Summary: Socio-economic Round table
FINAL

3rd July 2017, 9:30-16:30

s.Pro – sustainable projects, Kärntener Str. 20, 10827 Berlin

Content

1. Introduction

The idea of the round table was to exchange information about on-going research and to gather a better understanding of how socio-economic data can be used in order to inform and be integrated into MSP processes. Currently, research on socio-economic aspects of MSP is still in its infancy and involved researchers were interested in methodologies and approaches used in other projects. The round table fostered a better understanding of these methods, for what each of them can be used in MSP and how some of them may be combined in order to lead to stronger conclusions. Additionally the round table concretised interesting research questions.

So far socio-economic data used in MSP is mainly related to the value of sector, employment figures and number of companies. To a certain extend it also considers dynamics and drivers how business is developing. What is missing so far, is a better understanding as well as methods of how to valorise the maritime space for each sector; the land-sea interactions and the effects of planning decisions.

2. Objectives

The round table participants:

- Shared views, experiences and insights;
- Formed a greater shared understanding;
- Updated each other about on-going socio-economic approaches and methodologies; and
- Gathered an understanding of how these may be used in an MSP process
- as well as discussing on whether and how these can be improved in order to better comply to the needs of the MSP community.

3. Participants

Participants included researchers, MSP authorities, MSP project partners, and Regional Sea Convention (HELCOM) representatives. Please see Appendix 1 for the full list of participants.

4. Format of the day

The day was a mix of presentations and group discussions. The presentations brought participants up-to-date with current research on socio-economics in the coastal and marine area with a view towards land-sea connections. It also provided first ideas on how socio-economic methodologies could support the development and implementation of MSP.

The discussions allowed participants to gather insights about on-going research and practical work in other areas of the Baltic Sea and to share views with other sectors in an effort to understand key issues affecting the achievement of a sustainable development of the sea uses. After each presentation, participants could ask questions to the presenter and collectively brainstorm about:

a) What did I learn?

b) What did I not understand?

c) What can I take for my future work?

The discussions will be a starting point for further discussion and meetings, also in other EU sea basins and possibly under the frame of the MSP Platform "workshops upon request".

Please see Appendix 2 for a more detailed agenda.

5. Session 1 – Sharing of experiences from advanced methods

Four presentations set the context for the session.

5.1 Jan Maarten de Vet, Ecorys: Methods for doing socio-economic analysis in the Blue Growth area with relevance for MSP – looking back at earlier work

- Methodology for the onshore and offshore area –

What was the underlying question?

- What are the value chains of maritime economic activities (MEAs), including new and emerging MEAs?

Aim and method

The <u>aim</u> of the DG MARE study from the year 2014[1] was to measure MEAs and to understand the value chains, including new and emerging MEAs

A forerunner study, the DG MARE study (2013)[2], aimed to identify the potential of Blue Growth in the Baltic Member States and to provide recommendations for its development in the context of the EUSBSR. The study follows a sectoral approach, which does not capture half of the maritime economic activities.

To measure activities in a more specific division of activities, activity-specific indicators as well as more general indicators have been used for the presented DG MARE study from 2014. It followed a <u>mixed approach</u>:

- Specification of value chains based on 27 MEAs from the Blue Growth report
- Mapping MEAs to NACE codes – versus alternative approaches (e.g. short-sea shipping or marine aquatic resources based on NACE, blue technology or offshore wind estimated by using alternative sources)
- Collection of statistical data (Eurostat, national sources)
- Allocation to maritime / non-maritime activities
- Allocation between maritime economic activities

Transferability and difficulties

The mixed approach is <u>transferable</u>, however the following aspects have to be taken into account when applying the method:

- Complexity of socio-economic analysis
- Conflict between sectoral, functional and spatial dimensions
- No one size fits all approach; the different dimensions play out differently across MEAs
- Need to understand the MEAs involved
- Combination of statistical and field research approaches useful
- Emerging MEAs particularly hard to cover

Above all, there exist <u>challenges</u> in measuring maritime economic activities:

- Split between terrestrial and maritime activities
- Many sectors relevant for more than one activity
- New or emerging activities insufficiently covered (biotechnology, energy)
- Economic sectors close to the sea are not necessary maritime (e.g. manufacturing of essential parts of cruise ships)

