



CoCoNet Workshop 2 Report



CMRC & MACE

April 2004



Table of Contents	Page No.
1. INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Aims of the CoCoNet project	1
1.2 Aims of Workshop 2	1
1.3 Workshop 2 Programme	2
2. AGENDA	
2.1 Outline of Programme	3
2.2 Profile of Participants	3
3. WORKSHOP PRESENTATIONS	
3.1 Showcasing Session – Abstracts of Presentations	4-11
3.2 Resourcing Session - Abstracts of Presentations	11-19
4. FIELD CASE STUDIES	
4.1 Introduction	19
4.2 Borth Visit	19-20
4.3 Ynyslas Visit	21-22
4.4 New Quay Boat Trip	22
5. DISCUSSION	
5.1 Introduction	23
5.1 Coastal Surgery –Funding Future Projects	23-26
5.2 Coastal Surgery – Network Solutions	26-29
6. CONCLUSION	30
APPENDIX 1 Workshop 2 Flyer	31
APPENDIX II Participants List	32-33

1. INTRODUCTION

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). The aim of the project is to develop opportunities for networking among community groups with an interest in the sustainable management of their local coastal resources.

1.1 Aims of the CoCoNet Project

CoCoNet aims:

- To facilitate networking and communication among coastal communities; and
- To explore mechanism 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.

By carrying out a series out of workshops, CoCoNet will help to improve awareness of local ICM issues, increase understanding of marine and coastal environments and provide opportunities for stakeholders to share experiences.

This document is a report of the second CoCoNet Workshop, held in Aberystwyth on April 2nd and 3rd 2004.

1.2 Aims of Workshop 2

Workshop 2 aimed to:

1. Address the three main issues identified at the first workshop and look at ways forward;
2. To provide opportunities for dialogue amongst stakeholders from the southern Irish Sea INTERREG IIIA region.

The structure of the workshop facilitated discussion during both the participatory sessions and the fieldtrip events.

1.3 Workshop 2 - Programme

Time	Theme	Topic
9.00 – 9.30	Registration & Coffee	
Introductions		
10.00 - 10.05		Welcome – Dr. Rhoda Ballinger, MACE, Cardiff University
10.05-10.15		Introduction to the CoCoNet project & update – Cathal O’Mahony, CMRC, University College Cork.
Session 1	Show Casing - Coastal Communities Activities	Chair: Dr. Rhoda Ballinger
10.15 - 10.30	Overview	Participation in ICZM: Lessons from the EU Demonstration Programme , Graham King.
10.30-10.45	Overview	Coastal Partnerships in the UK , Dr. Steve Fletcher, Southampton Institute.
10.45 –11.00	Case Study from Region	Local Agenda 21 in Ireland , Dr. Ger Mullally, CPPU, University College Cork.
11.00 - 11.15	Case Study from Region	Ceredigion Marine Heritage Coast , Jamie Davies, Ceredigion County Council.
11.15 -11.30	Case Study from Region	Wales Environment Link , Dr. Madeleine Havard, West Wales Wildlife Trust.
11.30 -11.45	Case Study from Outside Region	Lacken Community Development Organisation , Gerry Murphy, Carrowmore- Lacken Community Development Association Ltd.
Coffee Break		
Session 2	Resourcing	Chair: Cathal O’Mahony
12.00-12.15	European Level	Overview of EU Funding Streams , Rhian Llewelyn, WEFO.
12.15 - 12.25	Ireland	Irish Funding Opportunities & Mechanisms , Bill Walsh, Wexford Organisation for Rural Development.
12.25 - 12.35	Wales	Cross-Wales Funding Mechanisms , Dr. Kirsty Dornie, Countryside Council for Wales.
12.35 - 12.45	Regional	Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum , Dr. Steve Morris.
12.45 - 12.55	Local	Freshwater East Coastcare Group , Steve Cannon.
12.55 – 1.00	<i>Introduction to fieldtrip</i>	Dr. Hance Smith, Cardiff University.
1.00 - 2.00	<i>Lunch</i>	
2.00 – 4.45	Fieldtrip	Visit to Ynyslas and Borth
4.45 – 5.00	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
Session 3	Coastal Surgeries	
5.00 - 5.05		Introduction to Coastal Surgeries , Wendy Dodds, MACE, Cardiff University.
5.05 - 6.05	Coastal Surgery A	Funding Future Projects
5.05 – 6.05	Coastal Surgery B	Political Engagement
5.05 – 6.05	Coastal Surgery C	Network Solutions
6.05 –6.20		Plenary Session
6.20 – 6.30	Close	Dr. Rhoda Ballinger, MACE, Cardiff University.

2. WORKSHOP AGENDA

2.1 Outline of Programme

The programme was designed to address two main themes: showcasing and resourcing. These themes attempted to bridge gaps and address the main issues that were identified at the first CoCoNet workshop*. The first theme – showcasing which formed session one of the event and provided an opportunity for case studies from both within and outside the INTERREG IIIA region to be presented. The case studies provided an insight into the challenges facing local community groups and partnerships. Speakers provided examples from their experience to date and gave details on successful approaches and achievements as well as obstacles and pitfalls encountered.

The second session focussed on resourcing, an issue that was very topical in the first CoCoNet workshop. Potential funding mechanisms available to local community groups were presented with speakers providing European, regional, national and local examples. A detailed copy of the workshop programme can be found in Appendix I.

2.2 Profile of Participants

49 people attended the workshop, representing community groups, coastal partnerships, Local Authorities from Ireland and Wales, non-governmental organisations, statutory agencies, and academic institutions. Thus, a good cross section of key coastal stakeholders was in attendance for the workshop. Appendix II lists the participant's names, organisations and contact details.

* The first CoCoNet workshop was held in Howth, Co. Dublin, Ireland on the 30th and 31st January 2004. The full workshop report and the workshop presentations are available as a pdf download from <http://coconet.ucc.ie/wkshop1.htm>.

