



CoCoNet/CZMNet Workshop



June 2004



Enterprise Ireland



Table of Contents	Page No.
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Aims of the CoCoNet Project	1
1.3 Aims of the CZMNet Project	1
2. WORKSHOP AGENDA	1
2.1 Aims of the Workshop	1
2.2 Programme	1
2.3 Profile of Participants	3
3. WEXFORD DECLARATION	3
4. RECOMMENDATIONS	4
5. WORKSHOP PRESENTATIONS	5
5.1 The future of ICZM in Europe	5
5.2 Lessons learnt in community based approaches in the US	5
5.3 Through the Window – Croatian Examples	6
5.4 CZMNet Status & Achievements	7
5.5 CoCoNet Status & Achievements	8
5.6 Networks in Integrated Coastal Management	8
5.7 Coastal Practitioners - Building from European Experiences	10
5.8 The Need for Coastal Partnerships	10
6. FUTURE PROJECTS	11
7. CONCLUSION	12
APPENDICES	13
APPENDIX I List of registered participants	14
APPENDIX II Rapporteur reports	16
APPENDIX III Draft recommendations	26

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This document is a report of the CoCoNet/CZMNet Workshop, held in Wexford on June 17th 2004. The CoCoNet and CZMNet projects are both concerned with coastal management issues in the Southern Irish Sea INTERREG region, however, each project is directed towards a different audience. The CoCoNet initiative focuses on community approaches to Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM), while the CZMNet project focuses on the approach of Local Authority planners. This final, jointly hosted workshop aimed to bring these statutory and voluntary stakeholders from Ireland and Wales together to develop consensus on common priorities for the future management of the coastal zone.

1.2 Aims of the CoCoNet Project

CoCoNet (Coastal Communities Network) is an INTERREG IIIA funded project, implemented by project partners in the CMRC (Coastal & Marine Resources Centre, University College Cork) and MACE (Marine & Coastal Environment Group, Cardiff University). CoCoNet seeks to develop opportunities for networking among community groups with an interest in the sustainable management of their local coastal resources.

CoCoNet aims to:

- Facilitate networking and communication among coastal communities; and
- Explore mechanisms providing coastal communities with a real sense of participation and involvement in the future management of the coastal and marine area.

The successful participation of community stakeholders is a fundamental aspect of the CoCoNet project, which has been designed to promote awareness of best practice and sustainability and provide a platform for dialogue and relationship building.

1.3 Aims of the CZMNet Project

The CZMNet (Coastal Zone Management Network) project is also funded under INTERREG IIIA. The CZMNet project aims to develop a network of Local Authority planners. In doing so, CZMNet aims to encourage and facilitate closer co-operation between Local Authorities in Ireland and Wales in the area of coastal zone management. CZMNet will provide a mechanism for the sharing of experiences and knowledge on coastal zone management.

2. WORKSHOP AGENDA

2.1 Aims of the Workshop

The workshop aimed to:

- Evaluate the role of networks to help Local Authorities and coastal communities to better manage their coasts.
- Examine the relevance of existing coastal networks in the Southern Irish Sea region.
- Facilitate the development of new project ideas for achieving sustainable coastal development in the Southern Irish Sea region.
- Produce recommendations on ICZM to influence policy development in Ireland and Wales.

2.2 Programme

The programme was designed to address the aims described above in Section 2.1. The morning session consisted of a number of pertinent presentations providing an overview

of ICZM within the EU, lessons learned from the US and Croatia, followed by a series of presentations on coastal networks operating at the European level (EuroCoast, EUCC, CoPraNet) and national level in the UK (CoastNet UK). The afternoon parallel sessions went into detail on specific topics of interest to each of the networks. There was a final joint discussion on the content of the Wexford Declaration (Section 3) and recommendations for coastal management (Section 4).

Time	Topic
09.00	Tea and Coffee Welcome (Valerie Cummins, CoCoNet).
	Session 1 – Food for Thought. Chair Hance D. Smith (Cardiff University).
9.15	The Future of ICZM in Europe (Arthur Martin, Brady, Shipman, Martin Consultants).
9.45	Lessons learned in Community Based Approaches to Coastal Management in the US and Croatia. (AnaMarija Frankic, Virginia Institute of Marine Science).
	Session 2 – The Potential of Coastal Networks.
10.15	CZM Net Status and Achievements. (Brendan Dollard, CZMNet). CoCoNet Status and Achievements. (Rhoda Ballinger, CoCoNet).
10.30	Networks in Integrated Coastal Management. (Jane Taussik, EuroCoast).
10.50	Coastal Practitioners: Building on Regional Experiences from Across Europe. (Alan Pickaver, EUCC).
11.10	The Need for Coastal Partnerships and the Role of the CoastNet UK Network. (Alex Midlen, CoastNet UK).
11.30	Discussion – The Future Role of Networks in Coastal Management.
12.00	Early lunch and walk around the quays in Wexford to observe the rejuvenation of the waterfront and harbour area.
14.00	Session 3 – Future projects <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of proposal to raise awareness of marine Special Areas of Conservation and coastal biodiversity issues. Facilitators Sian Shakespear and Hans Visser Rapporteur Wendy Dodds 2. Towards a coastal network for Ireland. Facilitator Jane Taussik Rapporteur Alex Midlen 3. How to facilitate public involvement in ICZM at the local level. Facilitator Kevin Lynch Rapporteur David Poulter 4. How to inform national policy development. Facilitator Brendan Dollard Rapporteur Vicki O Donnell
15.30	Rapporteur reports.
16:00	Coffee Break
16.20	Session 4 Influencing policy – Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the recommendations made by workshop participants. • Outline of the Joint CZMNet and CoCoNet Statement on Coastal Management (V.Cummins, CoCoNet). Discussion on recommendations for ICZM in Ireland and Wales.
17.00	Close. <i>Transport to Rosslare Harbour will be provided to connect with the 18.30 ferry to Fishguard.</i>

2.3 Profile of Participants

94 people registered to attend the workshop, with 80 participants attending on the day. The audience consisted of delegates representing community groups, voluntary organisations, coastal partnerships and networks, Local Authorities from the region, non-governmental organisations, statutory agencies, and academic institutions. Appendix I lists the participant's names, organisations and contact details.

3. WEXFORD DECLARATION

A key outcome of the workshop was consensus on the content of what has been called the Wexford Declaration (below). This Declaration has been formulated to address two key issues to emerge from previous CoCoNet and CZMNet workshops i.e. lack of public awareness of coastal issues and political apathy towards coastal management. The Declaration, which represents the common view of CoCoNet and CZMNet project participants, is directed towards decision makers responsible for coastal policy within the Southern Irish Sea region. The text will also be directed towards the media in the region to raise general awareness of the need for sustainable coastal development in Ireland and Wales.