---

[1] DG MARE (2014): Study on Deepening Understanding of Potential Blue Growth in the EU Member States on Europe's Atlantic Arc. Sea Basin Report. FWC MARE/2012/06; consortium lead by <u>Ecorys</u>; partners: s.Pro and MRAG. https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/maritimeforum/sites/maritimeforum/files/Blue%20Growth%20Atlantic_Seabasin%20report%20FINAL%2007Mar14.pdf

[2] DG MARE (2013): COGEA et al. (2013): Study on Blue Growth, Maritime Policy and the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region. Final Report. MARE/2012/07 – Ref. No. 1; consortium lead by <u>COGEA;</u> partners: AND International, Eurofish; contributions by s.Pro. https://sustainable-projects.eu/downloads/Final_Report_Revision_6_Dec_2013NEW_TEMPLATE.pdf

To address the conflict between the sectoral, functional and spatial dimension, the two recommended approaches are the sectoral and functional approach.

Lessons learned

- Important to understand the value chains of maritime economic activities, preferably at the level of activities rather than sectors.
- Combine statistical approach and field research approaches (top-down + bottom-up).
- Specific studies are required to analyse emerging maritime economic activities.
- Qualitative methods are necessary to compensate for the lack of topical data. Therefore, assumptions could be made in a transparent manner.

Please see attached ppt. No. 1, Appendix 3

5.2 Barbara Weig, s.Pro: A spatial cost-benefit analysis to support planners in assessing the spatial distribution of economic costs and benefits of shipping and offshore wind farms from the BaltSpace project (BONUS)

- Methodology for the onshore area –

What was the underlying question?

- To develop a method which allows to show the allocations of costs and benefits of marine sectors across a country?

Aim and method

A maritime spatial planner has to make spatial designations for different sea uses. These decisions often involve trade-offs between different maritime sectors. For example, the question whether more space should be allocated for offshore wind parks, even if this has negative impacts on sectors like shipping and coastal tourism, could arise. The task of the study was therefore to develop a replicable analytical method ('tool') for other regions, and to test it for the German Baltic Sea.

To meet this aim, a multitude of considerations entered the analysis. One of the aspects tackled by the tool was to get an understanding of who actually benefits from a certain sea use and where the beneficiaries are located. For example, does the coastal population benefit because of jobs in the area or are it rather the industrial centres? Answers to these questions also arise when maritime spatial planners are talking to stakeholders to explain and support their suggestions for spatial designations.

When developing the methodology, it became obvious that sectors are very different and that each economic sector requires a specific approach. Therefore, a detailed methodology for offshore wind energy and shipping was developed. Tourism and fishing were addressed as well, but less comprehensively. At the beginning, sector activities were put into a sequential order, in order to capture all relevant aspects. For offshore wind energy, this is a value chain; for shipping, a transport chain.

Data need to be harvested "by hand" to integrate them in a database for the visualisation tool. There is no ready to use compilation available on portals like Eurostat. The methodology has been therefore developed in the first place to address this need for compilation. No first-hand data have been used; rather, data from ports and statistical offices was compiled.

A pre-requisite for conducting a spatial cost-benefit analysis is a mapping tool. Here the software RegioGraph, provided by GfK Geomarketing was used. The program provides basic maps for Europe and allows the import of own databases to design maps.

End product of the spatial cost-benefit analysis has been a collection of easy-to-read maps showing the spatial distribution of beneficiaries. The maps can support decisions and arguments, related to MSP and other processes.

Transferability and difficulties

The method is adaptable to other regions if data is available. Limitations are the availability of data, the time-consuming exercise when assigning each company to one or more segments of the value chain based on the information on the company's website, as well as the mapping method. Furthermore, there cannot be one tool for all sectors. Costs and benefits can be analysed from different angles, e.g. taking into account different types of costs (economic, social, ecological, opportunity). The study focused more on different groups of beneficiaries (supply, demand).

It was not possible to estimate the monetary costs and benefits.

