**Planning Criteria MSP General, Shipping, Energy, Grid & Interconnectors, Environment– Update 16th of April 2019**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MSP | Belgium | Denmark | Germany | Netherlands | Norway | Scotland | Sweden |
| Progress in MSP | 2nd plan revision, 3rd cycle | Very early stage of the 1st MSP plan | 1st plan revision, 2nd cycle | 3rd plan revision, 4th cycle | 5th plan revision, 6th cycle | 1st plan revision, 2nd cycle | Final stages of the 1st MSP plan |
| How many planning areas? | 1 | 1  National MSP | 5  EEZ (federal for North Sea and Baltic Sea),  three coastal states | 1 | 3  Regions: The Barents Sea, the Norwegian Sea and the North Sea | 1  National MSP  11 Regional Marine Planning Areas (sub-national level) | 3 |
| Levels of spatial planning at sea | 2  National and Sectoral | 1  Sectoral plans so far | 1  Federal and state level planning system are separated (not hierarchical) | 1 | 2  National plans in the oceans, Regional plans in coastal areas | 2  Scotland’s National Marine Plan, and Regional Marine Plans. Including additional tier of sectoral marine planning | 2  MSP (national level), municipality. MSP guides municipal level. |
| Binding/non-binding MSP | Binding | Binding | Binding | Binding | Binding in coastal zone. In ocean areas: politically decided by parliament, but no law for this | Binding | Non-binding |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Energy | Belgium | Denmark | Germany | Netherlands | Norway | Scotland | Sweden |
| MSP’s role in locating OWE | MSP is used to designate spatial areas for renewable energy and for offshore wind, the wind turbine area | Until now sectoral decision-making and planning by the Danish Energy Agency.  MSP’s role is to coordinate use of the sea areas for different uses. | Designation of priority areas is indicative.  OWF can be built outside the designated areas. | MSP is used to designate wind energy areas and all the conditions required to build wind farms (location, permit and grid connection etc.) | No zones have been opened for OWE yet but 15 possible or suitable areas have been identified by SEA | MSP particularly focuses on the development of the marine renewable  energy sector  MSP is used to identify spatial ‘Plan Options’ for offshore wind, tidal and wave energy. | National interest areas from energy authority taken into MSP plan, but MSP suggest also new areas.  OWE can be built outside the designated areas. |
| OWE distance from the shore | 12 NM | Smaller OWF located between 4 and 20 km  Large OWF are located > 15 km distance | Not defined, but visibility and the National Park has been a reason why far from the coastline. Hub height limited to 125m if visible from coast | Current OWF 6-34 NM off the coast. All new designated OWF areas are at least 10 NM out of the coast. | Not defined, there are is currently no OWE | No minimum distance set, plan options can be within and out with 12NM (cut-off point for devolved powers) | Not defined (case by case) |
| MSP linked to permit procedure | MSP shows wind turbine area |  | Shows suitable areas in EEZ.  Indicative designation of suitable areas in EEZ.  Permissions outside designated areas possible | Wind farm site decisions are based on MSP designated areas. Wind farms are not permitted to be built outside these designated areas. | No zones opened yet therefore there is no existing practice on licensing for commercial OWE projects | MSP identifies spatial Plan Options. Seabed lease and marine licensing applications are expected to be located within the Plan Options. Applications within Plan Options are not guaranteed to obtain a licence.  Scotland’s National Marine Plan provides the framework for the licensing and consents process | MSP has a guiding influence, municipalities have a veto right. |
| Initiative from the operators or from the authorities/planning process? | The authorities define the area, the operators develop the windfarm layout |  | Until now initiatives from the operators. New scheme for OWF installations from 2021: designation of OWF areas by authorities. Preliminary assessment included | The State is responsible for designating offshore wind farm areas. |  | Initiatives from the planning authorities (sectoral planning) | Initiatives come from the operators |
| Use of planning criteria | Set of criteria has been developed by the authorities and stakeholders together | Set of criteria has been used by the energy authority | Technical and spatial planning criteria defined for the indication of OWF areas and development | Set of criteria being used – design and technical criteria | Set of criteria used to identify zones | Spatial and technical planning criteria used by the planning authority to show ‘Plan Options’ for offshore marine renewable energy | Has an indicative list, but always case by case |