WEXFORD DECLARATION:

In recognition of the EU ICZM Recommendation and in the context of the principle of subsidiarity, governments are urged to support the empowerment of local communities, including local government, to secure local sustainability of the coastal and marine environment.

To achieve this, priority actions include measures to:

- 1. Engage local communities in the formulation of coastal policy and in the adoption of responsible local management practices.**
- 2. Secure government support for the development and implementation of ICZM programmes, including national programmes, which promote local actions and the provision of guidelines for local authorities.**
- 3. Raise public awareness, respect and understanding of the coastal environment, including its natural, historic, cultural and socio-economic character, and related issues.**
- 4. Share experiences of and promote best practice in implementing local community-based management initiatives.**
- 5. Facilitate communication and collaborative working between coastal stakeholders in recognition of the environmental, socio-economic and cultural benefits of integrated management.**
- 6. Support and promote coastal networks in achieving ICZM at all levels.**

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

Each participant was given a list of suggested recommendations to consider during the workshop (see Appendix III for full list). Below are the top three recommendations as selected by Irish, Welsh and other/unspecified delegates.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Irish Delegates

1. Set out a **vision** for the sustainable development of Irelands coastal resources.
2. Encourage **integration** of plans effecting activities in coastal zones, for example development plans, community strategies, biodiversity action plans, SAC management plans, shoreline management plans etc.
3. Provide the **capacity** for Local Authority and stakeholder involvement in ICZM at the local level, recognising the importance of managing coasts at the local level and the need for public participation.

Welsh Delegates

1. Encourage **integration** of plans effecting activities in coastal zones, for example development plans, community strategies, biodiversity action plans, SAC management plans, shoreline management plans etc.
2. Provide the **capacity** for Local Authority and stakeholder involvement in ICZM at the local level, recognising the importance of managing coasts at the local level and the need for public participation.
3. Take advantage of the potential **synergies** presented in the implementation of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Water Framework Directives (WFD) and the European Marine Strategy.

Other/Unspecified Delegates

1. Provide the **capacity** for Local Authority and stakeholder involvement in ICZM at the local level, recognising the importance of managing coasts at the local level and the need for public participation.
2. Develop primary, secondary and third level **educational** programmes for ICZM.
3. Set out a **vision** for the sustainable development of Irelands coastal resources.

5. WORKSHOP PRESENTATIONS

The following sections contain abstracts summaries of the presentations made during the workshop. The full presentations are available to view and download at <http://coconet.ucc.ie>.

Food for Thought Session – Abstracts of Presentations

5.1 The Future of ICZM in Europe

(Arthur Martin- Brady, Shipman, Martin Consultants).

An assessment of the future of ICZM in Europe was presented along with a brief overview of the context for ICZM development in Ireland. With respect to Ireland, it is suggested that the history of ICZM development can be divided into several key stages. The 1960s saw initial interest in ICZM with a study from the Tourist Board (Bord Fáilte and Foras Forbaithe) This focused on coastal development, coinciding with an increase in development projects from overseas consortia. From this study and as a result of the development boom, it was suggested that areas of conservation should be identified along the coast. This was followed by a coastal survey in 1968, which became effectively a coastal management plan. This sought to influence the management of the coast through traditional planning, particularly zoning, methods.

Within the European context, following many years of debate on the need for supranational involvement in ICZM and a clear call for a coastal strategy in 1992, 1996 saw the development of the EU Demonstration Programme (although this largely was a reflective exercise). This informed the production of the EC Coastal Strategy and the EU Recommendation on ICZM, which are informing and guiding current ICZM development by Member States.

Following these European policy developments, the future of ICZM lies with the EU and the ICZM Expert Panel. However, it should be noted that the evolution of ICZM has been and is likely to continue to be very slow. There is a need for clarity in what ICZM is trying to achieve. In this context, the EU ICZM Recommendation has been a great help and the path has been laid out to guide Member States through to 2006 in the formulation of their stocktake's and national strategies. However, there is an issue in that the Recommendation has side-lined the 'spatial' element of ICZM and its linkage with the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP). Martin also questioned whether or not 45 months is enough time to carry out the Recommendation and to develop national strategies.

In highlighting the process element of ICZM at EU level, Martin questioned exactly how ICZM will interact with the ESDP. He stressed the value of more co-operations between the DGs in the Commission to develop this link in future.

To develop ICZM further, it was suggested that a high level perspective is needed along with a common language. The need to learn from past experiences in order to be able to identify opportunities for synergies are highlighted as issues.

5.2 Lessons learnt in Community based approaches to Coastal Management in the US and Croatia.

(Anamarija Frankic - Virginia Institute of Marine Science)

Frankic in this presentation seeks to reflect on the history of coastal management activities from the US perspective. Looking at the lessons that have been learnt, and

tools that have been designed to assist coastal management. Frankic concludes with thoughts towards the future of coastal management and community based management through new approaches such as GIS use suitability modelling.

The 1970s in the USA saw the emergence of the Federal CZM Act (1972). NGO Conservation International identified that the most endangered ecosystems in the world are coastal (<http://www.biodiversityhotspots.org/xp/Hotspots>). In the US, two reports were recently published assessing the coastal and ocean conditions and providing recommendations. Along with ecological and species degradation, social and cultural degradation, poverty and user conflicts often exist at the coast. The reports therefore recognised that the ocean and coast as the largest public domain have to be managed holistically. For more information please see the following websites: <http://www.pewoceans.org> and <http://oceancommission.gov/>.

The lessons that have been learnt over the last 30 years in the US in the area of coastal management show that the root cause is a failure of both perspective (reactive not proactive management) and a failure in governance. This includes a lack of community involvement in planning decisions and insufficient incorporation of socio-economics into the early stages of ICM. However there has been a move from crisis management to more proactive management and recognition that sustainability can only be attained if environmental conditions are appropriate.

Work has progressed with analytical approaches now being used to optimise benefits from the coast and marine resources for local communities. Geographical Information System (GIS) tools are being used to integrate both old data and new datasets to evaluate use conflicts and use suitability analysis, to spatially identify where certain activities should take place. This "Use Suitability" analysis minimises conflicts and prevents environmental degradation recognising that clean seas and coasts are dependent on appropriate land uses.

In conclusion, the next steps include efforts to integrate socio-economic factors and hear from local communities of what they want and find what suits their needs. The social, economic and environmental factors have to be moved and adjusted to find a balance. Older generation communities lived far more sustainable than we ever will with no help from scientists and managers, but there was a respect and dependence on the sea, islands and coastal resources. Therefore, today with all the sciences and technologies we should have much better chances to live sustainable! We just need more successful examples in coastal management and community based approaches.

5.3 "Through the Window" -Croatian examples of Community based approaches to Coastal Management.

(Jadranka Pelikan - EkoZadar)

Croatia has a population of 4.5 million, 31067 km² of sea and 58353kms of shoreline with 1,185 islands, islets and reefs (30.8% is mainland shore and the remainder is islands). In the summer period Croatia's population increases nearly ten fold due to tourism related visitors.

