**Planning Criteria Shipping in MSP – Update 16th of April 2019**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Shipping | Belgium | Denmark | Germany | Netherlands | Norway | Scotland | Sweden |
| MSP’s role in providing space for ship traffic | Priority area for shipping, no incompatible activities in this area | Priority areas for shipping shall safeguard space for ship traffic, no incompatible activities (e.g. artificial installations) are allowed | Priority areas for shipping shall safeguard space for ship traffic, no incompatible activities (e.g. artificial installations) are allowed | TSS, precautionary areas, clearways and anchorages | In the ocean areas there is enough space. Within the coastal zone is designated shipping routes divided between primary and secondary fairway | Navigational safety is paramount to vessel movement and must  be safeguarded. Displacement of  shipping should be avoided where possible.  Mitigate against potential increased journey lengths (and associated fuel costs, emissions and impact on journey frequency) and potential impacts on other users and ecologically sensitive areas | Priority areas for shipping shall safeguard space for ship traffic, conflicting or disturbing activities are restricted. |
| Role of the shipping sector in planning process | Consideration to economic implications for ports |  | The Water and Shipping Directorate gave important input for location +width of priority areas | High economic value of shipping, direct and indirect significance of shipping and accessibility to ports | Active participation | Shipping trade is essential for Scotland economy and its growth in terms of trade and employment |  |
| Use of planning criteria | Designation on AIS records  Safety distance is according IMO regulations, 500 metres of any fixed obstacle | Width of priority areas + safety zones according to traffic density and ship sizes on main traffic routes  (AIS data from 2016 + “Danmarks Statistik 2016”), guidance taken from Nautical Institute paper  Between 6 and up to 10 nm | Larger corridors equal widths of TSS; 1nm width for 1000-4900 vessels/year; 10nm for >10,000 ships. Based on AIS data from 2005-2009 | Mining installations or other individual permanent structures will not be permitted within the shipping routes or in a 500-metre zone surrounding these shipping routes.  The ‘Design criterion: distance between shipping routes and wind farms’ has been worked out together with the shipping sector. It is intended to determine the space between the shipping route and wind farms at sea that shipping needs to be able to navigate swiftly and safely. | MSP only covers the nationally important corridors. Smaller routes rely on the “freedom of navigation”. | Safety distance is according to IMO/UNCLOS – 500 m safety zone between shipping and offshore wind turbines during works and 50 m during operations. Corridors are created between sites to allow safe passage – assessment required to establish a minimum width of the corridor (case-by-case basis) | MSP only covers the nationally important corridors. Smaller routes rely on the “freedom of navigation”. |
| Existing IMO routeing measures | Several routes were already regulated By IMO.  Because of the windfarms, new IMO routing measures were made | Large area is regulated by IMO, which will be transferred to MSP  + 2nm safety zones along TSS | Large area is regulated by IMO, which is also transferred to MSP + 2nm safety zones along TSS | The traffic separation scheme (TSS) and accompanying ‘precautionary areas’ and *inshore traffic zones* have been established by the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) of the United Nations. | Large area is regulated by IMO, which is also transferred to MSP + 2nm safety zones along TSS | IMO traffic routing measures in Scottish waters including Traffic Separation Schemes (TSS), recommended routes, deep water routes, area(s) to be avoided (ATBA) and precautionary area. | Large area is regulated by IMO, which will be transferred to MSP, no safety zones added |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Similarities | Differences | Actions |
| * All use AIS data or density maps for data collection * IMO regulated routes * MSP provide priority lanes | * Different variation (different vessel data used) * Different timeline * Criteria are in every country different * Different identification of national lanes * Different approach of priority (soft or hard spatial claim) * Shipping expert involved in planning * OWF construction is an issue | * Try to find and use similiar criteria * Discuss with shipping experts at the final conference * Create a North Sea body (coherence) * Education of non-experts (have a similiar terminology between planners and practice/ industry) |