3. WORKSHOP PRESENTATIONS

The following two sub-sections (Sections 3.1 and 3.2) contain abstracts summaries of the presentations made during workshop. The full presentations are available at <http://coconet.ucc.ie>.

3.1 Showcasing Session – Abstracts of Presentations

Participation in ICZM: Lessons form the EU Demonstration Programme

(Graham King).

The EU Demonstration programme entitled “The Integrated Management of Coastal Zones” ran from 1997 to 1999. The purpose of this 3-year project was to identify good practise in ICZM using 35 sites across the EU. The sites identified by the programme sought to illustrate the great variety in approaches to management that occur due to a host of local, regional, national and international factors and circumstances.

At the end of the programme in 1999, Hyder Consulting were contracted to undertake a review of the participatory approaches undertaken by the demonstration project sites. The study involved visits to 17 of the sites along with interviews and questionnaires. In order to undertake this review, a number of assessment criteria were established. Six guiding principles were identified as:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. A Clear Process | 2. Fully Representative |
| 3. Open and Transparent | 4. Relevant Techniques |
| 5. Adequate Resources | 6. Learning Style |

Six modes of participation were then identified:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Consultation – Information Giving | 2. Consultation – Information Gathering |
| 3. Working Together | 4. Sharing Decisions |
| 5. Empowerment | 6. Legal |

A key conclusion to emerge from the study was that without participation, ICZM becomes just an academic exercise. Participation is an essential ingredient and the projects demonstrated the value of stakeholder involvement. A great diversity amongst the projects was revealed under examination and the important themes of local subsidiarity and appropriateness came through clearly in all sites. Consensus building, conflict resolution, increased knowledge and understanding were just a few of the many tangible and intangible benefits that were created via ICZM.

The study highlighted the important role of the project officer, in particular, their ability to act as a champion and a central driver and motivator for the projects. Participation can take many forms but requires partnership at all levels. At the community level, public participation needs careful planning using special mechanisms and should be kept as simple as possible. Conventional techniques are frequently sound and useful, but more innovative practices should be explored and assessed. An important reflection by the study was for the need for projects to plan their exit or succession strategies at an early stage (to address the rise and fall of the projects). The sheer diversity in the programme's sites reflects that ICZM and participation in ICZM cannot be prescriptive.

Coastal Partnerships in the UK

(Dr. Steve Fletcher).

Coastal Partnerships (CPs) have emerged since the early 1990s as a local and regional response to the national coastal management policy vacuum in the United Kingdom (UK). CPs are voluntary groupings of stakeholders aspiring to improve coastal resource use through integrated coastal management (ICM). CPs use the rationale of deliberative consensus building to develop and implement multi-sectoral coastal management strategies to deliver ICM. Despite the significance of CPs, there has been a lack of research into their effectiveness in securing meaningful representation of stakeholder views in decision-making. Poor stakeholder representation has the potential to undermine the credibility, legitimacy, accountability and democratic basis of CP management outputs.

Through a telephone interview schedule with CP Officers in the UK, the procedures and safeguards in place to accommodate stakeholder representation were evaluated. Results indicated that CPs have restrictive and variable membership criteria and unclear decision-making procedures. These limitations exposed CPs to poor inclusivity and served to maintain existing power relations amongst stakeholders. It was also apparent that CPs had little information concerning the legitimacy of those representing stakeholder constituencies, potentially risking exposure to misrepresentation. In order to examine these issues further, four case study CPs were selected and a personal interview schedule was undertaken with stakeholder representatives. It was found that representatives were, in general, the legitimate representative of their constituency, that most held a trustee relationship with their constituency, but generally had limited accountability – both individually and collectively. Representatives perceived the decision-making process of CPs to favour already powerful groups, which served to limit the credibility of the CP amongst the membership.

The concept of secure representation was developed to describe circumstances in which stakeholder representation could be assured. It was determined that secure representation occurred when representatives were responsive to their constituency, when CPs had an inclusive membership and when decision-making was fair to all involved. Specific management measures to deliver secure representation were defined. A conceptual model was developed that mapped secure representation against internal and external management measures. The model allowed generic routes for CPs to enhance their secure representation to be identified. It was concluded that reform to both the procedures and safeguards of CPs and the management measures within stakeholder constituencies is required. Central to this reform is the need for CPs to extend their sphere of influence to enhance secure representation measures in constituencies.

Local Agenda 21 in Ireland

(Dr. Ger Mullally).

Local Agenda 21 (LA 21) can be broadly defined as sustainable development goals and strategies implemented at the local level. The concept of LA 21 was introduced in 1991, at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. At that time, it was stipulated "*by 1996, most Local Authorities in each country should have undertaken a consultative process with their population and achieved a consensus on a local Agenda 21 for their communities.*" Ireland, in comparison to the broader European experience, had a relatively late start and limited response from Local Authorities in the implementation of LA 21 for their areas.

The implementation of LA 21 is dependent on a number of factors, the institutional reform of governance being a key criterion in the Irish context. Although institutional change has come about in Ireland, the direct impacts in relation to LA 21 are yet to be realised. Much of the progress on LA 21 to date has been undertaken on a project basis, which is susceptible to the constraints of being time bound and limited. Additional threats to the sustainability of partnerships developed on the basis of LA 21 are, lack of effectiveness, lack of legitimacy and "*participation fatigue*".

The recently revised guidelines advocate a regional approach to be adopted in the implementation of LA 21. Despite this, a regional focus does not appear to be well developed in the Irish context. In Ireland, a county plus model largely represent regions, this can include a wide variety of region types, e.g. planning regions, regional tourism authorities, regional fisheries boards and regions designated on the basis of Structural Funds e.g. NUTS III and NUTS II. Thus, it can be argued that a strong regional identity is not prevalent in Ireland.

