governance indicators for the preliminary identification and preparation phase of the marine management and governance process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Yes/no/ not relevant</th>
<th>Description/ Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Existence and functioning of a representative coordinating mechanism for ICOM</td>
<td>- Is there any lead agency or informal group or coalition promoting an ICOM process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is there cross-border cooperation and consultation, if relevant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is there a coordinating body for ICOM and with what mandate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is the coordinating body representative and to what extent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Stakeholder participation</td>
<td>- Have issues at stake and relevant stakeholders been identified and scoped?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Yes/no/not relevant</td>
<td>Description/Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>NGO and Community based activities (CBO)</td>
<td>- Is it? clear how many and what are the characteristics of NGOs and CBOs active in fields related to ICOM; - Is it? clear what activities are carried out by the NGOs and CBOs in support of ICOM (participation in meetings, advocacy and awareness raising, field projects, etc.); - Is it? clear what the degree of influence is of these activities on the advancement of ICOM?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Availability of human, financial and technical resources</td>
<td>- Is there an adequate number of formed/trained and performing staff available to prepare, implement and follow up management activities and interventions? - Are there adequate and sustained financial resources allocated and readily available to support management activities and interventions? - Are there adequate and regularly maintained facilities and equipment available to carry out activities and interventions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>The existence and application of scientific research in the ICOM process</td>
<td>- Is there scientific knowledge available relevant to ICOM? - Are there mechanisms to enhance the communication between scientists and managers? - Is the scientific knowledge applicable and used by ICOM managers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Yes/no/not relevant</td>
<td>Description/Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Educational and training curricula</td>
<td>- What university programmes exist specifically targeting ICOM or incorporating ICOM in their curricula; - What training courses exist, be they for unemployed or employed people, incorporating ICOM in their syllabi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Coordinating mechanism(task force)</td>
<td>- Is a task force representative of all the stakeholders and interests groups (institutional, disciplinary and geographic) identified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Administrative functions defined</td>
<td>- Is coordination within the Member State arranged? - Is cross-border cooperation and consultation relevant and applied?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Legislation enabling ICOM</td>
<td>- What law(s) are applicable for ICOM? - Do specific laws for ICOM exist? - Are these laws adequate in content and enforcement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Prioritization of problems</td>
<td>- Is a clear timeframe and planning framework established at the start of the planning process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Yes/no/not relevant</td>
<td>Description/Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| K         | Scientific research and information | - Does the planning agency consider the science and is it able to integrate it with economic, social and political considerations to develop option(s) that meet goals and objectives?  
- Do scientists recognise that ultimately ecological and socio-economic trade-offs will be made to achieve a politically acceptable outcome?  
- Is local knowledge incorporated? |                     |                    |
| L         | EIA, SEA and CCA procedures and assessments | - Do statutory procedures exist for environmental impact assessment (EIA) for projects relevant to coastal and marine areas?  
- Do statutory procedures exist for strategic environmental assessment (SEA) for policies, plans and programmes relevant to coastal and marine areas?  
- Do procedures exist for carrying capacity assessment (CCA)?  
- Which assessments EIA, SEA, CCA have been conducted? |                     |                    |
| M         | Awareness and mobilization of players | - Are stakeholders informed and consulted?  
- Do stakeholders participate in decision-making processes and activities related to ICOM through appropriate mechanisms? |                     |                    |
<p>| N         | Scientific research and information | - Is relevant scientific research planned or available in the ICOM process? |                     |                    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Yes/no/not relevant</th>
<th>Description/Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Conflict resolution mechanism</td>
<td>Are coastal conflicts been assessed in an adequate way? -Do agreed procedures and mechanisms for the resolution of conflicts over coastal resources exist?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>EIA, SEA and CCA (scenarios)</td>
<td>-Have different ICOM scenarios been developed, taking into account the impact assessments? - Is ICOM according to area and type of activity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Shared vision, prioritization of goals and objectives, and course of action</td>
<td>-Is there a shared long term vision for the marine/coastal area? -Is coherence achieved between terrestrial and maritime spatial planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Integrated management plans</td>
<td>-Has a management plan been formulated addressing all the key issues in the coastal area? -Is there adequate support from the stakeholders for the management plan? -Is ICOM management plan developed in a transparent manner? - Is monitoring and evaluation in the planning process incorporated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex 1 Inventory of governance indicators

ICOM governance indicators

| G1 | Existence and functioning of a representative coordinating mechanism for ICOM |
| G2 | Existence and adequacy of legislation enabling ICOM |
| G3 | EIA, SEA and CCA procedures for plans, programmes and projects affecting coastal zones |
| G4 | Existence and functioning of a conflict resolution mechanism |
| G5 | Existence, status and coverage of ICOM plans |
| G6 | Active management in areas covered by ICOM plans |
| G7 | Routine monitoring, evaluation and adjustment of ICOM initiatives |
| G8 | Sustained availability and allocation of human, technical and financial resources for ICOM |
| G9 | Existence, dissemination and application of ICOM-related scientific research and information |
| G10 | Level of stakeholder participation in, and satisfaction with, ICOM decision-making processes |
| G11 | Existence and activity level of NGOs and CBOs supportive of ICOM |
| G12 | Incorporation of ICOM into educational and training curricula and formation of ICOM cadres |
| G13 | Use of technology, including environmentally friendly technology, to enable and support ICOM |
| G14 | Use of economic instruments in support to ICOM |
| G15 | Incorporation of ICOM into sustainable development strategy |

The key EU MSP principles

1. Using MSP according to area and type of activity
2. Defining objectives to guide MSP
3. Developing MSP in a transparent manner
4. Stakeholder participation
5. Coordination within Member States — Simplifying decision processes
6. Ensuring the legal effect of national MSP
7. Cross-border cooperation and consultation
8. Incorporating monitoring and evaluation in the planning process
9. Achieving coherence between terrestrial and maritime spatial planning — relation with ICZM
10. A strong data and knowledge base

---

10 EC COM 2008/0791.
EU good governance criteria

1. Openness  
2. Participation  
3. Accountability  
4. Effectiveness  
5. Coherence

---

EC COM 2001/428.