EkoZadar is a Croatian environmental protection and organic farming NGO. This voluntary partnership is centred around the Zadar County and has 120-145 members. It has open membership with membership fees.

When the term sustainable development suddenly became fashionable in the 1990s many people involved in environmental practices in Croatia were unsure what this

actually meant. When it was subsequently defined as projects that were environmentally friendly, socially righteous and economically effective it became clear that sustainable development projects were in fact already taking place in Croatia.

EkoZadar has a series of community involvement projects including:

- A lobbying campaign against the 'Druzba Adria' Oil Company. Local communities through EkoZadar have opposed proposals by the company. There are obvious environmental dangers from such a project however financial impacts on tourism and the community needed to be investigated. Approximately 65% of the population's livelihoods depend upon tourism. It was obvious the proposed oil developments and the tourism industry could not co-exist. A cost benefit analysis was undertaken to establish that tourism brings in more revenue and poses less direct environmental threats.
- Nature Park Telascia – EkoZadar have been instrumental in educating and changing community views on organic production. The project involved encouraging training activities as well as marketing and production techniques surrounding olive farming.

It terms of coastal management in Croatia, the Zadar Coastal Management Plan was integrated within the spatial plan for the area in 2004. But more co-operation and integration is needed to avoid this just becoming a plan on the shelf - EkoZadar will work towards this.

EkoZadar engage with the community via a Green Forum that can be used to enact a lobbying facility. Additionally there is "Green Hotline" which acts an environmental issues hotline reporting facility. A range of NGOs and partners are involved in this who deliver the responses, solutions and outcomes.

Potential of Coastal Networks Session – Abstracts of Presentations

5.4 CZMNet Status and Achievements

(Brendan Dollard – CZMNet).

The Coastal Zone Management Network (CZMNet) is an INTERREG IIIA project being run by Enterprise Ireland in Ireland and Carmarthenshire County Council in Wales. In Ireland CZMNet has eight partners and in Wales CZMNet has 10.

The objectives of CZMNet are to:

- Encourage and facilitate closer co-operation between Local Authorities in Ireland and Wales in the area of coastal zone management,
- Provide a mechanism for the sharing of experiences of and knowledge on coastal zone management and
- Initiate a long lasting network of contacts

CZMNet has hosted three workshops dealing with a variety of coastal issues including one-off rural housing in the coastal zone and the use of bye-laws in coastal management. The first workshop was held in Dublin (October 2003), the second in Llandudno (February 2004) and the last in Wexford (hosted jointly with CoCoNet). CZMNet has attracted 22-27 participants per workshop. Over the course of the project, the advantages of working with network groups of this size became evident.

Achievements to note have been disseminated through the CoCoNet website (<http://coconet.ucc.ie>). These include nine papers that have been presented and knowledge and experience shared through the three workshops held.

The CZMNet structure has successfully facilitated networking within small groups, this approach has been proven to be beneficial. Goals have been set and issues raised, and networking evenings have been organised. The formula of letting the network members decide on the relevant issues and using presentations to stimulate discussion worked well.

5.5 CoCoNet Status and Achievements

(Rhoda Ballinger – CoCoNet)

The Coastal Communities Network (CoCoNet) project is an INTERREG IIA project run by the Coastal and Marine Resources Centre, University College Cork and the Marine and Coastal Environment Group, Cardiff University.

Workshops have been held as follows with the following foci:

1. Dublin (January 2004) Coastal Issues
 - Environmental problems including pollution
 - Access to the coast
 - Inadequate resources and capacity for ICZM
 - Lack of political will
2. Aberystwyth (April 2004) Stakeholder Involvement
 - Showcasing and lessons learnt from local community initiatives
 - Resourcing including funding of community-based initiatives
3. Wexford (June 2004) Networks (Jointly hosted with the CZMNet project)
 - Evaluation of the value of networks for coastal management within the southern Irish Sea Region
 - Development of new project ideas for relating to raising awareness of coastal environmental issues including SAC management and biodiversity
 - Production of Declaration and Recommendations to influence policy development in Ireland and Wales

Workshops have all included key presentations, themed sessions, discussions, local field excursions, interactive sessions and have facilitated much formal and informal networking. Attendance has been good with between 60 and 80 participants at each workshop. These include representatives from a wide range of organisations, from community groups through to government departments.

Outputs from the CoCoNet project include workshop and final project reports, a declaration and final recommendations, all of which will be available on the CoCoNet website (<http://coconet.ucc.ie>).

5.6 Networks in Integrated Coastal Management

(Jane Taussik – EuroCoast).

Networks in Integrated Coastal Management
Jane Taussik (EUROCOAST)

This presentation gave an overview of networks, looking at the purpose, organisation and functions of networks and also their value in Integrated Coastal Management.

A network can be defined as a system of links or a group for the inter-linkage and interaction of its members. Networks are essentially very loose whereas partnerships are

more formal with an aim of meeting particular objectives. A forum is platform for discussion.

Examples of ICM networks at various levels include:

- Local Level – Friends of Chichester Harbour
- Regional Level – Solent Forum
- National Level – CoastNET
- International Level - EUROCOAST

The value of networks in ICM has been recognised. Such structures allow the inclusion of the multiple uses and multiple stakeholders and aims to integrate these, as well as helping stakeholders deal with risk, uncertainty and rapid change and giving confidence to develop actions.

In integrated coastal management, no-one knows it all. This highlights the need to co-operate and communicate and the need for a common language.

A network can provide links and act as a communication channel, allowing the sharing of information and resources. If the network has a hub or centre, knowledge can be exchanged very quickly. They can contribute to changes in ways of thinking. For integrated coastal management, networks should be open and flexible, allowing new ideas to develop, improving understand and facilitating the development of new solutions. An example where new solutions emerged from links between different groups is provided by a project on the Manhood Peninsula, situated on the south coast of England near Chichester. Here UK coastal specialists were teamed up with various specialists from different organisations in The Netherlands. By stepping back, bringing different ideas together and exchanging views, the resulting team came up with a range of unexpected and far sighted scenarios for the Manhood Peninsula in the future. Networks also provide the support for individuals or organisations to have the confidence to apply new solutions or approaches in their area.

Networks can have various functions including: policy formulation; discussion of specific issues; providing professional contact; and linking producers. A network for ICM should cut across all these. As well as providing horizontal links, networking in ICM should extend vertically between different networks i.e. local, regional and national.

Networks can operate in a range of ways. They can be: open or closed; fixed or fluid; narrow or broad; formal or informal; local or national; and can operate through meetings, workshops, with a newsletter, through informal contacts or through some/all of these. The centre, or link pin, may be a paid officer or a volunteer. A clear purpose or objective of the network must be set down.

