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2. Executive Summary

Background and project objectives

The Celtic Seas surround the UK, Ireland and north-western France. This area includes a wide range of habitats and is home to some amazing wildlife, from whales, dolphins, sharks and seals to cold-water corals and slow-growing maerl beds. Some 23 million people live in and around the Celtic Seas, and many more across Europe depend on the area for their livelihoods and wellbeing.

WWF-UK led the Celtic Seas Partnership with Eastern and Midland Assembly in Ireland, NERC (British Oceanographic Data Centre), Seaweb Europe in France and the University of Liverpool. The Celtic Seas Partnership was an innovative four year project (2013-2017) exemplifying the use of a stakeholder-led approach to develop tools and approaches to support more effective ecosystem based management of marine activities in the Celtic Seas. This was an ambitious project that brought together governments, sea-users and scientists to find new ways of managing the marine environment. The collaboration involved working across national boundaries and sectors to address the big picture, taking the whole ecosystem into account. The project has been supported by all the national governments in the area, and worked with more than 1,725 people, empowering them to shape a more sustainable future for everybody – and, of course, for the Celtic Seas.

The Celtic Seas have some of the busiest shipping routes in the world and provide a home to commercially important fisheries such as mackerel and sea bass. There is a thriving tourism industry and huge potential for wind, wave and tidal power. As part of the Future Trends study in the project we found that the region supports approximately 400,000 jobs and is worth £15 billion a year to the economies of the UK, Ireland and France. Despite their importance, so far they’ve not been managed in the most sustainable way. Increasing demand for resources, ineffective management and climate change have all caused environmental damage and put some vulnerable species and habitats at risk. This then puts industries and peoples’ jobs at risk as a healthy economy needs healthy seas.

The aim of the Celtic Seas Partnership project was to support the delivery of Good Environmental Status in the Celtic Seas, by facilitating engagement between sectors and across borders to ensure the long term future of the environment while safeguarding people’s livelihoods and the communities that have a relationship with the sea. The Celtic Seas Partnership worked closely with the people involved in using, regulating and protecting the Celtic Seas – including government, scientists, industry and local communities. It developed innovative approaches to managing the marine environment and put the people who use the sea at the heart of its management.

The project worked in the context of the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive, helping people to understand the legislation and providing input to government consultation processes.

Key deliverables and outputs

The Celtic Seas Partnership helped to build relationships and create partnerships between scientists, governments and the people who use and love the sea - from fishers to divers to the energy industry. The project successfully ran three multi-national conferences and over 30
national workshops and meetings, engaging over 1,725 stakeholders from 14 different sectors. Annex B1.7 gives a summary of all the Country Workshops and multi-national conferences on a timeline. We received positive feedback from all of the events about having the opportunity to engage with stakeholders from different sectors and countries. The core project team have attended 628 meetings and/or workshops reaching an audience of approximately 13,600 key stakeholders (some duplication of stakeholders at events). 60 presentations were given on the Celtic Seas Partnership at events across Europe. 87 meetings and events were held/attended with Government officials across UK, Ireland and France during the project. Through these meetings, government officials were kept up to date with developments in the project, and provided feedback on synergies with their own current and planned work.

We set up Task Groups to look at some of the key challenges facing the Celtic Seas - themes included marine litter, invasive non-native species and sea-users collecting data. A pilot project was set up with Scottish fisheries, Scottish government and environmental organisations to see whether mediation could help build trust between groups with challenging relationships and break down the barriers that stop them working together. This was considered as a positive step in building these relationships and a similar project also took place in France led by Seaweb Europe.

A number of best practice guidelines were produced to support people in better managing their activities in the Celtic Seas. Guidelines produced by WWF include advice on the difficulties of working across borders and sectors, as well as more tailored information for planning authorities produced by the University of Liverpool. In the Final Evaluation survey, one stakeholder wrote: “The conflict resolution guidelines – these were addressed/addressed the issues very well. We encounter difficult audiences time and time again, and we haven’t had till now a ‘one-stop shop’ to go to regarding how to approach this”. Everyone depends on the services that the ecosystem provides, but putting a value on these services can be difficult. The University of Liverpool produced a resource pack with tools and recommendations on how to evaluate the services that the marine ecosystem provides.

An information portal and guide was created by the British Oceanographic Data centre to make it easier to find data and information on the Celtic Seas. A ‘Fishing4Data’ group has also been set up develop a strategy for making data collected by the fishing industry scientifically credible so that it can be used to inform policy making and its implementation.

**Dissemination**

We successfully developed and launched three Celtic Seas Partnership films at the end of the project which have already collectively received 688 views on YouTube. These films feature project stakeholders talking about their relationship with the sea and why they got involved with the project, and provide an effective legacy for the project.