On a regional scale, factors contributing to the viability of regional sustainable development processes include: the integration of key actors, especially business; strong regional identities; stronger participatory elements in planning and implementation; strengthening social capital in the regions; stronger cross-policy integration and trans and inter-regional co-operation.

Ceredigion Marine Heritage Coast

(Jamie Davies).

Over two thirds of Ceredigion's coastline is considered of conservation importance and affords some form of statutory protection. This protection comes in the form of over twenty miles of Heritage Coast, a Local Nature Reserve, an International Biosphere Reserve, 3 candidate Special Areas of Conservation and significant areas of Sites of Special Scientific Interest. While these are all 'top-down' legal designations, one section of the coast, the Marine Heritage Coast, is managed on a voluntary basis following the establishment of a partnership between local residents and Ceredigion County Council.

This partnership came about due to concerns amongst local residents about the possible impacts of increasing boat traffic on the local Bottlenose dolphin population and other marine wildlife. In 1991, 668 community members signed a petition supporting the creation of the marine designation to promote more effective management of the wildlife rich inshore waters. As a response, in 1992, the former Ceredigion District Council established the Marine Heritage Coast (MHC), a 12 mile stretch of coast between New Quay and Tresaith, extending to 1 mile offshore.

This initiative was the first of its kind in Britain. The objectives of MHC management are to:

1. To protect and enhance marine habitats and communities;
2. To provide interpretation and education facilities that will generate interest, appreciation and commitment for marine conservation
3. To manage recreational activities in a way compatible with conservation interests;
4. To support sustainable forms of tourism that recognise the cultural, social and environmental well-being of the coastline;
5. To use the MHC to promote marine conservation and coastal zone management; and
6. To assist effective communication and decision-making.

The initiative continues to generate considerable local support and a number of projects and schemes have been developed and implemented since 1993:

- Voluntary 8 knot speed limit within MHC area;
- Marine Conservation Code of Conduct;
- Passenger boat Code of Conduct;
- Cetacean Site Use and Boat Traffic within MHC, 1994 –2004;
- Wildlife boat trips and coastline walks;
- Annual seabird breeding colony census;
- Interpretation and education (e.g. MHC mural at New Quay).

As the designation was derived from community campaigning it was considered very important to harness and build on local support and adopt a participatory approach. In this light, hundreds of local people have been involved in various projects since the initiative began, with approximately over 6200 volunteer hours have being put into dolphin research related activities alone.

In 1996 sections of Cardigan Bay that incorporated the MHC designation were put forward as a candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC). While this initially caused contention, with local residents questioning the need for a statutory designation when local efforts were already underway, the community decided that the designations should run alongside to ensure a holistic to coastal management approach was adopted.

The MHC was always considered a pilot project and one that would provide a model for wider coastal management in the long term. As a testament to its success, MHC measures have provided a basis for many of the management actions currently being developed for the cSAC. Indeed, lessons learnt about the importance of effective communication in order to build trust and understanding are being implemented on a County and cSAC wide basis as a consequence of the scheme.

In co-ordination with other management initiatives the future of the MHC is bright. There is a continuing programme of activities in order to increase awareness amongst coastal users and plans have been developed to widen the concept of the MHC to the whole coastline through a Ceredigion-wide recreational boating scheme.

For more info visit: www.cardiganbaysac.org.uk or call 01545 572142

Wales Environment Link

(Dr. Madeleine Havard).

Wales Environment Link (WEL) is a network for voluntary environmental and countryside non-governmental organisations with an all-Wales remit. Established in 1989 as an umbrella body, WEL helps represent the shared interests of its 23 member organisations, who in turn represent over 170,000 subscribing members in Wales. These interests include the conservation, protection, access and quiet enjoyment of the landscape, wildlife, historic environment and features of general public amenity in Wales.

As the co-ordinating body for the major voluntary organisations in the environmental field in Wales we:

- Provide a voice for the environment movement in Wales
- Advocate to government and key decision makers the collective views of our members
- Enhance communication and dialogue *between* our members and with government
- Provides a number of services for its members including the weekly Assembly Bulletin

For more information please visit <http://www.waleslink.org>

Lacken Community Development Organisation

(Gerry Murphy).

Lacken is a remote rural coastal region situated on the north west coast of Ireland in Co. Mayo. The area is characterised by low population density, poor infrastructure and a reduction in traditional employment sectors, principally farming. It was becoming evident that by the 1990s the Lacken area was losing the ability to compete in a progressive economy, residential and farming properties were being converted to seasonal accommodation and area was experiencing difficulty in attracting investment.

In 1998, Lacken Development Association was founded to respond to the aforementioned issues. In 1999, to identify how Lacken Development Association could make an impact, it was decided to conduct a study of the area and formulate a Development Plan. A

questionnaire was distributed locally and a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis was undertaken. The findings from this research provided the blueprint for the future direction of the development association. A key finding was the growing need for a strong umbrella group representing the area to spearhead attempts to liaise with government agencies and to provide cohesiveness in efforts to identify how Lacken could bring about sustainable development in the area. Since going forward in trying to implement the plan for the area, Lacken Development Association has experienced both successes and difficulties, many of which are comparable to those facing other coastal communities.

3.2 Resourcing Session – Abstracts of Presentations

INTERREG Funding Streams – INTERREG IIIA

(Rhian Llewelyn).

INTERREG III is a Community Initiative, which promotes cross-border, transnational and inter-regional co-operation in the European Union and its border regions. The Ireland/Wales INTERREG IIIA Programme supports joint Irish/ Welsh projects. It aims to promote the sustainable development of the cross-border region through an integrated approach to economic, social and environmental development. The Programme is financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). The Programme covers the Local Authority areas of Carmarthenshire, Ceredigion, Conwy, Denbighshire, Gwynedd, Pembrokeshire and Anglesey in Wales. In Ireland it covers the counties of Dublin, Kildare, Meath, Wicklow, Carlow, Kilkenny, Tipperary (south), Waterford and Wexford.