EUROCOAST is the EUROpean network for COAstal Scientific and Technical cooperation and exchange. It supports the development of ICM. It was established in 1989 with its own secretariat. It brings together scientists, engineers and decision-makers from across Europe. It has a federal basis and provides linkages through a website to national associations. EUROCOAST decisions are reached at General Assemblies held at the biannual Littoral conferences. The 7th EUROCOAST International Conference will be held in Aberdeen from the 20th –22nd September 2004. At the EUROCOAST General Assembly in Croatia in 2000 the principle of a coastal network for Ireland in the EUROCOAST Federation was welcomed.

What lessons could be transferred to the establishment of an Irish Coastal Network? Such a network would allow knowledge of who does what around and associated with the management of the coast. It could mean that an increased amount of information could

be circulated quickly. It might provide a framework wherein new solutions to existing problems might be found. Resources could be shared or tapped and increased knowledge, awareness and information could generate an increase in confidence to tackle coastal management issues.

5.7 Coastal Practitioners – Building on Regional Experiences from Across Europe (Alan Pickaver – EUCC)

The current working group of the High Level Forum on ICZM has expressed a need for indicators to be developed to establish:

- How to measure progress in ICZM?
- How to measure the success of ICZM measures?

The first of these can be done by way of progress indicators (in order to measure how ICZM is being implemented). The second of these can be done using a set of sustainability indicators (state of the coast indicators).

EUCC has been commissioned to develop a model that can be used to determine whether or not ICZM is being implemented and to what extent.

A progress indicator set has so far been developed that uses a system of 26 questions/action using a binary response. There are five general phases of progress that the model can determine, these being:

1. Non-integrated
2. Framework for ICZM exists
3. Vertical and horizontal integration
4. Efficient participatory process
5. Full implementation

The indicator set is currently being tested and future developments may involve giving a response weighting i.e. 1-4 rather than just the binary Yes/No. The Commission's expert panel has shown willingness to adopt this system. This indicator set can be found on the EUCC's website (www.eucc.nl).

CoPraNet – Coastal Practitioners Network is an INTERREG IIC project, which has the aim of developing a network of coastal stakeholders to exchange information and best practice on coastal management. The project will run for three years until December 2006. The EU is encouraging the CoPraNet project to extend beyond the current project partners that stands at 21 partners in 11 countries.

Outputs intended from this project include the production of an international quality label for tourism destinations ('Quality Coast' to act as a standard of sustainable tourism) and a multilingual guide for beach management and coastal erosion. These objectives will be achieved via a series of conferences and thematic workshops. More information on the CoPraNet project can be found at www.coastalpractice.net.

5.8 The need for Coastal Partnerships and the Role of the CoastNet UK Network (Alex Midlen – CoastNet UK)

Coastal Partnerships are an extension of coastal fora, having a more formalised structure. The impetus for the development of coastal partnerships has come from the recognition that there is a difficulty in delivering sustainable development and that many issues on the coast cannot be solved by one organisation in isolation.

The benefits of the Partnership approach can be illustrated through the two cases of Wivenhoe and Brightlingsea, Essex. The Local Plan identified a brown field site in Wivenhoe and proposed a housing development. This proposal went out to consultation

and generated 100 objections, the processing of which was highly time consuming and complicated. So having learnt from this approach the next case, Brightlingsea, involved Stakeholders very early on in the process. Stakeholders were encouraged to develop a wish list for the area, which was subsequently incorporated into the Local Plan thus avoiding conflict.

Coastal Partnerships are also able to bring a coastal focus to organisations for which the strategic focus is elsewhere – either geographically or sectorally. ICZM is inherently peripheral to any organisations main body of work, and coastal partnerships can bring coastal issues into focus.

Funding has always been an issue for such Partnerships. It is essential that such organisations approach potential funders with concrete outputs and outcomes of what they can deliver. They must aim to add value to the existing arrangements and to meet the needs of individual partners.

CoastNET has been particularly active in guiding the direction and dealing with the concerns of Coastal partnerships in England. A workshop held in March 2004 brought together 30-40 partnership organisations in order to begin to define the role of coastal partnerships. What emerged was that partnerships currently in place see themselves as establishing a common vision amongst stakeholders for their area, raising awareness, managing and disseminating information, facilitating exchange, producing projects and outputs, delivering sustainable management, engaging the public and wider stakeholders and ensuring the adoption of good business practice.

The next stage in establishing and promoting the work and value of coastal partnerships will be picked up in the English coastal strategy stemming from the EU Recommendation and the National Stocktake. Where there is a need, CoastNET is keen to undertake similar work in other Regions and States.

CoastNET's role in the UK involves producing a contacts database, a good practice guide, facilitating information exchange, raising awareness and acting as a policy "Think Tank". CoastNet provides a home for such specialist networks that don't necessarily have a legal basis.

6. FUTURE PROJECTS

An opportunity for discussion of future initiatives amongst delegates was an important component of the workshop. For this reason, a dedicated session focussing on future projects was run in the afternoon. During this session the delegates were split into four sub groups, each group had a facilitator to direct and focus discussions, whilst a scribe recorded the main discussion points.

One group was assigned to discuss each of the topics listed below.

- Development of a proposal to raise awareness of marine Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and coastal biodiversity issues.
- Towards a coastal network for Ireland.
- How to facilitate public involvement in ICZM at the local level.
- How to inform national policy development.

Summaries of the discussions from each group are given in the Appendix II.

7.CONCLUSION

The main outputs from the workshop were threefold:

1. A plan for a new project to succeed CoCoNet emerged from the workshop. A proposal will be submitted to the Interreg IIIA programme to develop a pilot project to raise awareness of marine SACs and coastal biodiversity issues. This project will involve local authorities on either side of the Irish Sea (Fingal County Council and Gwynedd County Council) working with local community stakeholders. The vision for the project embraces the linkages between local authorities and coastal community groups encouraged by the joint CZMNet/CoCoNet workshop. The proposal will address the topic of raising awareness of the value of the coastal environment, which was a key issue to emerge from participants at previous CoCoNet project events.
2. Participants were unanimous in their recognition of the importance of networks for furthering coastal management initiatives and in their support for the creation of a coastal network for Ireland. It was agreed to pursue the establishment of a national network with the objective of promoting the delivery of the sustainable development of the Irish Coast. It was agreed that a core working group would take discussions forward during the forthcoming summer months.
3. Consensus was achieved on the content of the Wexford Declaration and on the appropriateness of using the Declaration to inform coastal policy makers of the priorities for coastal management identified from the CoCoNet and CZMNet projects¹. It was agreed that the Declaration would be disseminated widely following the workshop to raise awareness and to focus attention on ICZM within the Southern Irish Sea INTERREG region.

¹ Delegates had an opportunity to make suggestions on the wording of the text at the workshop. The Declaration was posted to the CoCoNet website for one week following the workshop to allow additional time for feedback and comments to be received.