Lessons learned

- The location of an operator or owner of, for example, offshore wind, has an impact on the location of other involved companies.
- It is possible to identify geographic hotspots in terms of the different stages relevant for an offshore wind development.
- The number of enterprises can be a feasible indicator.
- The method supports a better understanding of economics behind specific maritime sectors.
- Some steps of the methodology can be transferred easily but are time-consuming.
- In a next step, the methodology could be developed for other sectors, taking into account the inter-relation between land and sea.
- In further surveys the monetary costs and benefits could be estimated as well.
- The updated HELCOM map service, which has been verified by the Member States could be used for further analysis.
- The mapping is an appealing way to show difficult issues to the public.
- The analysis could be cross-compared with the study under 5.3 (Methodological approach related to offshore wind projects), e.g. related to numbers of specific companies.

Please see attached ppt. No. 2, Appendix 3

5.3 Annica C. Lind, Energicontor Sydost AB (Energy Agency for Southeast Sweden): Methodological approach related to offshore wind projects

- Methodology for the onshore area –

What was the underlying question?

- How many jobs were created and what is the potential for job creation due to the expansion of offshore wind in the region?

Aim and method

The Sölvesborgs municipality has two cases of offshore wind power establishments in recent years: Blekinge Offshore (500-700 turbines, up to 2,500 MW installed power) and Taggen (80 turbines, up to 300 MW). Due to the different sizes of these two, the bigger one has received the most attention, and after the rejection of Blekinge Offshore, new investigations are needed.

The purpose of the (recently started) project is a socio-economic study on Taggen (municipality of Sölvesborg). Here different development scenarios have been analysed and how these would affect their municipality. The report will be delivered before staff working at the OW site will quit their service.

The analysis used the calculation model from 2010 to show the number of new jobs created by the expansion of the wind power (based on numbers from Vattenfall and from the Blekinge Offshore report). These numbers result in costs of 1655 kSEK per one fulltime job during one year and per installed MW. It

has been estimated that 15.1 fulltime jobs (work opportunities) per installed MW can be created. Operating and maintenance costs per year have been taken into account in this calculation as well.

The work opportunities offered due to the development in the wind power sector are:

- Direct temporary and permanent jobs, at Vattenfall
- Local business, that can be benefit due to the wind power and therefor get the opportunity to reach larger markets
- The ability to create technical bubs, like education, services, studies on ships and transports, and ports

Additionally to the numbers for the whole Taggen area, Vattenfall suggested to use the local effect of 5-10 %.[3] On the industrial side, future perspectives are seen in the ports. The maintenance harbour will employ 30 annual jobs directly at Vattenfall, with presumably 30 more subcontractors.

First results are provided related to the number of jobs for the first five years and also 20 years ahead, mainly for maintenance and the subcontracting services. Also first numbers for how high investments have to be to create new jobs are available.

Transferability and difficulties

The approach is <u>transferable</u> if sufficient data is available. The calculation costs are based on existing offshore wind farms and at least five years monitoring and experience with the sector. A <u>shortcoming</u> of the study could be the use of data provided by one company only. Also the regional costs and benefits of offshore wind have not been assessed. It is difficult to distinguish between temporary and permanent jobs although relevant for outputs. Multi-use approaches are not taken into account yet.

Lessons learned

- The method was developed to show the number of jobs created by one sector in a specific region.
- The costs of jobs are referring to the average, not the local level.
- The method could include multi-use approaches, including synergies and barriers.
- The presented method could be elaborated to combine regional economic consequences and trade-offs between sectors.
- The absence of official data increases the reliance on industry data, which may cause biases.
- The change in jobs due to the increase of efficiency of OW has not yet been analysed.
- In future work the benefits of the local markets could be investigated as well.

Please see attached ppt. No. 3, Appendix 3

5.4 Adam Mytlewski, MIR, Department of Fisheries Economics: Economic valorisation of Polish sea space in relation to fishery and its implication for the Polish MSP

 - Methodology for the offshore area –

---

[3] The numbers are taken from an investment of offshore wind power mill (/MW). Vattenfall describes 5-10% of the work/job usually end up locally. How much depends on how active the local companies are when the contracts are written.

What was the underlying question?

- Which areas of the Polish sea territory are important for the fisheries sector?

Aim and method

The <u>aim</u> of the study was to valorise fisheries to identify the most important areas for this sector within Poland, currently developing an MSP Plan. In January 2018 the environmental assessment will be backed by a coastal fishery assessment. The first version of the MSP Plan is expected in April 2018.