| Existing OWF | 6 offshore wind farms (182 turbines) | 13 offshore wind parks (516 turbines)  3 under preparations | 18 (North Sea):  EEZ (942 turbines – 4495 MW)  6 OWF in construction  9 under preparation  (11/2018) | 5 OWF ( 957 MW) +  10 areas designated for OWF  See offshore wind energy roadmap 2030. www.noordzeeloket.nl/en | 1 turbine | 12 bottom-fixed foundation OWFs and 3 floating OWFs have been granted consent | 5  77 turbines, 7 OWF approved + several projects in preparation |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Similarities | Differences | Actions |
| * MSP process has at least started * Most countries have designated OWF areas * No minimum distances from shore was applied so far * Strong influence of MSP on OWF licensing | * No one size fits all -> different legislation, planning &maturity level * Different levels of exclusivity, incl. Fishing, MPAs, shipping (e.g. Sweden and Germany) * Technical layers per country differ -> bathymetry, visual impact, Natura 2000) * Licensing duration & process differ * OWF initiative differs: top-down, bottom-up and unknowns * Planning criteria themselves of different origins, nature & weighting | * Awareness where other countries are in the process * Tools can help: timeline, living Q * Communicate differences better * Harmonisation of transnational EU level regulation * Interpretation -> Natura 2000, SEA, HRA, (it´s a framework) * Make distinction between developer and operator |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grid & interconnectors | Belgium | Denmark | Germany | Netherlands | Norway | Scotland | Sweden |
| MSP’s role in locating grid connections, platforms and interconnector routes | Cable corridors are identified in the MSP and space has been designated for cables |  | Definition of subsea cable routes or corridors, platforms and transboundary gates for the grid connection of offshore windfarms and interconnectors within the EEZ in the Site Development Plan and not in the MSP | Priority and preferred routes for cables around sand extraction reserve areas which are determined in the Integrated Maritime Spatial Policy map and North Sea Policy Document 2016-2021 | No MSP exists so planning for grid connections and cable routes is yet to be considered | The planning of cables is considered within Scotland’s National Marine Plan (NMP) and planning advice and guidance is captured within the plan’s policies and objectives. There are indicative export cable routes for offshore wind, wave and tidal energy developments identified in Scotland’s NMP | No MSP exists so planning for grid connections and cable routes is yet to be considered |
| Integration into the onshore power grid;  Localisation of grid connection points |  |  | Onshore grid connection points are defined within the Network Development Plan by the TSOs and Federal states are responsible for the cable routing within the territorial waters |  |  |  |  |
| MSP linked to permit procedure | Cables and interconnector corridors are defined in MSP and developers propose cable routes within the corridors |  | Cables and interconnector routes are defined in MSP, but there is no cable priority area. Only the corridors (meaning gates) to territorial waters or the neighbouring countries are determined. Specifications in sector planning. Interconnectors and cables have to follow the MSP plan. | Developers can apply for cable routes within the cable priority areas which are subject to licensing procedures | MSP not linked to licensing due to no MSP existing. | Cable routes are largely proposed by developers for Marine Scotland’s review and the NMP is considered during the licensing process. | MSP not linked to licensing due to no MSP existing. |
| Initiative from the operators or from the authorities/planning process? | Designation of cable corridors and interconnector corridors by authorities (sector planning) |  | Designation of cable corridors and interconnector corridors by authorities (sector planning) | Designation of cable priority areas by authorities (sector planning) | Initiative from operators | Initiative largely from operators | Initiative from operators |
| Use of planning criteria for cables and platforms | Few planning criteria exist including the use of cable corridors |  | Well established planning criteria. Set of criteria has been used (see Spatial Offshore Grid Plan or draft of new Site Development Plan) | Established planning criteria such as bundling and routing measures | No set planning criteria but environmental issues, biodiversity, visual impact etc. considered during planning | Less established planning criteria than for example, Germany. Some Government-led and some Industry-led criteria. Some are more guidelines rather than strict rules that are at the developers discretion | No established planning criteria |