APPENDICES

1. APPENDIX I - List of Registered Participants

CoCoNet Workshop 3		
Delegates	Organisation	Contact Information
Rhoda Ballinger	Marine & Coastal Environment Group	ballingerRC@cf.ac.uk
Liam Barnes	Dublin Civil Defence	
Roger Bennett	Waterfront Wales	rainsail@aol.com
Nick Bowie	RNLI Wexford	wex.boats@iol.ie
Kate Bradley	ENFO	kate_bradley@environ.ie
Malachy Bradley	Fingal County Council	malachy_bradley@fingalcoco.ie
Barbara Brezina	Dublin Civil Defence	
Patrick Buck	South Western Regional Fisheries Board	buck@swrfb.ie
Tom Byrne	Wicklow IFA	
Joe Campbell	Dublin Civil Defence	joe.campbell@dublincity.ie
Bernadine Carry	Meath County Council	bcarry@meathcoco.ie
Sinéad Casey	Wexford County Council	sinead.casey@wexfordcoco.ie
Gerry Clabby	Fingal County Council	gerry.clabby@fingalcoco.ie
Richard Cleary	Cleary Conservation Ltd.	clearyconservation@eircom.net
Anthony Cross	Fortwilliam Fisheries/ Blackwater Salmon Development Group	anthonycross@eircom.net
John Crothers	Fingal County Council	John.crothers@fingalcoco.ie
Valerie Cummins	Coastal and Marine Resources Centre	v.cummins@ucc.ie
Ruth Cunningham	Cork County Council	
Emily Dicks	Countryside Council for Wales	e.dicks@ccw.gov.uk
Wendy Dodds	Marine & Coastal Environment Group	DoddsW1@cf.ac.uk
Brendan Dollard	Enterprise Ireland	brendan.dollard@enterprise-ireland.com
Alan Drumm	Marine Institute	alan.drumm@marine.ie
Declan Dunne	Coastal and Marine Resources Centre	d.dunne@ucc.ie
Peter Earle	Ballygarrett and District Community Council	
Alison Edwards	Gwynedd County Council	AlisonPalmerEdwards@gwynedd.gov.uk
Gerard Farrell	Department of Marine	gerard.farrell@dcmnr.gov.ie
AnaMarija Frankic	Virginia Institute of Marine Science	afrankic@vims.edu
Tara Gallagher	Wood Environmental Management Ltd.	tgallagher@weml.ie
Gael Gibson	Wicklow County Council	ggibson@wicklowcoco.ie
Aidan Gray	An Taisce	gcawards@eircom.net
Lorcan Griffin	Wexford County Council	lorcan.griffin@wexfordcoco.ie
Loreto Guinan	Meath County Council	lguinan@meathcoco.ie
John Hamer	Countryside Council for Wales	j.hamer@ccw.gov.uk
Harry Hermon	Irish Sailing Association	harry@sailing.ie
John Hickey	Bord Iascaigh Mhara	hickey@bim.ie
Jack Higginbottom	RNLI Wexford	wex.boats@iol.ie
Billy Horgan	Cork County Council	billy.horgan@corkcoco.ie
Gruff Jones	Keep Wales Tidy	gruff.jones@keepwalestidy.org
Ifor Jones	Pembrokeshire Coast National Park	info@pembrokeshirecoast.org.uk
Lucy Kay	Countryside Council for Wales	l.kay@ccw.gov.uk
Rita Kearney	Bere Island Conservation Group	kearneyandassociates@eircom.net
Beatrice Kelly	Heritage Council	bkelly@heritagecouncil.com
Liam Kelly	Carrowmore Lacken Development Assoc.	
John (Sam) Kennedy	RNLI Courtown	samkennedy@eircom.net
Paul Leahy	Brittas Bay Community Group	pauldunes@eircom.net

Grainne Lynch	Coastal and Marine Resources Centre	grainne.lynch@ucc.ie
Kevin Lynch	Cork County Council	kevin.lynch@CorkCoCo.ie
Joseph Maddock	Irish Fishermens Organisation	
Eithne Mallin	Fingal County Council	Eithne.mallin@fingalcoco.ie
Denise Maloney	Bord Iascaigh Mhara	maloney@bim.ie
Arthur Martin	Brady Shipman Martin	mail@bsmconsult.com
Sharon McDonald	Cork County Council	
Paddy O'Sullivan	National Parks and Wildlife Service	
Alex Midlen	CoastNet UK	Alex.Midlen@colchester.gov.uk
John Moriarty	Dublin Civil Defence	john.moriarty@dublincity.ie
Steve Morris	Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum	s.morris@pembrokeshire.ac.uk
Enda Mullen	Wicklow Mountains National Park	emullen@duchas.ie
Billy Murphy	County Wexford Partnership	info@wexfordpartnership.ie
Gerry Murphy	Carrowmore Lacken Development Assoc.	
Cliff Nelson	Green Sea Partnership	CNelson@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk
Niall O'Boyle	Clew Bay Marine Forum	innishoo@hotmail.com
Patrick O'Donnell	Gorey-Courtown Forest Park Ltd.	patodonnell@eircom.net
Vicki O'Donnell	Coastal and Marine Resources Centre	v.odonnell@ucc.ie
Paul O'Keefe	INTERREG	interreg@eircom.net
Jenny O'Leary	Marine Institute	jenny.oleary@marine.ie
Jadranka Pelikan	EkoZadar	jpelikan@inet.hr
Alan Pickaver	EUCC	pickaver@eucc.nl
Emma Plunkett Dillon	National Trust	emma.plunkett-dillon@nationaltrust.org.uk
David Poulter	Camarthenshire County Council	djpoulter@camarthenshire.gov.uk
Joyce Power	Union of Students of Ireland	environmental@usi.ie
Marion Reuter	Wicklow Coastal Business Alliance	mrclogga@eircom.net
Sian Shakespeare	Gwynedd County Council	sianetal@fish.co.uk
Hance Smith	Marine & Coastal Environment Group	SmithHD@cf.ac.uk
Cathal Stockdale	National Parks and Wildlife Service	cstockdale@duchas.ie
Charlotte Street	Severn Estuary Partnership	strategy@cardiff.ac.uk
Jane Taussik	EuroCoast	jane@taussik.u-net.com
Ruth Tipping	Environment Agency	ruth.tipping@environment-agency.gov.uk
Sarah Varian	Marine Dimensions	sarahvarian@O2.ie
Hans Visser	Fingal County Council	hans.visser@fingalcoco.ie
Michael Walsh	Irish South and East Fishermens Org.	isefo@eircom.net
Ted Walsh	Ted Walsh and Associates	tedwalsh@iol.ie
Emyr Williams	Pembrokeshire County Council	enquiries@pembrokeshire.gov.uk
Maura O' Brien	Portmarnock Coastal Group	mob36@tutor.open.ac.uk
Ann Kenny	Portmarnock Coastal Group	
Myra Mulligan	Portmarnock Coastal Group	
Deirdre Pearson	Portmarnock Coastal Group	
Angela Bury	Portmarnock Coastal Group	
Fiona English	Wexford Area Partnership	fionaenglish@iolfree.ie
Pat Cullinane	Kilmore Quay Community Development	
Brian O'Loan	Bord Iascaigh Mhara	oloan@bim.ie
Karin Dubsky	Coastwatch	dubsky@iol.ie
Deborah Tiernan	Fingal County Council	
Irene Murphy	Carrowmore Lacken Development Assoc.	
Mary Kelly	Carrowmore Lacken Development Assoc.	

