

-
- ¹ Black Sea Strategic Action Plan (1996) signed with some provisions for ICZM.
 - ² ICZM Regional Activity Centre (RAC) established in Krasnodar, RU.
 - ³ ICZM National Focal Points designated in each Black Sea country.
 - ⁴ Regional ICZM Advisory Group to the Black Sea Commission established since 1996 and meets regularly.
 - ⁵ Countries prepared National ICZM Reports in 1996.
 - ⁶ National ICZM Policies and Strategies documents prepared by countries and Regional ICZM Strategy by RAC.
 - ⁷ Some funding in support of regional ICZM efforts provided by EU and UNDP/GEF.
 - ⁸ Annual national reports are being prepared for the Black Sea Commission. ICZM progress indicator tool was adopted as well and **regular national reporting initiated**.
 - ⁹ Updated Black Sea Strategic Action Plan (2009) with certain provisions for ICZM signed by all countries.
 - ¹⁰ ICZM Regional Activity Centre ceased functioning in RU.
 - ¹¹ Regional and national ICZM policies and strategies implemented with limited scope.
 - ¹² Guidelines for marine protected areas produced for the Black Sea with EC EuropeAid ECBSea project support.
 - ¹³ Pilot Projects implemented in RU (2003), UA (2003), TR (2006) and GE (2009).
 - ¹⁴ EU funded ECBSea project ICZM component provides certain minor resources for pilot activities.
 - ¹⁵ **EC funded FP7 Pegaso Project provides certain resources for ICZM in the Black Sea region.**
 - ¹⁶ **National ICZM Stock-Taking questionnaires filled within EC FP7 Pegaso Project, regional synthesis is ongoing.**
 - ¹⁷ **EC funded FP7 Pegaso Project provides resources for Black Sea CASES in Sevastopol Bay (UA), Danube Delta (RO) and Guria Region (GE).**

ADVISORY GROUP ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMON METHODOLOGIES FOR ICZM TO THE COMMISSION ON THE PROTECTION OF THE BLACK SEA AGAINST POLLUTION

Version: 2011.10.10 (draft)

GUIDELINES FOR FILLING ICZM PROGRESS INDICATORS – THE BLACK SEA REGION

These Guidelines are based on and are closely following the approaches suggested in the references [1] and [2], updated to meet the needs of Black Sea littoral countries to complete the periodic self-assessments indicating the progress with implementation of ICZM through filling the colour coded marker tables (sample of the table is enclosed with this document).

The indicator table is divided into 4 phases and 31 actions. The Guidelines include Section I with instructions and technical tips how to fill in the progress indicator table and the Section II containing notes explaining the meaning of the 'phases' and 'actions'.

The Guidelines are to be agreed upon (and amended from time to time) by the ICZM Advisory Group (ICZM AG) to the Black Sea Commission at its annual meetings.

Reporting milestones for measuring the progress with ICZM indicators correspond to Ministerial meetings and/or international cooperative actions of the Black Sea countries within the framework of the Bucharest Convention. The reporting milestones to date include the meetings convened for the adoption of Odessa Declaration in 1993, signing in Istanbul the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan of 1996, adoption of Sofia Declaration in 2002, and the signing of the updated Black Sea Strategic Action Plan at Kiev Ministerial in 2009. Results of ICZM progress assessments covering approximately 5 year period are to be included in the periodic State of the Black Sea Reports prepared by the Black Sea Commission and reported to the regular Ministerial meetings.

Operational updating of the ICZM progress indicators is to be performed annually and presented at the meetings of the ICZM AG. Results of the operational ICZM progress marker assessments should therefore be reported to the Black Sea Commission on an annual basis.

The progress markers and respective endnoted textual arguments should be flexibly addressed at four administrative and spatial levels: international, national, sub-national and local. International level might include Black Sea regional, EU, regional seas, or other applicable international scales. Sub-national level might include coastal regions, large protected areas or similar units of sub-national designation, as determined by each country. Local level initiatives are to be considered in ad hoc manner as progress is monitored at local level and at this stage of development are not accounted for on a site-specific/geographic basis, though in future it is envisaged to introduce spatially explicit progress indicators.

It is the responsibility of the respective ICZM National Focal Points to complete and validate with stakeholders the responses at national, sub-national and local levels. Progress at the international level is observed and completed by the ICZM AG and endorsed at its annual meetings.

[1] Report on the use of the ICZM indicators from the WG-ID: a contribution to the ICZM evaluation, EEA, September 2006, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/iczm/pdf/report_wgid.pdf.