<u>Method:</u> The study will be finished end of 2017, containing a survey and having interviewed 70% of fishermen to localise where they use passive gear types. The methodology contained the following steps:

- Development of a methodology to define value of a marine space for a specific sector
- Identification of sources of information
- Calculations
- Analyses and modelling of thresholds
- Binary scoring of the importance of the fishery function
- Mapping of the fishery function

The study was based on fisheries data such as costs, revenues, and fixed and variable costs to assess the productivity of the area. All data available for the 10% marine territory of Poland have been used and all assumptions are related to the whole area, based on smaller fishery segments. In addition, Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data measured in the unit 'one kilometre of sea square' like operational data of the fleet, recorded catches and efforts have been the basis for assessing efforts intensity in an area. Specific outputs of the calculation are the costs of fishing intensity in the sea square and the spatial distribution of variable cost intensity of the Polish fishery, the productivity of the sea areas and the spatial distribution of this productivity. Also a synthesis has been drawn:

- To valuate intensity and productivity approaches and
- To map the results including the routes of the fleet.

In a next step, the main other uses of the areas like nature protection, transport and renewable energy will be correlated to follow a multifunctional approach and to show overlapping issues

Transferability and difficulties

The method itself is <u>transferable</u> to all other sea regions, depending on the availability of data.

The main <u>difficulty</u> when adapting the method was with the thresholds. After the calculation it had to be defined whether specific areas were important or not. Also, a better precision of the sea squares to valorise fisheries would have provided more precise results.

One shortcoming may be the missing ecosystem approach in the analysis. Also the dependency of fishery on factors like port proximity or water quality is difficult to track. The difference between intensity of fisheries and productivity is also an aspect, which could be outlined in more detail within the analysis.

Lessons learned

- The method is applicable to valorise marine space for a given sector.
- Measuring the value of a fish stock is however difficult regarding the accuracy of results.
- The method can be extended to other sectors to benefit the MSP processes.
- Further development of the method could highlight the relationship between important maritime space areas for a specific sector and the economic value (jobs, property) on land.
- The "co-use" of space important for the fisheries sector has to be taken into account as well.
- VMS data could gain a stronger role for MSP.
- The method has to take into account the benefits of land-sea interactions related to fisheries.
- A combination of the methods under 5.2 and 5.4 could show the valorisation on land and at sea and to understand the interrelations.

6. Session 2 – Learning more about the project Plan4Blue

6.1 Riitta Pöntynen, University of Turku: Blue Growth scenarios

- Methodology for the onshore area –

What was the underlying question?

- What are the Blue Growth scenarios for selected blue economy sectors in some regions of Finland?

Aim and method

The aim of the Plan4Blue project is to produce Blue Growth scenarios for selected blue economy sectors in the Gulf of Finland, Archipelago Sea and their coastal areas. The Blue Economy sectors include energy, maritime cluster (shipping, ship building and clean tech), tourism, "blue" bio economy and sub-sea resources.

Work package 1 is on the potential for Blue Economies, consisting of an economic analysis on the development of scenarios and followed by guidelines and recommendations. WP 2 focuses on environment, WP 3 on spatial aspects, WP 4 on MSP solutions.

Scenarios are 'sustainable scenarios', combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. They may be forecasting, backcasting, and developed with stakeholder participation to accommodate expertise: multi-sectoral and cross-border expertise from the Delphi panel and workshops. The Delphi panel is the expertise panel, currently 55 experts representing blue economy sectors, public and private sector associations and administrations (e.g. councils, ministries) from Estonia and Finland.

Online questionnaires where maps could be drawn have been used, as well as desktop research.

The Delphi-panel has also assessed synergies and conflicts of between business sectors, and drivers affecting the development of blue economy.

A scenario workshop was arranged in Helsinki, June 2017 to complement and assess the results.

6.2 Tuomas Pohjola, University of Turku: Current status and potential for blue economy in the Gulf of Finland and the Archipelago Sea – indicators

- Methodology for the onshore area –

What was the underlying question?

What is the effect of seas on both, regional and municipal level economy?

Aim and method

In order to understand the effect of seas on both regional- and municipal-level economy, municipality data was analysed, looking closer at industries and their locations, including information about employment and population data (also from national statistics).