We were granted a three month extension to the project (January to March 2017) to enable us to carry out further dissemination and communication of the project outputs following the final conference in October 2016. During this period the project partners carried out numerous activities to broadly and effectively disseminate the project outputs, ensuring a strong legacy for the project. This included presentations by WWF and the Associated Beneficiaries at many important meetings and conferences throughout the Celtic Seas and further afield. For example, the Project Manager and Policy Officer presented the results of the Celtic Seas Partnership project and showed the ‘Guardians of the Sea’ film to senior marine government
officials from over 20 European countries at the European Commission Marine Strategy Coordination Group meeting in Brussels. We also hosted a stand and the Project Manager gave a speed pitch on the project at the Coastal Futures conference in London in January 2017 – an important marine policy conference in the UK with around 260 delegates, from all of the key marine stakeholder sectors in the UK. A one-to-one meeting was held with the local French government to present all project outputs. Graham Rees, the Deputy Director of Marine and Fisheries, offered his personal praise and thanks to the Celtic Seas Partnership, in front of the whole Wales Marine Strategic Advisory Group, for the contribution made to progressing action on MSFD.

The Project Manager published a journal article with former Project Manager, Lyndsey Dodds, in the ICES Journal of Marine Science about the Celtic Seas Partnership and LIFE+ PISCES Projects: "An approach for effective stakeholder engagement as an essential component of the ecosystem approach" (Annex 5.2.19). The Celtic Seas Partnership (MaREI) has also published two pieces in the Inshore Ireland magazine. One was published in their spring edition: ‘Call for more cooperation as the seas get busier’ (Annex 5.2.9), and the other in their summer edition: “Achievements of the Celtic Seas Partnership” (Annex 5.2.10). Inshore Ireland has a readership in excess of 2,500, covering stakeholders ranging from marine users and industries, coastal communities and NGOs from both the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland.

We have also created mechanisms for sharing our approaches and learning from the Celtic Seas Partnership more widely beyond the Celtic Seas in an international context. We produced some web pages for our top tips for anyone wanting to involve people in regional marine policy: http://www.celticseaspartnership.eu/learning/. We gathered personal experiences and insights from all Celtic Seas Partnership staff. This information was collated and organised in a way that is accessible to a wider audience. The honesty and originality of the material makes this a valuable Celtic Seas Partnership output - one that will hopefully keep inspiring improved engagement into the future. WWF has been actively disseminating the Celtic Seas Partnership project approach to our network offices by setting up a series of lesson sharing webinars with the WWF Kenya coastal programme who are working on marine spatial planning and fisheries co-management approaches. The webinars took place between March and May 2017, each one being led by a different team member on different topics including communications, project strategy and stakeholder engagement, and monitoring & evaluation.

**Impact of the project**

The biggest achievement of the project was that it created a unique opportunity for transboundary, cross-sector collaboration amongst stakeholders, as well as increasing knowledge and awareness of marine policy and MSFD across the Celtic Seas. This was evidenced by the results of the final project evaluation, which found that the highest average ratings among stakeholders were for the following impacts:

- Increased transboundary engagement in the Celtic Seas;
- Increased cross-sectoral engagement in the Celtic Seas; and
- Increased understanding of MSFD/marine policy amongst marine stakeholders in the Celtic Seas.
The MSFD animation and interview online tutorials created by WWF have been a very useful tool for increasing stakeholder awareness and knowledge on MSFD. They’ve had 4,817 collective views by the end of February 2017 which is far higher than expected.

By improving stakeholders’ understanding of marine policy and their capacity to shape policy, this project led to the development of tools and approaches that have stronger buy-in and are thus more likely to be effective in the long term. The implementation of these approaches in turn leads to better management of the environment and improved environmental status in the long term. The Celtic Seas Partnership Marine Litter Task Group’s Eco-Schools initiative was included in the Irish government’s draft programme of measures to achieve Good Environmental Status in the Celtic Seas. The Celtic Seas Partnership is also cited within the draft measures as an example of where the Irish Government has engaged with stakeholders. These inclusions demonstrate a level of commitment to the aims of the Celtic Seas Partnership – a significant achievement and legacy for the project. The success of the project is also reflected in 41 organisations/individuals signing up to the Celtic Seas Partnership Statement of Support, which acknowledges the contribution that the Celtic Seas Partnership has made to the achievement of GES in the Celtic Seas and the desire for this contribution to be maintained into the future.

Following the decision for the UK to leave the European Union towards the end of the project in June 2016, there has been a period of uncertainty and it is likely to be some time before we fully understand what the implications are for marine policy. In the meantime, it’s vitally important that we continue to work together across boundaries and sectors to ensure a healthy, sustainable future for our seas and the people who depend on them. Throughout the project we have received strong support in this endeavour from all the administrations across the Celtic Seas, including the Isle of Man which already operates outside the EU. In the final months of the project we remained committed to ensuring that the work and relationships we developed are sustained beyond the life of the project. The final multi-national conference in October 2016 in Dublin had over 100 delegates from a wide range of sectors from across the Celtic Seas 6 constituent countries. This indicates that we successfully maintained interest and engagement in the project and successfully mitigated the risk of decreased interest among stakeholders following the result of the referendum. The final conference was very well received, with more than 85% of delegates giving very positive feedback.