[2] Pickaver, A.H., Gilbert, C. and Breton, F. (2004), "An indicator set to measure the progress in the implementation of integrated coastal zone management in Europe", Ocean & Coastal Management, Volume 47, Issues 9-10, 2004, Pages 449-462, <http://ec.europa.eu/ourcoast/download.cfm?fileID=1283>.

I. INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE INDICATOR TABLE

Following are the steps to complete the indicator table:

1. Alongside each phase/action colour coded cell should indicate whether particular action is implemented (green), partially implemented (yellow), or not yet implemented (red).
2. In case of positive or negative changes in time, indicated with modifying the colour of the cell, an explanatory reason forcing this change should be explained with the numbered endnotes.
3. Endnote number should be prefixed with '+', '-' or no sign, indicating the direction of change (upgrade/downgrade/unchanged) of the particular phase/action.
4. In order to identify trend through time the colour coded table is to be filled at respective reporting milestone (Ministerial meeting) or at annual operational update (ICZM AG meeting).
5. Latest formal reporting period and current operation update dates should be inserted in the indicator table header.
6. Updated/modified endnote texts vis-à-vis previous reporting period should be highlighted in bold to show most recent changes in the colour coded progress marker status.

Following are some technical tips on filling the indicator table:

7. There are two types of numbered items: automatically numbered endnotes with respective referenced texts (which are displayed at the end of the table), as well as the links referencing the equivalent endnotes with the same number as the referenced endnote. Latter is used whenever the same endnote explanation contributes into the progress with two or more colour coded cells.
8. New endnotes can be introduced with copy and paste into new cells (explanatory texts should be changed as appropriate). Numbering of all endnotes is automatically updated.
9. Reference link numbers are not updated automatically and they need to be updated manually. Links to endnotes should be indicated with underline to distinguish them from endnotes (see examples of underlined reference links in the sample marker table).
10. To update the colour of the cell it should be selected and the needed colour indicated with 'borders and shadings' command. Please use standard red, yellow and green colours as provided in the sample table. These colours are distinguishable in greyscale version as well.
11. Whenever there is a need to indicate new reporting date, inserting new row at the end of the respective section of the table is easily possible.
12. These guidelines and its Sections I and II should be deleted after finalizing each update of progress makers, so that final product is compiled in a correct format for final distribution. Filename should be changed to indicate actual completion date and the country concerned.

II. PHASES AND ACTIONS: SOME EXPLANATORY NOTES

These notes have been written to help understand what is meant by each phase and each action. They either add something to the description of each action or comment on the particular role of the action in the ICZM process. One should read the notes through before beginning to fill in the table.

PHASE 1: Aspects of coastal planning and management are taking place

In this phase, the coastal zone is treated in the same way as anywhere else in the municipality or region. Spatial planning and development control is taking place but the coast is not regarded as a special place requiring a different approach to its planning and management.

Action 1. The coastal zone is not a free-for-all. There are general rules and regulations (of varying degrees of strictness) which guide or determine development. There may be local laws which regulate specifically coastal activities such as boating, sea bathing or fishing. Access to certain areas is restricted to protect wildlife or landscape.

Action 2. Sectoral interests recognise that tackling certain coastal and marine issues is often easier if other stakeholders are involved but such collaboration is both temporary and usually restricted to specific issues.

Action 3. 'Spatial development plans' include (i) broad strategic plans typical of provincial or regional planning, and (ii) development controls typical of municipal or local planning.

Action 4. Monitoring aspects of the coastal environment and economy often leads to the coast being identified as a special place requiring special treatment.

Action 5. The significance of the coastal zone for nature conservation is recognised and confirmed by special protection measures.

PHASE 2: A framework exists for taking ICZM forward

In this phase, the building blocks of an ICZM approach to coastal planning and management are being put in place. The coastal zone is recognised increasingly as an entity which requires a different approach to elsewhere. Sectoral stakeholders have been identified and brought together to discuss issues of common interest. Actions are beginning to flow from this joint approach; dedicated funding is sometimes allocated for coastal projects.

Action 6. New instruments specially devised for the coastal zone have not been introduced yet but there is a willingness to adapt existing rules and regulations to the reality of planning and managing the coast (for example, zoning inshore waters for different recreational uses).

Action 7. Coastal actions during phase 2 are rarely funded from base budgets. Rather, they receive support from one-off grants or special project allocations.

Action 8. A stocktake is an indispensable first step along the ICZM road to coastal management.

Action 9. Having identified a range of interests through the stocktake, the next step is to bring stakeholders together on a regular basis to discuss common issues.

Action 10. It is often the case that one or two specific issues can act as catalysts in encouraging stakeholders to work together. Resolution of the issues can set an early example of how an integrated approach can help individual interests punch above their weight.