The total budget for the Programme is €65.5 million (over £40 million at current exchange rates). The Programme lasts from 2000 to 2006. Projects must be approved before the end of 2006. However, payments on projects can continue until the end of 2008. In Wales the maximum rate of grant is generally 75% of the total eligible cost. With the rate being 50% for Ireland from January 2006. The next deadline for submission of project proposals is Summer 2004.

The Programme has two main Priorities, each of which is divided into a number of different Measures. Cross cutting themes of the Programme are equal opportunities,

environmental sustainability and the development of the Information Society. Priority One is to encourage the economic, social and technological development of the cross-border area, this Priority has four measures. Priority Two is to achieve sustainable growth by enhancing the overall quality of the cross-border area. Measure One of this strand is: Marine and Coastal Development and the Environment. Overall, a total of €8.6 million was allocated to this Measure, of which 69% has been committed with the forecast balance of €2.6 million.

Indicative actions of Priority Two, Measure One include:

- Promoting sustainable marine and coastal resource development;
- Protecting and managing the marine and coastal environment;
- Improving understanding of the marine and coastal environment.

Projects currently receiving funding via this Measure include Clean Coasts which is a project being undertaken by An Taisce in Ireland and Keep Wales Tidy in Wales. Clean Coasts have been introduced in Meath, Dublin, Wicklow, Wexford and Waterford. Keep Wales Tidy have been able to transfer a lot of experience to An Taisce as part of the project.

INTERREG is looking for the next round of projects in the Marine and Coastal Development Measure that would ideally involve the community and Local Authorities. Examples of these kind of projects would be networks e.g. SACs in the Irish Sea, Biodiversity Officers, Coastal Engineers- these have the potential to be sustainable and lead on to further collaboration.

Contact Details:

Welsh European Funding Office website: www.wefo.wales.gov.uk

Interreg Development Officer web-site: www.interreg.ie

Development Officer for North Wales: Jonathan Walsh

Canolfan Busnes Ynys Môn

Llangefni

Ynys Môn LL77 7XA

Ffôn / Tel: +44 (0) 1248 752141

E-bost/ E-mail: jmwpl@anglesey.gov.uk

Development Officer for West Wales: Rhian Llewelyn

Canolfan Ewropeaidd Gorllewin Cymru / West Wales European Centre

Adeilad Dewi / Dewi Building

Coleg y Drindod / Trinity College

Caerfyrddin / Carmarthen

SA31 3EP

Ffôn / Tel: 01267 224814

E-bost: rllewelyn@sirgar.gov.uk

E-mail: rllewelyn@carmarthenshire.gov.uk

Development Officer for Ireland: Paul O’Keeffe

St Manntan’s House, Kilmantin Hill

Wicklow

Co Wicklow

Ffôn / Tel: +353 (0) 404 66058

E-bost/ E-mail: interreg@eircom.net

Irish Funding Opportunities and Mechanisms

(Bill Walsh).

Wexford Organisation for Rural Development (WORD) was established in 1991 to implement the LEADER I programme in Wexford. The success of WORD meant the organisation continued to act as a conduit for the subsequent LEADER II programme (1995 -1999) and the current LEADER+ programme (from 2000-2006).

LEADER is a EU rural development initiative, established in response to changes in rural areas; declining employment levels, growing isolation of communities, changing demographics and developments in both national and European policies (CAP, GATT). These changes presented major challenges for rural, coastal or otherwise, communities. The need to examine job and wealth creation in non-traditional farm activities and in the

non-agricultural sector has become increasingly important. This is particularly poignant for Wexford as it is predominantly a rural based county and agriculture will continue to play a crucial role in the foreseeable future.

WORD's objective is to establish a network with a community-wide vision that will facilitate a process of mutual learning and exchange of experience, and which will ultimately support these communities in the future. In assisting to identify and evaluate community needs, WORD recognises the importance for increased rural development based on participation from the community. The emphasis for local development must come from these communities in order to preserve their unique identity. Essentially, rural communities are helping to contribute to their own survival.

LEADER is organised around a number of priority themes, actions eligible for grant aid include training, analysis and development, innovative rural enterprises, craft enterprises and local services/facilities, exploitation of agriculture, forestry and fisheries products, enhancement of natural/built/social/cultural environment, environmentally friendly initiatives and rural and agricultural tourism.

Cross- Wales Funding Mechanisms

(Dr. Kirsty Dernie).

The Countryside Council for Wales (CCW) administers a grant budget of around £3-4 million per year that is used as a key mechanism to work in partnership with others in Wales, allowing CCW to support those who share our objectives so that both parties can work together to achieve common goals. CCW work with many partners including public bodies, voluntary organisations and individuals and have supported a huge variety of projects. However, CCW grants cannot be used in commercially profitable projects, for pure academic research or towards professional qualifications. CCW can normally offer to fund up to 50% (or more in special circumstances) of the eligible costs of work that is aligned to our corporate strategy (see <http://www.ccw.gov.uk>). Individuals who have ideas for projects that are of benefit to the environment should contact their local CCW office to discuss these further with the local grant officer, who will do their best to answer any

questions, help to develop a project idea that is in line with CCWs objectives, or provide direction to other sources of funding if a CCW grant is not appropriate.

Other funding bodies that may be of help include:

Environment Wales: (<http://www.environment-wales.org/>),

Sustainable Development Fund available through National Parks and AONBs in Wales: (<http://www.countryside.wales.gov.uk/fe/master.asp?n1=3&n2=338>),

Crown Estate Marine Stewardship Fund:

(http://www.thecrownestate.co.uk/09_marine_stewardship_04_02_06),

Lottery Funding: (<http://www.lotterygoodcauses.org.uk/heritage.htm>, www.community-fund.org.uk, <http://www.nof.org.uk/>),

Award for All Wales: (www.awardsforall.org.uk/cymraeg/wales/)

Esmee Fairbairn Foundation: (<http://www.esmeefairbairn.org.uk/>).