Main indicators of the method:

- Population and employment,
- Industry turnover and number of employees,

- Productivity,
- Company location and density,
- R&D and high technology investments, and
- Maritime patents.

During the workshop presenters discussed other perspectives affecting the Blue Economy potential in the Gulf of Finland:

- Research and education are crucial for business success,
- Social aspects such as diversity of population and the effects of immigration (to be discussed how to take this into consideration in the project),
- Urbanisation and its impact on regional development,
- The effect of (future) environmental legislation, and
- The impact of planned transformation routes.

The ecosystem approach is very important in the project. Researchers created an environmental vulnerability profile of benthic nature values to answer questions like: what are the environmental vulnerability effects on regional blue growth, and smart specialisation objectives?

The project will make recommendations for

- Sustainable blue growth activities,
- Cross-border collaboration to reduce pressure and risks, and
- Right timing for marine operations to avoid risks such as those related to the nesting of birds and seals.

Transferability and difficulties (Riitta Pöntynen and Tuomas Pohjola)

In general the approach can be <u>transferred</u> to any other region. Data about a) the share of coastal regions in a country, b) number of people who live in coastal regions, c) employment rates in coastal regions, d) gross value added (GVA) of coastal (NUTS3) regions and gross domestic product (GDP) per capita in a country's coastal regional are pre-conditions when using the method.

It is <u>difficult</u> to analyse whether environmental vulnerability effects on regional blue economy and smart specialisation objectives exist. Another impediment when engaging stakeholders can be the different knowledge and equipment levels between established and emerging sectors. Furthermore, it is not always proven whether involved actors have enough knowledge to identify real synergies.

Lessons learned (Riitta Pöntynen and Tuomas Pohjola)

- Cross-border collaboration is needed to reduce pressure and risks. The influence of major transportation routes / infrastructure changes is very important. A tunnel as one scenario makes it easier for hesitant participants to contribute to forecasts for the far future.
- One solution for MSP: Right timing of marine operations might help avoid some pressure risks such as those related to the nesting of birds and seals.
- Finding synergies requires technical knowledge. Synergies can also be within a sector, in different geographical locations.

Please see attached ppt. No. 6, Appendix 3

6.3 Tiiu Paas, University of Tartu: Economic potential of maritime regions: research framework and preliminary results in the case EST-FIN border regions

- Methodology for the onshore area –

What was the underlying question?

- How are maritime economies interlinked with national economies of Finland and Estonia?
- How productive and efficient are blue economy sectors in maritime regions?

Method and aim

The <u>aim</u> of the study was to find out whether the maritime sectors in Estonia and Finland are rather independent in their development within national economies. Previous literature from 2005 ("Korea study" and from 2016 ("Ireland study") found stronger evidence of maritime sectors linkages with national economics.

<u>Input-output (I-O) methodology</u> explores the linkage and production effects of the Estonian and Finnish maritime sectors on national economies and cross-border cooperation. There exist I-O tables for maritime sectors and products: in Estonia for fish and other fisheries products as well as for aquaculture products and water transport; in Finland for the fishing and water transport industries.

- o Method 1: input-output tables showing how different sectors are interlinked with national economies. Data from OECD and national input and output tables have been used.
- o Method 2: AMADEUS (ET) and ORBIS (FI) micro data for descriptive statistics to answer the question how productive and efficient the blue sectors are in the two countries.

Transferability and difficulties

- What is <u>transferable</u> to MSP reality? Not known yet.
- Statistical <u>problem:</u> the tables and methodology are weakly developed for analysing linkages between the sectors. Statistics have to be improved, especially with a view to cross-border cooperation. EUROSTAT is currently working on improving cross-border statistics.
- I-O analysis is informative but depends on availability of detailed I-O tables
- AMADEUS database is a good source but expensive

Lessons learned

- How to use data has an influence on how to generate new ideas and which models are used.
- Information on availability and quality of statistical information; proposals for improvement of statistical data (also cross-border statistics – currently a hot topic in Eurostat).
- Mapping economic activities in coastal regions; productivity and efficiency of blue sectors comparing to other sectors.
- Interesting method for benchmarking
- Possibly I-O method is fostering discussions between stakeholders
- I-O method may be good for cross-country comparison
- How to take dynamics of economy as well as dynamics of governance and legislation into account when applying the method?
- What is useful for planners? Don't know yet!