| Existing interconnectors | In operation:  - Nemo Link 1 GW to England  Concept/early planning:  - Nautilus/Nemo 2 1400 MW to England | Pre-Construction:  - Viking Link 1400 MW to England  Under construction:  - COBRA cable 700 MW to Netherlands | Interconnectors through EEZ in operation:  - NorNed (Norway-Netherlands)  Under construction:  - NordLink (Norway-Germany)  - COBRAcable (Netherlands-Denmark)  Approval procedure:  - Viking Link (Denmark –UK)  Concept/early planning:  - NeuConnect 1400 MW to England  - NorGer 1400 MW to Norway | In operation:  - BritNed 1 GW to England  - NorNed 700 MW to Norway  Dormant  - NorNed 2 700 MW to Norway  Under construction:  - COBRA cable 700 MW to Denmark | In operation:  - NorNed 700 MW to Netherlands  - Skagerrak 1-4 440 MW to Sweden  Under construction:  - NordLink 1400 MW to Germany  - North Sea Link 1400 MW to England  Concept/early planning:  - NorthConnect 1400 MW to Scotland  - NorGer 1400 MW to Germany | In operation:  - BritNed 1 GW England to the Netherlands  - Nemo Link 1 GW England to Belgium  Under construction:  - North Sea Link 1400 MW England to Norway  Pre-Construction:  - Viking Link 1400 MW England to Denmark  Concept/early planning:  - NeuConnect 1400 MW England to Germany  - NorthConnect 1400 MW Scotland to Norway  - Nautilus/Nemo 2 1400 MW England to Belgium | In operation:  - Skagerrak 1-4 440 MW to Norway |
| Existing landing points |  |  | Spatial Offshore Grid plan:  4 gates to territorial sea  13 gates for transboundary connections  Spatial Development Plan (draft):  5 gates to the territorial waters  14 gates for transboundary connections  6 cable routes for interconnectors |  |  | 2 (Peterhead and Cockenzie) |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Similarities | Differences | Actions |
| * Grid plan: always ad hoc (except Germany) | * Only some countries have cable corridors * Northern North Sea has enough space | * Link in maps the OWF to the grid (existing or to be created) * Connect terrestrial land planning to MSP planningwhen it comes to OWF, grid development & land fall points * Connecting seas through the grid -> one single energy market |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Environment | Belgium | Denmark | Germany | Netherlands | Norway | Scotland | Sweden |
| Consideration of MPAs and other ecologically valuable areas in planning process | Most of the MPAs are part of the existing part  (Special Area for Conservation, Special Protection Area, National nature reserve, Special zone for seabed integrity | No current MSP plan | The needs of the marine environment are protected by provisions for marine  environmental protection included in the regulations applying to the individual uses (e.g. exclusion of offshore wind farms in Natura2000 areas) and by dedicated regulations for the protection of the marine environment | Designated Natura 2000 are part of the current MSP plan | Environmental value of Norwegian sea areas are part of existing MSP plan | 31 Nature conservation MPAs (17 territorial, 13 EEZ) and 8 historic MPAs are part of the national marine plan | Natura 2000, (planned) MPAs and areas of national interest for nature values in MSP plan |
| Role of your MSP authority in designating MPAs and other ecologically valuable areas |  |  | BSH as maritime planning authority does not designate MPAs, the Federal Ministry for Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (for EEZ) and the respective ministries at state level (for TS) are responsible for designating MPAs. | The Ministry of Agriculture Nature and Food Quality is responsible for designating MPAs. | Norway does not have a MSP authority as the work is round-table. The management group identifies ecologically valuable areas, based on scientific advice. | Marine Scotland under The Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 designates MPAs out to 12nm, and the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 provides powers to designated out to the rest of Scottish waters. |  |