See the websites for further information.

Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum

(Dr. Steve Morris).

The Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum was established in 2000 has 13 funders. These provide a range of funding including core funding, funding in kind and project-based grant funding. The aim of the forum is:

“To promote the sustainable and strategic approach to the planning, management, use and development of the Pembrokeshire Coast and Waterway”.

In June 1999, Pembrokeshire College volunteers convened meetings of a set-up group. This group worked to define forum objectives and obtain project funding for the forum. European Regional Development (Objective 1) funding was obtained with match funding from listed organisations, some as cash and some as “in kind” funding. The latter includes the Milford Haven Port Authority who currently house the Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum office.

In December 2001 staffing of the Forum team saw Tonia Forsyth appointed as Project Officer. The 3-year Objective 1 funding relates specifically to two tasks, these being:

- Secure position of the Forum at the hub of the ICZM Network in Pembrokeshire
- Preparation of an ICZM Strategy for Pembrokeshire

The progress that Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum has made includes the development of the forum's organisational structure. This contains a steering committee, topic groups, a management group, the Forum team and a Forum chair (currently the MP for Carmarthenshire West and South Pembrokeshire). Currently, the Forum has over 900 individuals and organisation on its mailing list.

The management and development of the Forum consists of many task and functions that include:

- Source, collate and disseminate information
- Publicity and marketing
- Debate / information exchange and networking
- Awareness raising

The ICZM Strategy for Pembrokeshire is currently underway and is using Issue reports to guide its development. To date, a significant and tangible outcome of the Forum has been the creation of a Marine Code. This was accomplished via the facilitation of meetings and discussions, culminating in the establishment of a voluntary marine code for tour boat operators. The development of an Outdoor Charter has been another challenging project, the aim of which has been:

‘To promote the sustainable use of Pembrokeshire for outdoor activities in the marine and terrestrial environment’.

Despite the project having been perceived as an essential component of the management of the Pembrokeshire Coast, it was felt that it was “losing its way” and required new funding. Subsequently, the project has been re-established with new funding and an officer under the management of the Coastal Forum Officer.

Threats that face the Forum include the uncertain status of ICZM at National and EU level. There is also a potential failure of will to continue amongst some of the funding partners. Issues related to the lack of continuity of funding, as Objective 1 funds are due to

run out at the end of 2004. However, the strengths of the Forum lie in it being a genuine “bottom up” approach to ICZM that has evolved from interaction amongst stakeholders in Pembrokeshire. The acceptance and awareness of the Forum is high due to the work of the Forum team who continue to work to secure funding for the Forum so that it remains the focus for ICZM in Pembrokeshire.

Freshwater East Coastcare Group

(Steve Cannon).

The Coastcare project is part of the Keep Wales Tidy Project Part that is financed by European Union. It is supported by other agencies including:

- Welsh County Councils and Port Authorities
- Wales Tourist Board
- Environment Agency Wales
- Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water
- Countryside Council For Wales
- Pembrokeshire Coast National Park

The aim of the project is to involve local communities in caring for their coastal environment. Community groups are encouraged to “*adopt*” a beach or stretch of coastline. Groups can receive grants for purchasing of equipment (gloves, tools, etc), insurance and administration. Keep Wales Tidy Project Officers are assigned to each group to provide advice and practical assistance.

Freshwater East Coastcare Group was established in June 1999 and currently has 14 active members with additional regular support from other members of the local community. This group is one of the most active and innovative of Coastcare groups in Wales. The objective of this group is:

“To preserve and enhance the rural aspect of the beach and its environment for the mutual benefit of all”.

To achieve this aim the group has worked with and will continue to work with other interested groups in a spirit of consultation, participation and partnership. The group has been extremely active and has undertaken:

- Beach cleans and surveys
- Meetings with agencies involved with the beach
- Provision of bins and bio-degradable dog bags
- Marine mammal First Aid course
- Regular monitoring
- Water quality
- Otter Watch
- Code of Conduct
- Regular meetings
- Raising awareness

In order to raise awareness of the group and funds the group have been innovative in their approach that has included:

- Production of a CD featuring local bands
- Local community and ATC in beach cleans
- Leaflets produced and distributed about the group and its work
- Beer mats with environmental message distributed round amenities in the local area
- Radio interviews
- FEDO Leaflets
- Treasure hunt and environmental quizzes

4. FIELD CASE STUDIES

4.1 Introduction

During the workshop, several field excursions provided a local perspective of coastal management in mid Wales and allowed delegates to network informally. The fieldtrips that were held on the Friday afternoon involved visits to two sites, Borth and Ynyslas and included talks from a local councillor Ray Quant and the warden from the National Nature Reserve, Mike Bailey. On the Saturday morning, a short boat trip from New Quay was arranged for delegates to view the Ceredigion Marine Heritage Coast and the Cardigan Bay SAC from a seaward perspective.

4.2 Borth Visit

Workshop delegates were greeted on the slipway at Borth by Councillor Ray Quant who gave a short talk on several of the coastal management issues being faced by the local

community. Firstly, an introduction to the site was given. This highlighted the close proximity of the village of Borth (including residential and commercial properties) to the coast (Figure 1).



Figure 1. View of Borth coast- looking northwards (Photo: Rhoda Ballinger, MACE).

Other usage of the site by locals and as well as visitors in the tourist season was identified. The need for coastal defence to protect development was discussed. Issues of flood defence and maintenance of the current coastal defence, including the groynes were explained along with a brief overview of the controversial plans for an offshore artificial reef. The reef's construction would seek to improve coastal protection, by absorbing much of the approaching wave energy. Additionally, it is envisaged that it would create impressive surfing conditions, which would boost the region's tourism.