Please see attached ppt. No. 7, Appendix 3

6.4 Annika Jaansoo, University of Tartu: Blue Economy networks

- Methodology for the onshore area –

What was the underlying question?

- What kind of networks from public and private sectors in the project Plan4Blue impact area (Gulf of Finland and Archipelago Sea) are there and what is the nature of those networks?
- What is the maritime value of those networks?

Method and aim

Purpose of the analysis: The outcomes of the network analysis will be used further in the project as an input for the scenario-building for Sustainable Blue Growth as it helps to define joint MSP options based on the scenarios regarding the location of economic activities and shipping routes.

The method used different types of data.

- Data in hand: Preliminary list of stakeholders of the Plan4Blue project (energy, offshore construction, shipping incl. Marine transportation, blue bio-economy incl. marine fishing and aquaculture, tourism and sub-sea resources)
- Prospective data: Data collected via online survey;
- Data collected via face-to-face analyses.

Methods:

- Online survey was sent to all potential stakeholders

- Respondents add data about missing stakeholders

- Face-to-face interviews with key players of the networks

- Preliminary interviews with the interviewees considered as key players

- Final interviews with key players based on the social network analysis. The interviews will be processed with Atlas.ti, a software for content analysis in order to classify the information for the interpretation of data

- Social Network Analysis (SNA); collected data will be visualized via the Ucinet and Netdraw software

First results show how many stakeholders (organisations and sectors) are involved in MSP and with which other sectors they are in contact with.

Transferability and difficulties

The method including SNA is transferable. However, the study shows that some countries responded less than others. More responses would have shown a broader and statistically proofed picture.

Lessons learned

- Surveys alone are not sufficient, responses are not representative - therefore interviews were included into the methodology.
- Tools and specific software for content analysis have to be tested in more detail.
- What are the networks and what is their economic value? Possibly interesting for a stakeholder strategy within MSP processes.

Please see attached ppt. No. 8, Appendix 3

7. Session 3 – Socio-economic work of regional sea conventions

7.1 HELCOM: Socio-economic work (Heini Ahtiainen)

- Methodology for the onshore area –

What was the underlying question?

- How do human activities contribute to national and regional economies?
- How does the state of the marine environment contribute to the wellbeing of current and future generations?

Aim and method

The <u>aim</u> of the work strains is to gain coherent and comparable information across countries.

Four pieces of work have been started by HELCOM. First, there is a general development of <u>economic and social analyses</u> taking into account the HELCOM expert network on economic and social analyses. Further work strains are linked to the 2nd holistic assessment of ecosystem health, the "State of the Baltic Sea" report as well as the SPICE project (2017) and the processes in MSP (application of Pan Baltic SCOPE project).

In the "State of the Baltic Sea" report, the analysis compared the use of marine waters with the costs of degradation based on the approach to assess human activities, pressures and state of the ecosystems.

First results have been achieved related to the contribution from the use of marine waters to the economy in the BSR annually. The analysis referred to selected sectors and monetary value, employment and quantitative indicators like a) fish and shellfish harvesting, b) finfish aquaculture, c) marine and coastal recreation and d) transport infrastructure. In a next step, annual welfare losses for citizens if good environmental status is not reached were outlined. First numbers have been provided for a) losses from eutrophication, b) losses of recreation values and c) losses from degradation of perennial vegetation and fish stocks.

At the time of this workshop, the Pan Baltic SCOPE project application had not yet been approved. The aim is, on a very general level, to exchange information on social, cultural and economic aspects of MSP in the BSR, including valuation of ecosystem services. Possibly a regional framework on how to do socio-economic analysis in MSP will be developed, supported by two workshops.

Transferability and difficulties

The approach of the "State of the Baltic Sea" report can be <u>transferred</u> to other regions, always depending on reliability and availability of data. The Pan Baltic SCOPE project is expected to include ecosystem services, which are not common for European MSP processes. However, the project can foster an understanding of what underlying services of the ecosystems are providing and it can support the ecosystem-based approach, which is a requirement in the MSP Directive.