| Existing MPAs and other ecologically valuable areas in MSP | - Nature reserve  - Natura 2000  - Fishing limitation zones  - Ramsar | (- Natura 2000  - §3 Protected nature types  - National parks) | - UNESCO World Heritage site  - Nationalpark (TS)  - RAMSAR wetland (TS)  - Natura 2000 sites (SCI and SPA) (EEZ)  - Natura 2000 sites (SCI and SPA) (TS)  - Nature conservation areas (Naturschutzgebiete, NSG) (EEZ)  - Nature conservation areas(Naturschutzgebiete, NSG) (TS) | - Natura 2000 (SAC & SPA)  - Ramsar  - Plaice box (Sectorial) | - Cross-sectorial conservation measure (national park)  - Cross-sectorial conservation measure (nature reserve)  - Important wetlands / RAMSAR sites / Birds protection sites  - Ecologically or Significant Marine Areas (EBSAS) | - Natura 2000 (SAC & SPA)  - Historic MPA (HMPA)  - Demonstration & Research Marine Protected Areas (D&R MPAs)  - Sites of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI)  - National Nature Reserve (NNR)  - Nature conservation MPA (NCMPA)  - Ramsar | - Natura 2000 (SAC & SPA)  - Nature reserve  - National park |
| Consideration of any connectivity between MPAs and other ecologically valuable areas |  |  | Connectivity between MPAs was not considered in the first plan. | These have not yet been considered as such but because of the MSFD requirement to protect the sea floor, some areas outside N2000 are going to be restricted for bottom trawling. | Connectivity was not considered in the last plan, but will be in the future | Connectivity or linkages between MPAs within the network is considered |  |
| Restrictions in MPAs and other ecologically valuable areas (no fishing, shipping etc.) | No fishing in fishing limitation zones, in other MPAs all impacts regulated | Identified pressures in Natura 2000, Any activity unless engaged in before an area became protected in protected nature types | Anthropogenic impacts such as tourism, camping, but also industrial use in national parks; defined activities in Natura 2000 and nature conservation areas, for example for NSG EEZ: relocation of dredges material, aquaculture, recreational fishing, introduction of non-indigenous species. | No bottom trawling in plaice box, direct restriction of certain activities in Natura 2000, depending on area restriction to fisheries. | Restrictions on activities that have an impact on MPA (reduce conservation values, change natural environment). In other valuable areas, there may also be specific restrictions to maintain the ecosystem values. E g no or reduced oil activities, no bottom trawling | MPAs are managed to conserve or recover the features within MPAs and the principle of sustainable use allows for appropriate activities to continue in the rest of the MPA. However specific activities which pose a significant risk to a protected feature will be managed. | All pressures impacting endpoints in Natura 2000 and national park, defined activities in nature reserve |
| Do you and how do you apply the EBA in your MSP? |  |  | In the current MSP, adopted in 2009, the EBA was only considered in terms of food chain interactions.  For the revision of the plan (adoption planned in 2021) there is an ongoing discussion within BSH on how to implement the EBA in a more comprehensive way. | The criteria of the MSFD for Good Environmental Status are considered as a practical approach to EBA. These criteria are applied for the assessment of the impacts of each initiative and collectively (accumulation) in a Strategic Environmental Assessment.  The starting points are the ecosystem approach and the precautionary principle. | EBA is a natural part of the Norwegian marine management. It is the basis for the process and organization of the work with the management plans. | Scotland’s National Marine Plan promotes an ecosystem approach but the current state of knowledge about many aspects of the structure and functioning of marine ecosystems limits how this principle can be translated into definitive planning policies. In particular, an EBA is applied to the management of fishing. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Similarities | Differences | Actions |
| * MPAs are designated by environmental authorities (not MSP) * There is a communication between MPA planners and MSP planners * Processes run more or less parallel. | * In NOR the MSP authority is also the environmental planning authority (same institute, different department). * In SWE the MPAs are mostly designated by municipal governments. * NOR has PVVAs (not legally binding, but recommendation), and MPAs (legally binding, approved by king) * In some countries the communication between environmental Planners and MSP planners is easy, in others a bit more tensed. * Fishing limitations zones are in NL. * Fishing in OWF allowed in UK and DK (partly in NL) * SCOT has demonstration (art. Reefs) and research MPAs. * Connectivity key in SCOT planning process, in SWE fostered in discussion. * MPAs in SWE are in coastal regions, in GER in TS and EEZ. | * Define the meaning of fishing limitation zones in environmental report. * Better understanding of different demonstration and research MPAs. * How is connectivity included in the planning process (from a legislative point of view, as well in practice)? |