Appendix II – Rapporteur Reports from the Four Parallel Sessions

Group 1 - Development of a proposal to raise awareness of marine Special Areas of Conservation and Coastal Biodiversity issues

Facilitators: Sian Shakespear and Hans Visser
Rapporteur: Wendy Dodds

Participants

Sian Shakespear	Lucy Kay	Paddy O’Sullivan
Emily Dicks	Lorcan Griffin	Sarah Varian
Alison Edwards	Karen Dubsky	Tara Gallagher
Liam Kelly	Loreto Guinan	Gruff Jones
Alan Pickaver	Cathal Stockdale	Enda Mullen

This session brought together delegates with an interest in developing project ideas relating to marine SACs, biodiversity and the wider coastal environment. The range of delegates attended varied including statutory agencies, NGOs and community groups, however the majority of participants were from Irish Local Authorities.

After introductions by delegates, the facilitators of the group presented their project proposals. Hans Visser (Fingal County Council) went through a project proposal relating to the development of an education package on the marine environment that would incorporate habitat mapping and fisheries studies to be carried out by the local community. The target audience for this education package could include for example schools and scouting groups. The use of a wide variety of tools would allow the dissemination of the package to be tailored for distinct audiences. Sian Shakespear from Gwynedd County Council then went through a project brief relating to awareness raising of the Pen Llyn & Sarnau SAC in North Wales. This project would seek to engender pride in the community, encourage more sympathetic activities by user groups and contribute to the tourism industry. The methods for achieving this could include theatre production, an underwater movie, poster exhibitions, sightings recording schemes and the creation of a Code of Conduct by the community. The methods could be designed to target different audiences such as the local youth population and beach users.

Small breakout groups were then used to allow delegates to discuss these project ideas and develop further objectives. Each of the small groups reported back on their discussion and any objectives that they agreed upon within their groups. These included:

- The development of guidelines for SAC management including a directory or Who’s Who, which show the responsibility of departments and/or individual staff members.
- The raising of awareness of the Habitat Directive within County Councils.
- Review of the guidelines of UK SAC to see if best practice is being implemented.
- Oral historical recordings of the local coastal environments in the region.

These objectives were individually discussed and the difference in SAC management across the southern Irish Sea region was a theme that emerged during the discussions.

A group discussion then followed to look into whether these objectives and project ideas could be packaged individually for bid purposes or whether several smaller proposals could be placed under one project banner. It was felt by the group that an overall education programme could be designed as an umbrella project to address both raising

awareness for SAC related matters and of the coastal environment as a whole (including biodiversity and heritage issues).

The group was then split into breakout groups in order to carry out some action planning for this project. Groups were given the headings of

- Project partners
- Funding sources
- Time scales
- Urgent actions required

The final group discussion saw delegates from Local Authorities in Ireland (Fingal, Wexford), Countryside Council for Wales, NGOs and Portmarnock Community Group giving their support to the project. Other desirable project partners such as the Marine Institute are to be contacted in regards to their possible involvement. It was agreed that a pilot project would be developed to in the first instance to allow the overall project to be manageable for the participants. An application for INTERREG IIIA funding is to be drafted with Fingal County Council (Hans Visser) taking the lead in the bid preparation and submission.

For more information about this project development please contact either Hans Visser at hans.visser@fingalcoco.ie or Sian Shakespear, at sianetal@fish.co.uk.



GROUP 2 - Towards a Coastal Network for Ireland & Wales

Facilitator: Dr. Jane Taussik

Rapporteur: Dr. Rhoda Ballinger

Participants

Harry Hermon

Patrick O'Donnell

Deirdre Pearce

Val Cummins

John Hickey

Gael Gibson

John Higginbottom

Alex Midlen

Sinead Casey

Joseph Maddock

Brian O'Loan

On the subject of the establishment of a coastal network for Ireland, the group agreed unanimously that there was a need for an Irish coastal network. The discussion moved onto the issue of identifying the purpose/goal of a national coastal network. Initial discussions pointed for the need for a network to deliver:

- Information exchange – sharing access to information
- Issue discussion
- Listening / exchange of ideas (as equals – with respect)
- Focal point – finding best practice within and beyond Ireland
 - link with other coastal networks
- Assistance with funding
- Guidance – to develop consistency

The point was made that there is a need to distinguish between LEARNING and ACTION networks i.e. where the network could facilitate policy preparation / development i.e. as a FACILITATOR (e.g. CoastNet) OR where it could lobby government i.e. as a LOBBYIST

Following reference to a perceived policy gap between local and national levels, discussion touched on whether or not a national network could help to bridge this gap. After considerable debate, it was agreed that the aim of the network could be to '*promote the delivery of the sustainable development of the Irish coast*'

With regard to membership, in consideration as to whether or not the network should be open or closed, the fact that open networks are self-selecting was noted. The group agreed that the network should be all-inclusive, multidisciplinary and should include both institutional and individual members. However, some concern was expressed regarding the effectiveness of the network if its membership would become too wide. There, were suggestions that it might incorporate specialist interests (special interest groups) and facilitate sectoral, topic-driven workshops and discussions. However, it was seen to be essential that work programmes should be devised to ensure that any sub-groups are outward looking. There was reference at this point to the CoastNet experience, which currently includes four conferences a year and also facilitates both multi-sectoral and intra-sectoral exchange. Suggestions indicated that although the network should focus at national level, there should be mechanisms to allow local levels to feed into the network.

The importance of networks in developing trust between members and in changing people's mindsets / ways of thinking as part of the network process was stressed. This in turn can result in new solutions to problems. In new and rapidly evolving policy areas (e.g. the WFD and marine spatial planning), it was pointed out that effective networking could provide an opportunity for better and more co-ordinated planning and early and better informed discussion, which could inform policy development.

Although some concern was expressed regarding a possible rift between government bodies and the public (the 'us and them' scenario), it was generally felt that involving both

the government and the public would be beneficial, helping change misconceptions and aiding more informed and inclusive policy development. It was also considered necessary to include public bodies for funding purposes and local councils, as bodies with some of the main legal responsibilities.