A <u>difficulty</u> is that tourism statistics mostly do not include the local population. Also tourism data do not show recreational benefits. Another open question is how to take into account welfare losses / property price development and other economic developments during the analysis.

Lessons learned

- Impact of activities on ecosystem health matter. The approach of ecosystem services does not only show losses but also benefits.
- So far HELCOM does not collect spatially explicit socio-economic data, but this may change in case Pan Baltic SCOPE project is approved.

Please see attached ppt. No. 9, Appendix 3

7.2 OSPAR: Socio-economic work

Documents were provided by the Dutch government on their relevant work and shared with participants. The main focus so far was on the socio-economic analysis of the use of the marine environment, contributing to the OSPAR Intermediate Assessment (IA). OSPAR Members agreed on sectors and indicators like the NACE code, gross value added, employed persons per sector or production value and other relevant data on trends between first and second IA. Maps are showing where the economic sectors take place, including their environmental pressures and are based on data from the OSPAR Secretariat.

In a next step, member states recommended to use the concept of ecosystem goods and services for the economic analyses and to discuss, based on case studies.

Please see attached ppt. No. 10, Appendix 3

8. Session 4 – Reflection on needs of MSP

In a final session, participants started to identify what input/kind of results from economic and social studies would be directly useful for national MSP processes and authorities. Reflections and discussions focused on the following questions in relation to the presentations:

- How can we use the presented methods for MSP?

- How can methods be adapted to be (more) useful for MSP?

Preliminary results

The round table provided a variety of different approaches and methodologies focusing on and dependent of different aspects and research questions. In consequence, different approaches are using different types of data and backgrounds with different results. The question which has to be dealt with in more detail during subsequent discussions is how transferable these different methodologies are and how much can be learned from each project.

Until now, no one tool fits all sectors. Also, socio-economic aspects can be analysed from different perspectives, taking into account different forms of costs (economic, social, ecological as well as opportunity costs) and different groups of beneficiaries (supply side, demand side). This results in different data availability and (mapping) methods. Also the time needed when applying a method can be challenging. Therefore, the complexity of the approaches should be made transparent showing underlying assumptions in a clear way.

How can we use the presented methods for MSP?

- Spatial distribution of the economic and social value of maritime uses/sectors
- We need an overview on available databases and software
- MSP practitioners need to understand the value of activities, including interdependencies
- We have to find out what kind of information is valuable and should be drawn from the various methodologies to capture the value of maritime space
- Create an index of maritime space
- Continue the assessment of valorisation on land and link it to offshore aspects of MSP
- Use synergies from MSFD / ecosystem service valorisation work
- Integrate effects beyond effects on maritime space, e.g. electricity generation of offshore wind energy (-> less need for coal power stations)
- More attention on functional relations between various maritime economic activities
- Scenarios are needed but must be based on real understanding of the dynamics of the maritime economy
- Combine approaches, qualitative and quantitative methods
- Appropriate mapping software like RegioGraph is already available, including different NUTS levels and the two digit postcode levels. Further possibilities enable information in a geographical context and can be useful for MSP
- To use the data for MSP, better statistics of maritime sectors are needed
- Regarding the I-O method, it is questionable whether maritime economy is less linked to national economy because it is more international and open

- New approaches have to be developed to capture the economic and non-economic value of the sea

How can methods be adapted to be (more) useful for MSP?

- Adapt indicators of how the uses affect each other in economic terms to MSP needs and show how uses change the value of maritime space
- For *spatial* cost-benefit analysis a different set of data is needed. Today, data have to taken "by hand" to be integrated as databases into the visualisation tool. There is no ready to use compilation available on portals like Eurostat. Therefore methodologies have to be developed to cope with this circumstance.
- Adapt fishery method (5.2, presentation of Adam Mytlewski, MIR) to other sectors to valorise the maritime space
- A combination of the Method under 5.2 (on the valorisation of fisheries) and 5.4 (first approach of a spatial cost-benefit analysis) could show the benefits of different economies on land and at sea and to understand the interrelations
- It would be an added value for all methodologies to take the dynamics of economy as well as the dynamics of governance and legislation into account.
- GVA and employment for comparing the value of sectors are important indictors, also for socio-economic MSP analysis. However, also non-monetary values matter.
- Compare different methods' results and identify reasons in case of discrepancy
- Simulate impact of different MSP planning options on input/output distribution
- Find methods for taking future developments into account

9. Next steps

After a short wrap-up, participants agreed to collaborate on future work on socio-economic aspects, with a special focus on how to use results for MSP. They saw the value of using synergies between different on going or finished projects and stressed the need for further expert rounds like the one of today.