Figure 2. Delegates at Borth (Photo: Jim Mitchell, Severn Estuary Partnership).

4.3 Ynyslas Visit

After the visit to Borth, delegates were then taken to the Dyfi National Nature Reserve. Countryside Council for Wales warden, Mike Bailey met delegates and gave a brief overview of the site's importance in terms of its flora and fauna. He also described the ongoing management of the site. The Dyfi site has other ecological designations including a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. The site has many similar coastal management issues to that of North Bull Island that was visited during the first CoCoNet workshop (for those delegates that attended the first workshop, this provided an opportunity for comparison). Visitor management practices included zoned visitor parking on the beach, boardwalks around the sand dunes, look- out points and the creation of the interpretation centre, acting as a honey pot for visitors.



Figure 3. Delegates at Ynyslas Reserve (Photo: Jim Mitchell, Severn Estuary Partnership).



Figure 4. Delegates within the Ynyslas Reserve Interpretation Centre (Photo: Rhoda Ballinger, MACE).

4.4 New Quay Boat Trip

A boat trip was organised with one of the local boat operators that operates out of New Quay harbour and who provides marine wildlife tours for tourists during the summer season. Cardigan Bay SAC Officer, Jamie Davies attended and provided the group with informal discussions relating to the management of the SAC. This site is designated solely on the basis of its resident population of Bottlenose dolphins (one of only two sites in the UK). Pressures facing the site from tourism and the proposals for a new tourism development (Baywatch) that could see thousands more tourists coming to the area every year were discussed. On the boat trip delegates participated in dolphin and porpoise watching as well as networking with other delegates.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

As with the organisation of the first workshop, opportunities for discussion amongst delegates were extremely important. For this reason, coastal surgery participatory sessions were run on the Friday afternoon. The rationale behind these was that delegates should have ample opportunity to access the speakers that had presented earlier in the day.

Speakers were assigned to the coastal surgery that was most appropriate to their knowledge thus allowing them to input into the discussions and answer questions or queries. During these sessions a facilitator directed and focused discussions whilst a scribe recorded the main discussion points. Additionally, the use of Post It notes ensured all delegates were able to input into the session and allowed the CoCoNet team to carry out post-workshop analysis.

Although three coastal surgeries were designed to run (**Funding Future Projects**, **Political Engagement** and **Network Solutions**), demand from delegates proving to be only for the Funding Future Projects and Network Solutions led to the CoCoNet team making the decision not to run the Political Engagement surgery. It was considered that this issue would also feature prominently with the remaining surgery topic discussions.

5.2 Coastal Surgery – Funding Future Projects

This coastal surgery proved most popular amongst delegates. The first part of this participatory session was used to establish what the participants felt were the main constraints or problems relating to funding for coastal management activities. The second part involved a brainstorming exercise which allowed delegates to put forward suggestions to overcome these constraints either with hypothetical suggestions and ideas or solutions from personal experience. Throughout the session delegates sought to ask questions of the speakers that were present.

The main constraints and problems that the group identified are as follows:

- The complex application procedure;
- Difficulties in finding match funding to assist in funding bids;
- Funding constraints that create limited time spans for projects;
- Administrative procedures which drain project resources (time and money);
- Lack of carry-over funds for projects;
- Difficulties in finding suitable grant aiders;
- Lack of revenue to cover running costs of project;
- Lack of partner available to merge with for projects;
- Lack of private sector involvement;
- Small funding schemes.

With these constraints identified, solutions were sought from the group. A host of ideas and suggestions were made (Table 1).

Table 1 Post It Note Suggestions- Coastal Surgery A

Coastal Surgery: Funding Future Projects	
Constraints Identified	Suggested Solutions
Complex Application Procedure	Information on available funding to be readily available
	Easy Access start up funding
	Use designated officers who are there to help you
	One stop shop to inform project proposers where to start
	Comprehensive funding explanation resource (online / interactive)
	Training workshops on funding
	Identify grant schemes that have proved successful in the past and are user friendly
Difficult to Find Match Funding	Seek advice of those who have completed application process
	Match funding not to be a pre-requisite
Limited Time Span	Minimum funding time span of 5 years
	Creation of 9 year funding package that is reviewed every 3 years
	Use of planning cycles (e.g. 10yrs)
Resources spent on Administration	Appoint Officer to carry out administrative costs
	Add these costs to initial application for project management
	More funding that is flexible enough to support running costs of clearly beneficial projects
Lack of Carry- Over Funds	Fiscal incentives for large companies to find community/ sustainability projects in coastal sector
Finding Suitable Grant Aider	No Post It note suggestions put forward
Lack of Revenue / Running Costs	Audit of grant schemes and identify projects where revenue funding is essential for continuity
Lack of Partners	Web portal i.e. everyone who is interested in finding partners logs their details, who they need, project type etc.
	Website to assist groups to find suitable partners
	Networking regionally & identifying likely partners within the voluntary sector - try to all involve all relevant stakeholders
Lack of Private Sector Involvement	Involve private sector funding without alienating public sector
	Research into benefits of industry in engaging in partnership work and/or statutory responsibility to get involved
Small Funding Schemes	Could have one large bid made for small community led projects to access
	Grant giving projects within larger funding programmes
	Small grant schemes - often precursors to community interest
Misc	Establish local authority / community organisation forums
	Publish information leaflet on sources of funding, list organisations, website addresses

Solutions to the complex administration process included seeking the help and advice of those involved in the processing of applications, such as INTERREG Development

Officers, and from those who are familiar with completing the requisite application forms. This constraint received the most suggestions, indicating the valuable knowledge and experience of the participants.