Running of network - Concern was raised that if the network was entirely voluntary it might burn out quickly. It was suggested that there was a need for a management model that made light work of the administration. It was considered that there is a need to combine the enthusiasm of volunteers with the professionalism of a paid administration. There was brief mention of the possibility of rotating the administrative functions of the network and also for the formation of a steering group comprised of representatives of the various sectors. Reference to the possibility of contracting out the running of the network was also made. It was also pointed out that CoastNet has shown that there is a need for GOOD quality (professional) outputs. This means there is a core need of resources for conferences; workshops need good facilitation (need grant money); magazines – costs in publications; database – VERY hard work – not possible on a voluntary basis. However the voluntary approach would be satisfactory for a network aimed at exchanging experience.

Delivering an effective network comes with an administrative burden with a board / advisory group or committee to ensure the organisation is run effectively. It was suggested that if the network becomes an association, then – as a business - comes with all sorts of legal obligations (need professional managers / administrators – funding experiences; project management etc. – moves away from central coastal focus.

When discussing the functions of network, it was considered that these could include:

- **Sharing experience** – Through face-to-face contact through symposia, congress, conferences, fieldtrips, workshops, case study analysis. Virtual environments, sharing through Internet websites and other interactive opportunities including discussion groups.
- **A database of members**, although recognition was given to the legal and confidentiality issues associated with this along with the need for the database to be maintained to remain up-to-date.
- **Publications** – including a regular newsletter; one-off reports; best practice guide; members directory
- **Identification of best practice**
- **Raised awareness** – including education on legal issues.
- **Spin-off for project development**
- **Sharing resources**

Payment for national network - Some discussion in relation to levels of payment took place. It was pointed out that the going rate for memberships of relatively low key associations ranges between 35 to 40 Euros per individual member while corporate membership is usually between 200 – 250 Euros. It was suggested that a tiered approach to membership might be appropriate with higher fees required for increased services (for example, more expensive options might include training seminars as part of the membership package). It was considered that there would probably be a need to pool money from various sources to support the network, including public funding and individual and group membership fees.

Mechanisms to enable continuation of network activities / Sustaining the discussions - It was agreed that a core working group was needed to take the discussions forward.

Delegates were issued with a brief questionnaire on the topic of a coastal network for Ireland and Wales, this was disseminated individuals from all the sub-groups. Key results from this questionnaire were as follows:

Delegates not members of a formal or informal network

Q. What topics for future networks would interest you?

Majority – Coastal management
Coastal & Marine Tourism

Q. What form of membership would be preferable?

All agreed – Organisation/Association

Q. Which modes of delivery would you like to see future networks take?

Majority – Workshop
Discussion Groups
Email Network

Q. What level would you feel would be most appropriate?

Majority- Transboundary – Nationally Wales/Ireland
National

Q. Would you be prepared to pay a membership fee to join a coastal network?

Yes as an institution

Q. Who do you feel should host the network?

Majority - Independent Organisation
Research Centre

Delegates who are members of an informal or formal network

Q. What topics for future networks would interest you?

Majority Coastal Management
Coastal & Marine Tourism

Q. What form of membership would be preferable?

Options to join as an individual or as an organisation wereselected.

Q. Which modes of delivery would you like to see future networks take?

Majority Workshop
E-mail

Q. What level would you feel would be most appropriate?

Majority - Transboundary – Nationally Wales/Ireland
International

National

Q. Would you be prepared to pay a membership fee to join a coastal network?

Yes –both as an individual or as part of an organisation.

Q. Who do you feel should host the network?

Majority Independent Organisation
Research Centre

Group 3 - How to facilitate public involvement in ICZM at the local level

Facilitator: Kevin Lynch

Rapporteur: David Poulter

Participants

Steve Morris

Roger Bennett

Eithne Mallin

Angela Bury

Jadranka Pelikan

lfor Jones

Sharon McDonald

Ruth Cunningham

Emma Plunkett-Dillon

Charlotte Street

Anamarija Frankic

Gerry Clabby

Cliff Nelson

Pat Cullinane

Aidan Gray

Deborah Tiernan

Representatives introduced themselves and their involvement in coastal management. A good range of organisations, both public and voluntary, was represented. Kevin Lynch (Facilitator) outlined his experience with statutory development plan consultation and with the Bantry Bay Project.

Steve Morris gave an account of the development of Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum. The Forum currently had 900 people on its mailing list, drawn from local government, government agencies, conservation organisations, fisheries and other industries, as well as interested individuals. Public meetings had been well attended, with about 150 and 90 people at the first two meetings, falling to about 70 thereafter. Many Forum objectives had a long-term perspective and inevitably some people lost interest after their initial involvement. Subsequent discussion indicated the following benefits provided by the Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum:-

- Public meetings
- Access to documents
- Access to public surgeries
- Discussion and prioritisation of coastal issues.
- Access to an independent organisation with an overview of local coastal issues

The Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum was seen as a successful example of facilitating public involvement in ICZM at the local level. Factors contributing to this success were thought to include:-

- A key individual, with skill, enthusiasm and time, to drive the project forward
- Adequate time to develop a project, e.g. two years was felt to be too short
- Although a project would need long-term objectives, it was felt important that a project should be able to produce some early results in order to retain supporters' enthusiasm.

Wider discussion revealed a number of factors thought to be important:-

- Widespread lack of awareness of coastal issues in local authorities and amongst the general public
- Need for openness about the complexity of issues and the time needed to address them
- Importance of locating the right individuals within organisations
- Importance of targeting likely key volunteers
- Approaching ICZM at two levels, firstly short-term solutions, and secondly long-term resolution of problems, with the emphasis on education.

The importance of school education was discussed, with an emphasis on developing a love of the coastal environment and an understanding of coastal ecology. Other aspects of public involvement in ICZM touched upon included the following:-

- Waste management was a big issue
- Difficulty of identifying Local Authority contacts
- Training for community group representatives
- Need for interaction to be organised
- Promote opportunities for involvement in a detailed way, e.g. via local biodiversity action plans
- Advantages of a personal approach to attract busy people to events.

The Irish and Welsh experiences of ICZM networking were compared. In general networking opportunities were felt to be very limited in Ireland, whereas in Wales and the United Kingdom there might be too many. The strong tradition of voluntary work in the UK, linked to its high proportion of active retired people, was felt to be significant. It was felt better to have overlap of voluntary organisation roles, rather than gaps.

The consultation fatigue resulting from so much public consultation on official plans was common to both Wales and Ireland, and more should be done to target relevant consultees. A reluctance to approach local authorities seemed to be more of a problem in Ireland than in Wales, and was partly a reflection of way development planning decisions had been made during the last ten years. The importance of patience and confidence building when engaging the public was stressed. Cork County Council had improved relations with its local population by giving away thousands of free copies of its Development Plan on CD.

The issue of public access to coastal resources needed to be clarified, particularly in the face of development pressure. Community activity generally should be encouraged in view of the potential developed by one project to be put to good use in another project. The example discussed was of members of a computer class who went on to form a children's club.