Action 11. Most countries (as well as many coastal regions or cities) have produced sustainable development strategies highlighting environmental, economic and social concerns. But do these strategies include specific references to *coastal* phenomena?

Action 12. This action reflects a concern for coastal well-being on the part of national and regional governments. Such concern is expressed through a process whereby provincial or local planning authorities are steered towards the desired outcome via 'planning policy guidelines'.

PHASE 3: Most aspects of an ICZM approach to planning and managing the coast are in place and functioning reasonably well

In this phase, a fully-functioning ICZM-based planning and management system is in place. It is characterised by a degree of permanence – in staffing and in funding – and by a fairly sophisticated network of coastal practitioners at all administrative levels. Plans recognise the special nature of the coast and the land/sea interface has largely ceased to be an obstacle to rational management.

Action 13. Here, sectoral interests, which usually have some sort of statutory or legal competence, are joined by non-statutory organisations and interests such as coastal communities, NGOs and pressure groups. The core of this action is that *all* coastal and marine interests feel that they have somewhere to go to discuss coastal matters, should they want to.

Action 14. The ad hoc or partial monitoring typical of earlier phases is succeeded here by a comprehensive study with a commitment to repeat the exercise at a specified future date.

Action 15. Statutory coastal zone management plans are relatively rare. Where they exist they usually concentrate on a particular issue such as coastal defence or nature conservation.

Action 16. SEAs are an important addition to the ICZM toolbox because they assess policies rather than proposed developments. They can be used, therefore, to push for an integrated approach at an early stage.

Action 17. Non-statutory coastal management strategies are wide-ranging and may include statutory plans. The crucial aspect to look for is whether an action plan has been drawn up and is being implemented.

Action 18. This action reflects the need for joined-up government when dealing with coastal matters, both horizontally (between administrations at the same level) and vertically (between administrations at different levels), from municipalities to central government ministries.

Action 19. Note the adjective 'sole!' Coastal management is cursed by 'temporariness'; an ICZM approach stresses permanence, not least in terms of someone at each administrative level with just one responsibility – the coast!

Action 20. This action reflects the increasing vogue for marine spatial planning – but is the *terrestrial* part of the coast included?

Action 21. 'Sea areas' here could refer to a bay or coastal cell (local), the entire coast within an administrative area (regional) or territorial waters (national).

Action 22. Responsibility for planning and managing the coast is usually (and traditionally) exercised by local or regional planning authorities with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Elsewhere, competence can be vested in sectoral interests such as port authorities, environment and nature conservation agencies, flood defence organisations, and so on. Recently, however, non-statutory partnerships of coastal stakeholders have often taken the lead in developing strategies and carrying out innovative, dynamic and charismatic actions (often freed from the constraints of statutory authorities).

Action 23. In some countries, statutory authorities consult a prescribed list of local and regional authorities, organisations and interest groups about development proposals including their own planning schemes. Are coastal partnerships also *routinely* consulted?

Action 24. A precept of ICZM is that coastal communities participate in the decision-making process. (Note the verb 'participate' – this is very different to being 'consulted'!)

PHASE 4: An efficient, adaptive and integrative process is embedded at all levels of governance and is delivering greater sustainable use of the coast

In this phase, integration between stakeholders is embedded in working practices at all levels and coastal management of the coast is mature, flexible and responsive to new challenges. Information-rich partnerships comprising representatives from the statutory, private, voluntary and public sectors take the lead in both policy development and delivering actions on the ground.

Action 25. Political support in earlier phases could have blown hot and cold.

Action 26. This action reflects the need for agencies, authorities and interests to collaborate when necessary across administrative, local, regional and international boundaries (such as intended when implementing the Bucharest Convention, Black Sea Strategic Action Plan or Water Framework Directive in EU countries).

Action 27. Goals have been set and progress towards achieving them is being monitored using a set of comparable indicators (such as those agreed upon by the BSC ICZM Advisory Group).

Action 28. 'Long term' means a minimum of five years.

Action 29. This action is about ensuring that the huge amount of information on coastal and marine issues is made available to practitioners when they need it and in a form that they can

readily use. It implies that end users have been part of the information gathering and disseminating process from the beginning.

Action 30. ICZM is a cumulative process. Each revolution of the management cycle is concluded by an assessment of progress at all levels of governance and a re-evaluation of where best practice lies.

Action 31. Implementing ICZM is not an end in itself. Its purpose is to deliver greater sustainability of the coastal zone: this action attests to whether or not it is achieving success and will be linked closely to the evidence gathered in Action 25.