Appendix 1- Participants

Participants from research / MSP Platform
- Riitta Pöntynen, University of Turku, FI
- Tuomas Pohjola, University of Turku, FI
- Riku Varjopuro, SYKE, FI
- Hanna Nieminen, SYKE, FI
- Annika Jaansoo, University of Tartu, EE
- Tiiu Paas, University of Tartu, EE
- Adam Mytlewski, MIR, Department of Fisheries Economics, PL
- Annica Lind, Energicontorsydost, SE
- Jan Maarten de Vet, Ecorys, BE
- Barbara Weig, s.Pro, DE
- Angela Schultz-Zehden, s.Pro, DE
- Susanne Altvater, s.Pro, DE
- Ivana Lukic, s.Pro, DE
- Antje Roß, s.Pro, DE

Participants from MSP authorities / regional conventions
- Heini Ahtiainen, HELCOM
- Sweden: Marie Hallberg, SwAM, SE

Appendix 2 – Agenda

9:00 Arrival

9:30 – 10:00 Introduction and short tour de table

10:00-11:30 Presentations on methods and results of projects and studies
Objective: To share experiences from different approaches and learn from each other
Four 10 minutes presentations
- **Jan Maarten de Vet, Ecorys:** Methods for doing socio-economic analysis in the Blue Growth area with relevance for MSP
- **Barbara Weig, s.Pro:** A spatial cost-benefit analysis to support planners in assessing the spatial distribution of economic costs and benefits of shipping and offshore wind farms.
- **Annica C. Lind, Energicontor Sydost AB (Energy Agency for Southeast Sweden):** Methodological approach related to offshore wind projects
- **Adam Mytlewski, MIR, Department of Fisheries Economics:** Economic valorisation of Polish sea space in relation to fishery and its implication for the Polish MSP

Each presentation is followed by questions for the presenter and collective brainstorming about:
- What did I learn from the approach?
- What have I not understood?
- What can I take on for my future work?

11:30 – 11:45 Coffee break

11:45 – 13:00 Continued presentations on methods and first results of on-going projects

Three 10-15 minutes presentations from the Plan4Blue project
- **Riita Pöntynen and Tuomas Pohjola, University of Turku:** Socio-economic networks in the Gulf of Finland area (including blue economy networks).
- **Tiiu Paas, University of Tartu:** Economic potential of maritime regions: research framework and preliminary results in the case EST-FIN border regions
- **Annika Jaansoo, University of Tartu/University of Twente:** Blue economy networks

Each presentation is followed by questions for the presenter and collective brainstorming:
- What did I learn from the approach?
- What have I not understood?
- Do you have suggestions for improvement/refinement?

13:00-14:00 Lunch

14:00-15:30 Discussion: Reflection on and summary of needs of MSP authorities (reflection rather on results than on methods)
Objective: Identify what input/kind of results from economic and social studies would be directly useful for national MSP processes and authorities.
The discussion will start with an overview presentation of HELCOM and input from the OSPAR region.
- **Heini Ahtiainen, HELCOM:** Socio-economic work of HELCOM
- **Input from the Dutch government (Xander Keijser / Rob van der Veeren), presented by s.Pro:** Up-date on economic and social analyses in the OSPAR area

Questions for discussion and reflection (related to all presentations):
- How can we use the presented methods for MSP?
- How can methods be adapted to be (more) useful for MSP?

15:30-15:45 Coffee break

15:45-16:20 Closing remarks
Objective: To reflect on key themes and outline next steps

16:20-16:30 Evaluation

15:30-15:45 Coffee break

Appendix 3 – Presentations

Presentations can be found on the EU MSP Platform website [here.](#)

Appendix 3 – Presentations

FINAL Summary, Socio-economic Roundtable, 3 July 2017, Berlin. Version: 05.10.2017   18