In summing up Kevin Lynch, thanked representatives for participating and emphasised the following points:-

- Openness
- Involvement of key individuals
- Leadership
- Clear goals
- Friendliness
- Achievement of short-term, as well as long-term, goals
- Innovative approaches to avoid consultation fatigue

Group 4 - How to inform national policy development

Facilitator: Brendan Dollard
Rapporteur: Vicki O Donnell

This group discussion was started by the facilitator posing the question *how many people were members of informal/formal networks*, as networks are often effective mechanisms for influencing policy and raising political awareness about an issue.

A representative from the National Fisherman's Organisation was a member of a number of networks. They hoped to inform policy at national and EU level. Last year the Pan Irish Sea Alliance was formed. They are also putting together a proposal with France, Belgium and the UK for the conservation of cod, as they don't agree with the conservation policies of the EU on cod management. Currently, they are looking for other networks and had recently worked with Coastwatch in Waterford. They meet with the Minister of the Marine on an ongoing basis.

Delegates from within the group agreed they had lobbied politicians, but many do not appear to have an interest in the coastal zone. The group also agreed that the media was not being used enough. Additionally it becomes difficult to sustain and maintain momentum when progress seems not to occur. A representative of Brittas Bay Community Group said they do lobby councillors but have not had any success getting anything done. Within Brittas Bay they are setting up a Coastcare group, it was felt that progress was achieved through the efforts of the local populace and community group rather than through the actions of politicians. The hardest work is to raise the profile of the work being undertaken.

New Strategic Policy Committees do make some progress. But policy is formed from a number of key documents that are nearly obsolete, from the 1960s. The newer policy 'Towards a Draft Policy' is from 1996.

There is a lack of clarity in relation to what ICZM is. Thus there are opportunities existing to influence policy from the local level.

The group were asked to provide feedback on what mechanisms are available to influence policy?

Use politicians, MEPS, media (Coastwatch are a group that have shown the success of using media and getting them on your side). It is useful to have tiers of networks and have a unified approach with synergies.

It was noted that there were no representatives from the Dept of the Marine at the meeting. It is essential to have a champion within the Department to bring ICZM to the forefront of government thinking.

It is essential to know *what cause needs to be championed?* Make a clear issue from the start. Must be realistic.

All decisions are made considering *socio economic* inputs, so don't separate the coast from the rest of the areas that are on this bandwagon, i.e. BUY IN

A way to get voices heard is to use the implementation of the Water Framework Directive.

You need transparency from the start. You need a communicator rather than an agitator.

More than three quarters of individuals within this group felt they had a poor level of input into the ICZM process in terms of the national stocktake and national policy development.

In conclusion,

- Take a staged approach.
- Use the media, let them give positive examples of local projects.
- Show the monetary benefits of ICZM.
- You need a champion within government departments.
- Target consultants, make them lobby for you.
- Education, focus efforts on the youth, let them understand ICZM.
- Take a unified approach, umbrella organisation with a good communicator.
- Have a clear and targeted message
- Use tags such as the WFD, climate change and awards such as the 26 points of CZM.

APPENDIX III– List of Recommendations

Tick for type of participant: IRISH WELSH OTHER

List Top 3 Recommendation Numbers

Suggested Recommendations:

PRINCIPLES/APPROACHES

1. Build on the concepts of sustainable development and the ecosystem approach.
2. Endorse regional seas approaches.

OTHER:

INSTITUTIONAL/POLICY

3. Set out a vision for the sustainable development of Ireland's coastal resources.
4. Establish specific goals to be achieved within the ICZM process.
5. Provide the capacity for Local Authority and stakeholder involvement in ICZM at the local level, recognizing the importance of managing coasts at the local level and the need for public participation.
6. Consider the extension of Local Authority planning powers offshore.
7. Provide a framework to integrate and streamline financial and human resources in government departments and state agencies concerned with coastal management.
8. Endorse the Budapest Declaration and support the formulation of an EU community development policy
9. Outline funding mechanisms to ensure the sustainable implementation of coastal management initiatives.
10. Secure investment to monitor and evaluate community involvement in ICZM.
11. Endorse the recommendations of the Irish Sea Pilot project.
12. Ensure leadership for the management of marine SACs.
13. Encourage integration of plans effecting activities in coastal zones, for example development plans, community strategies, biodiversity action plans, SAC management plans, shoreline management plans etc.

INSTITUTIONAL

14. Clarification of roles, regulations and responsibilities for coastal management.
15. Encourage industry participation.
16. Promote coastal community involvement as a specific and explicit priority within national and EU community development policies and programmes.

GUIDELINES

17. Provide guidelines and support for ICZM within Local Authorities.
18. Guidance and support to community groups wishing to develop projects and partnerships to implement projects at the local communities.

TOOLS AND MECHANISMS FOR IMPLEMENTING ICZM

19. Define where, when and how ICZM should be implemented POLICY
20. Provide a focal point for information, research, training and education.
21. Establish mechanisms for communication with coastal practitioners including a national coastal network.

22. Increase surveillance of coastal zone (monitoring of prohibited activities, unlawful development, etc.).
23. Accommodate the collection of data in a consistent manner. Produce common methods of collecting data to allow meaningful comparisons.
24. Develop a central point of access for coastal datasets with adequate metadata including the development and maintenance of GIS systems.
25. Mechanisms to promote the integration and participation of public, private and voluntary sectors in community based management.

OTHER:

CAPACITY BUILDING, INCLUDING TRAINING

26. Encourage links between research centres and statutory bodies to ensure that scientific studies are translated into meaningful results for decision makers.
27. Develop primary, secondary and third level educational programmes for ICZM.
28. Wider dissemination of information on coastal issues should be encouraged with greater availability of plans and strategies relating to the coast.
29. Activate and sustain voluntary and community action to applied and effective training and support.

OTHER:

SCIENCE, INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

30. Endorse the recommendations of the Galway Declaration and the Irish Sea Pilot.

_ OTHER:

SECTORAL RECOMMENDATIONS

31. Provide plans for the control of development in coastal areas (one-off housing issue).
32. Provide standards and codes of conduct for coastal eco-tourism.
33. Address Right to Roam issues. Develop strategies for the maintenance and enhancement of public access to the coastal zone by documenting the location and extents of public access areas.
34. Ensure improved opportunities for local democratic approval of offshore development proposals.
35. Strengthen monitoring of coastal activity, including a new role and structure for local sea fisheries committees.
36. Continued international cooperation in support of sustainable use of coastal resources, particularly fish stocks.

PROGRAMME SUPPORT

37. Provide incentives to coastal communities to mobilise local people and resources to address local problems.

- 38. Give statutory recognition to shoreline management plans.
- 39. Ensure that local authorities have the resources to update and implement shoreline management plans.

OTHER:

IMPLEMENTATION

- 40. Implement European environmental directives (notably the Habitats and EIA Directives).
- 41. Take advantage of the potential synergies presented in the implementation of the SEA and WFD and the European Marine Strategy.

OTHER:

OTHER
