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Marine Spatial Planning

• MSP: An ‘idea whose time has come’ (Elher, 2018)...
• Rapidly becoming the most accepted approach to reforming marine governance.
• Should facilitate a radical shift in marine governance
  – Addressing sectoral and fragmented gov. issues.
  – Closing democratic deficit in marine gov.
Sectoral Management

The Irish Sea

Source: AMPMER, 2004

North Sea

Source: Flood of Sea Project
Sectoral Management

Gov. Dept

Fishing

Decision

Renewable Energy

Decision

Tourism

Decision

Oil & Gas

Decision

Nature Conservation

Decision

Offshore Aquaculture

Decision
Evaluations of MSP in practice

- MSP has:
  - maintained the agendas of dominant actors through the use of empty participatory rhetoric (Ritchie & Ellis, 2010; Smith & Jentoft, 2017; Tafon, 2017);
  - developed weak objectives that fail to address critical marine problems (Flannery & Ó Cinnéide, 2012a,b; Jones et al. 2016; Sander, 2018);
  - deployed technocratic-managerial forms of governance that favour elites (Smith & Jentoft, 2018; Flannery et al., 2018).
Study Site

- East Inshore and Offshore Plans
- First Statutory Plans in the UK
- MPS – strong social element, social equality, cohesion, wellbeing, etc.
- Two plans – one document published in 2014, progress reviewed 2017
- Today: Synthesising findings from two papers
Paper 1

- Post-political describes a process that appears open and progressive but is closed and cements to status quo
- Based on interviews and document analysis
### Paper 2: MSP Governmentality in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th>Operational</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining Desired ends</td>
<td>Choose the instruments to achieve ends</td>
<td>Implementing instruments</td>
<td>Assessing Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Synthesising across the two studies

1. Where are we going?
2. Who gains and who loses?
3. Through what mechanisms, processes etc do they do so?
4. What are we going to do about it? (adapted from Flyvbjerg, 2001).
Where is MSP in England Going?

• Neoliberal form of planning
  – Focus is on reducing ‘burden’ to industry rather than on good governance.

• Path dependent decision-making:
  – Plans add nothing new!
  – Even those viewed as benefiting most said they can ignore the plans.
  – Dominated by sectoral thinking

• Technocratic-managerialism:
  – Focus on GIS data sets (recollecting data), not planning
Who gains and who loses?

• Tokenistic participation:
  – Plans became about sign-posting ‘what was already there’;
  – Did little more than collate existing policies
  – Little need for participation when preserving status quo.
Through what mechanisms?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th>Operational</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radical reform of UK Marine Governance is needed:</strong></td>
<td>We’d like to be more radical but our hands are tied due to:</td>
<td>DON’T RULE BRITANIA! Let’s preserve the status quo:</td>
<td>Everything is Awesome!...here’s a 16p monitoring report with 2p of results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State:</strong> Needs to develop coordinated, consistent decision-making process is need to ensure SD.</td>
<td><strong>State:</strong> Limited scope for governance reform and path dependent decision-making, What can we do?</td>
<td><strong>State:</strong> reduce the overall regulatory burden; provide greater certainty for developers</td>
<td><strong>State:</strong> Strong and stable. Coordinated and consistent decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment:</strong> a resource which if managed correctly will maximise sustainable activity, prosperity and opportunities for all, now and in the future</td>
<td><strong>Environment:</strong> Complex trade-offs unresolvable due to lack of knowledge. But we’ve re-mapped the same data again!!.</td>
<td><strong>Environment:</strong> Marine businesses are acting in a way which respects environmental limits and is socially responsible. This is rewarded in the marketplace.</td>
<td><strong>Environment:</strong> The evidence we used about the environment is of the highest quality and we are now maximising its use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Society:</strong> an opportunity to develop resilient and cohesive communities that can adapt to risks and opportunities through participatory governance</td>
<td><strong>Society:</strong> Stakeholder fatigue – we’ll engage with them differently, in terms of their capacity/willingness.</td>
<td><strong>Society:</strong> Benefitting from trickle down economics.</td>
<td><strong>Society:</strong> Doing better than the rest of England…but that was true before the plan, but we’ll take it!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are we going to do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 Normative</th>
<th>Phase 2 Strategic</th>
<th>Phase 3 Operational</th>
<th>Phase 4 Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desired ends and ideals</td>
<td>the means to achieve stated goals and objectives are selected</td>
<td>Means to achieve goals are implemented</td>
<td>Monitoring and assessment criteria selected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationality

Participation

(Flannery and McAteer, under review)
Inserting difference

• How do we insert difference into MSP process (Boucquey et al., 2018)?
• Recapture what planning should be:
  – A state-led process of distributing development rights to produce public good.
• Many Marine Plans have little impact on:
  – Development rights; or
  – The Public Good.
• Need for progressive framings/principles to be inserted during strategic phase
  – Principles such as fairness, equity, justice – linking to SDGs, e.g. No Poverty
  – Alternative models of local/coastal development – not trickle down economics
  – Citizen science, alternative data to empower stakeholders
  – Advocacy Planning (Tafon, 2019).
Where next for MSP research?

- Being exported to Global South EU & UNESCO #MSPGlobal
- The goal is to speed up MSP adoption....
- Speed is a requirement of capital (Harvey, 1985)...not good governance.
- Be vigilant as MSP is rolled out:
  1. Where is it going?
  2. Who gains and who loses?
  3. Through what mechanisms, processes etc do they do so?
  4. What are we going to do about it?
  5. Does it distribute development rights to produce a public good?
Thanks for listening

Questions/Comments?
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