The significant problems and constraints that many groups face in trying to secure match funding proved to be a less easily overcome issue. Few practical suggestions were provided and it was felt by some that only major revisions to funding procedures would enable attempts to address this issue. However, with regards to finding match funding, innovative suggestions included the creation of a “*dating agency*” style website to facilitate finding suitable partners for ICZM projects.

Practical solutions were put forward on many of the constraints. These included:

- The inclusion of administration duties into project application bids, e.g. including the cost of appointing a part-time administrator;
- The amalgamation of a number of small community- led projects into one bid to address the problems that small scale project face in accessing funds;
- Seeking grant schemes within larger funding programmes as a way for smaller scale community projects to gain funds.

Dissemination of information on funding availability was felt crucial and several suggestions incorporated the creation of a handbook or information pack to serve this purpose.



Figure 5. Discussions and brainstorming by delegates during coastal surgeries (Photo: Rhoda Ballinger, MACE).

5.2 Coastal Surgery – Networking

This group that was smaller in number than the Funding Future Projects surgery, took the opportunity to consider many issues relating to networks both past, current and future.

Participants were keen to look at the realities of networks in terms of their sustainability and outputs. The lifespans of networks in relation to funding cycles were discussed as part of this. The outcomes and objectives of networks were investigated as it was felt that there is a need for definition and navigation to be a fundamental part of the communication and feedback aspect of a network. The different drivers of a network were identified as topic based/ problem / conflict / concern- centred. Past networks that have dissolved (such as the Cardigan Bay Forum) highlight the success that a network can attain when it is issue or problem driven and have been realistic about stakeholder commitments. Recognition that networks have to be flexible and sometimes informal was put forward by several participants. These attributes may be necessary for networks to continue to avoid the “*fading of networks*” which can occur.

The practices of current formal and informal networks such as CZMNet, CoCoNet, Countryside Management Association, local government ecologists, SAC officers were considered to see if lessons can be learnt.

Analysis of the Post- It note suggestions can be grouped into four main headings, these being:

- Pre-requisites of networks;
- Network process requirements;
- Obstacles to be avoided;
- Suggestions for types and modes of networks.

In relation to the first of these, pre-requisites of networks, suggestions from participants included the need for future projects to have clear objectives with an individual(s) to champion its cause and act as a central co-ordinator.

Undertaking the creation of a network was addressed by delegates with some suggestions from participants including the need for networks to “*incorporate a practical self-sustainability to have a real long-term effect*”. Adequate publicity of networks and their functions is needed in order to for networks to be useful to all and to reach as large a participation base as possible.

With consideration given to past networks that have become fragmented or moribund, some participants warned of the need for future networks to learn from these past experiences and mistakes. Delegates considered that it seemed essential not to “*create networks for the sake of it*”, networks should be “*relevant to all members to retain involvement and commitment*”, networks should avoid “*short-term thinking*”.

Other suggestions from the group included the creation of topic-based email groups, the use of regular bulletins by networks and conference-style meetings of stakeholders for networking purposes. A complete list of the delegates suggestions for network solutions can be found in Table 2.



Figure 6. Delegates discussing networking solutions (Photo: Rhoda Ballinger, MACE).



Figure 7. Coastal surgery discussions (Photo: Rhoda Ballinger, MACE).

Table 2 Post It Note Suggestions - Coastal Surgery B

Coastal Surgery: Network Solutions	
Constraints Identified	Suggested Solutions
Process Requirements	Identify all groups / individuals that are working on similar projects/ themes
	Must be relevant to all members to retain involvement and commitment
	Facilitators (key individuals) are essential to networks, champions
	Must have clear objectives of co-operation and not change these once made
	Publicise groups so the general public know who to contact if they have any issues to raise
Pre-requisites of Networks	There needs to be a central coordinator or co-ordinating body
	Non self- sustainable ICZM initiatives need to incorporate a practical self sustainability to have a real long term effect
	Identify what you are trying to achieve through your network before setting it up / inviting people to join
Obstacles to be avoided	Needs at least one person to 'champion' your network
	Don't create networks for the sake of it
	Obstacles = short- term thinking, over reliance on key individuals
Suggestions for types and modes of networks	Host further conferences and investigate possibility of sponsorship by ferry companies
	Compilation and circulation of a bibliography / database
	Topic based email groups - encourage fairly specific questions and answers
	Personal contacts by meetings - yearly or 6 months
	Set up groups for networking purposes
	Regular bulletins (e.g. quarterly)



Figure 8. Coastal surgery discussions (Photo: Rhoda Ballinger, MACE).

6.CONCLUSION

In both Wales and Ireland, ICZM activities at community, regional and national levels are ongoing. Differences in their funding and approaches, both in terms of membership and objectives, are evident within the southern Irish Sea groups engaged in the ICZM process. A wealth of experience exists that should and can be harnessed by these groups from both existing and past projects, networks and initiatives. The greatest hazard that groups currently face is their sustainability. The threat of collapse due to problems relating to funding and commitments of stakeholder resources and capacity is a commonality.

Issues identified in the first workshop such as resourcing, will continue to be an issue in the near future as ICZM, as a predominately voluntary affair, is at risk of funding cuts from various sources. Political engagement is, therefore, paramount to addressing some of these resourcing constraints.

ICZM is a process that has the ability to be flexible, pro-active as well as reactive to its surroundings. This along with the enthusiasm and energy of stakeholders, will allow ICZM to play a key role for those who view the protection and sustainability of the coast as paramount.

The strong representation of coastal stakeholders at both the first and second CoCoNet workshops illustrated the willingness of interested coastal stakeholders to come together via the Coastal Community Network to share and learn from others experiences. Opportunities for dialogue, coupled with the strengthening of previous networking, and the creation of new contacts was a successful element of the second CoCoNet workshop. Discussion of coastal issues and their solutions was an important feature of the event. In looking at ways forward on various suggestions, delegates often found themselves to be part of the solution, this will play an important role in future ICZM activities in the southern Irish Sea.

APPENDIX I Workshop 2 Flyer



2nd CoCoNet Workshop National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth 2nd / 3rd April, 2004



CoCoNet (Coastal Communities Network) is a project funded under INTERREG IIIA. The CoCoNet project aims to develop a network of community stakeholders with an interest in sustainable management of their local coastal resources. As countries bordering the southern Irish Sea, Ireland and Wales share experiences associated with economic growth in coastal areas and related environmental and social impacts. The participation of stakeholders is fundamental to CoCoNet's success.

The second **CoCoNet** workshop will be held in Aberystwyth on April 2nd / 3rd, 2004. The workshop will examine coastal issues with southern Irish Sea (INTERREG IIIA) region that were prioritised at the first **CoCoNet** workshop.

The interactive workshop will incorporate:

- *Informative presentations*
- *Participatory sessions and*
- *Fieldtrips to several coastal locations*

to address the coastal issues and look at ways of moving forward through sharing of current practice and improved resourcing of activities.

Programme: (see next page for detailed programme for Day 1)

Day 1 (9.00-6.30)	Day 2 (10.00-1.00)
<i>Session 1: Show Casing -Coastal Communities Activities</i>	<i>Fieldtrip: Boat trip from New Quay</i>
<i>Session 2: Resourcing ICZM Activities</i>	
<i>Fieldtrip: Ynyslas – Tour by Warden. Fieldtrip: Borth – several coastal issues will be looked at inc. PWC's and flood risk</i>	<i>Examination of Local Approaches to Management including SAC management of Cardigan Bay</i>
<i>Session 3: Coastal Surgeries</i>	

APPENDIX II Participants List

CoCoNet Workshop 2		
Delegates	Organisation	Contact Information
Alf Bowen	Aberdovey Partnership	
Alison Edwards	Pen Llyn and the Sarnau SAC Officer	AlisonPalmerEdwards@gwynedd.gov.uk
Barbara Brezina	Dublin Civil Defence	00 353-1- 677 2699
Bill Bracewell	Aberdovey Partnership	b@bracewel.freeseve.co.uk
Con Breen	SEMPA	conbreen@hotmail.com
David Poulter	Arfordir	djpoulter@carmarthenshire.gov.uk
Emily Dicks	Marine Awareness North Wales / CCW	e.dicks@ccw.gov.uk
Evangelia Moutselou	Cardiff University	MoutseloueE@cardiff.ac.uk
Gael Gibson	Wicklow County Council	ggibson@wicklowcoco.ie
Gesine Martin	Welsh Development Association	gesine.martin@wda.co.uk
Hans Visser	Fingal County Council	hans.visser@fingalcoco.ie
Ian Dutch	Ceredigion County Council	iandutch@ceredigion.gov.uk
Ian Flood	Dublin Civil Defence	
Iwan Basten	Welsh Yachting Association	iwan@wya4000.freeseve.co.uk
Jim Mitchell	Severn Estuary Partnership	MitchellJ1@cardiff.ac.uk
Joe Campbell	Dublin Civil Defence	joseph.campbell@dublincity.ie
Leigh Denyer	Ceredigion County Council	leighd@ceredigion.gov.uk
Liam Kelly	Lacken Community Development Association	
Libby Taylor	Pembrokeshire Coast National Park	libbyt@pembrokeshirecoast.org.uk
Martin Eaglestone	Anglesey County Council	mexpl@anglesey.gov.uk
Niall O' Boyle	Clew Bay Marine Forum	innishoo@hotmail.com
Nigel Nicholas	Ceredigion County Council	nigeln@ceredigion.gov.uk
Pat O'Donnell	Gorey-Courtown Forest Park Ltd.	patodonnell@eircom.net
Paul Evans	Ceredigion County Council	paule@ceredigion.gov.uk
Paul Leahy	Brittas Bay Community Development Group	pauldunes@eircom.net
Paul O'Keefe	INTERREG (Ireland)	interreg@eircom.net
Paul Owen	Future Communities Project Officer	paulo@ceredigion.gov.uk
Rhiannon Thomas	Antur Teifi	rthomas@carmarthenshire-enterprises.org.uk
Simon Thomas	MP for Ceredigion	
Wil Williams	Hafan Pwllheli Marina	wil@hafanpwllheli.co.uk
William Low	Keep Wales Tidy	William.Low@keepwalestidy.org
Speakers		
Ger Mullally	CPPU, University College Cork	g.mullally@ucc.ie
Gerry Murphy	Lacken Community Development Association	00-353-96-34964
Graham King		gad.king@virgin.net
Jamie Davies	Cardigan SAC Officer	jamied@ceredigion.gov.uk
Kirsty Dernie	CCW	k.dernie@ccw.gov.uk
Madeleine Havard	West Wales Wildlife Trust	madeleine@wwwt.co.uk
Rhian Llewelyn	WEFO	r.llewelyn@carmarthenshire.gov.uk
Steve Cannon	Freshwater East Coastcare Group	SteveCannon@chevrontexaco.com
Steve Fletcher	Southampton Institute	steve.fletcher@solent.ac.u
Steve Morris	Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum	s.morris@pembrokeshire.ac.uk
Bill Walsh	Wexford Organisation for Rural Development	bwalsh@wexfordleader.ie

Staff		
Rhoda Ballinger	MACE, Cardiff University	ballingerrc@cf.ac.uk
Hance Smith	MACE, Cardiff University	smithhd@cf.ac.uk
Wendy Dodds	MACE, Cardiff University	dodds1@cf.ac.uk
Cathal O'Mahony	CMRC, University College Cork	c.omahony@ucc.ie
Vicki O'Donnell	CMRC, University College Cork	v.odonnell@ucc.ie
Grainne Lynch	CMRC, University College Cork	g.lynch@ucc.ie