The launch of our ground-breaking study on Future Trends in the Celtic Seas received great media coverage, including a piece on BBC Wales news: [http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-37910855](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-37910855). The Project Manager was also interviewed for a news report for BBC Wales Today ([http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-37910852](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-37910852)), which received one of the highest viewing figures from the year so far – over 356,000 people tuned in, which was 35% of everyone watching TV in Wales at the time. As well as helping us to reach a much larger audience, this media coverage also led to very successful advocacy of the project outcomes. The BBC asked both the Welsh Government and DEFRA to respond to our findings, in particular to explain how they would use our results to inform their national marine plans which are currently under development. This helped to raise the profile of the report within the relevant departments, and gave us an on-the-record commitment from both governments to engage with the contents of the report. Subsequently the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) decided to use our scenarios from the Celtic Seas Future Trends study for their own Future Trends study to feed into the National Marine Plans. A Plaid Cymru Assembly Member, Vicki Howells, referenced the report in an Assembly debate on the State of Nature
in Wales. Using specific examples and phrases from the news report, she used it to put pressure on the government to apply equal focus to issues facing the marine environment.

In the Final Evaluation, one stakeholder said: “I don’t know of any other project at this point in time which is transboundary and gets all the relevant organisations and administrations together like this. It is beyond projects, very valuable. It has given people the feeling and understanding of a wider area of co-operation”.

Summary of chapters in this report:
- **Introduction**: this section gives an overview of the project aims and objectives and outlines the expected results and long term results of the project. It also describes the problems/issues that the project addressed and the methodological solution the project provided.
- **Administrative part**: this section gives an overview and evaluation of the management system used throughout the project.
- **Technical part**: this section provides the main bulk of this report. It describes in detail the following:
  - Technical progress per task: this provides a description of each project Action, including what has been done, what was achieved and whether any changes were made. Detailed technical descriptions and project outputs are included in annexes.
  - Dissemination actions: this provides a comprehensive overview of dissemination activities per action, including quantitative data (e.g. number of times a particular report has been downloaded from the project website).
  - Evaluation of Project Implementation: this provides an evaluation of the project methodology and compares the results achieved against the original objectives. It also evaluates the effectiveness of the dissemination.
  - Analysis of long-term benefits: this part of the report describes the long-term benefits of the project on the environment and the relevance to marine policy. It also gives evidence to the long-term benefits and sustainability to the economy, society and the environment. The replicability, demonstration, transferability and cooperation of the project is described in detail, with specific examples highlighted as evidence. This section also highlights the lessons learned from the project and the innovation and demonstration value – as well as the long term indicators for success.
- **Comments on the financial report**: this section gives an overview of the costs incurred, information about the accounting system and relevant issues from the partnership agreements and the allocation of the costs per action.

3. **Introduction**

The project focused on the Celtic Seas (as defined by MSFD); an area of sea in the north east Atlantic. We engaged with stakeholders from each of the countries within the Celtic Seas, including: England, Northern Ireland, Republic of Ireland, Scotland, Wales and France. We also engaged with the Isle of Man. As identified at the beginning of the project, the main pressures affecting the Celtic Seas result from:
- Fishing
- Seafloor damage
- Pollution by nutrient enrichment and contaminants
- Spreading of non-native species
Marine litter
Underwater noise

Continuing degradation of our oceans is a significant risk to our marine resources and the activities and communities that depend on them. We identified in the project proposal that better planning and management is needed to restore and protect the health of our seas. In 2008, the European Union introduced the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) to promote sustainable use of our seas. The aim of the directive is to achieve Good Environmental Status (GES) in Europe’s seas by 2020. Good Environmental Status involves protecting the marine environment, preventing any further deterioration and restoring it where practical, while using marine resources sustainably. The Directive requires that countries work together at a regional/sub-regional scale to develop marine strategies for achieving GES.

At the core of MSFD is the concept of implementing the ecosystem approach to management to achieve healthy seas. The ecosystem approach, in simple terms, is a way of managing marine activities that looks at the environment as a whole, including the human relationship with that environment. It promotes conservation and sustainable use of resources and addresses the need to balance social, economic and environmental issues. The involvement of stakeholders in management is at the heart of the ecosystem approach.

For this approach to be successful, countries and sectors need to work together and coordinate their efforts. Stakeholders must have the means and opportunities to talk to each other, to communicate with government and to share experience and information. However, before the Celtic Seas Partnership there were few mechanisms in place to facilitate any discussion or exchange of information at this sub-regional, cross-border scale for the people that are directly involved in marine activities. The Celtic Seas Partnership built upon the work undertaken in the PISCES project and applied it at a much larger scale.

The Celtic Seas Partnership brought together key stakeholder that use or have an interest in the Celtic Seas (including governments and the scientific community) to find workable ways of implementing the MSFD. This information can then inform marine management – giving stakeholders the opportunity to influence how their marine environment will be managed in the years to come. Stakeholders hold the solutions to many of the problems that face Europe’s seas – this project found a way of getting those solutions out on the table. And, getting the people that can put those solutions into practice around that table.

Objectives of the project

Goal: Demonstrate successful approaches to transboundary ecosystem-based marine management through multi-stakeholder collaboration to guide practical implementation of MSFD and contribute to “good environmental status” of the Celtic Seas Marine Region.

Objective 1: By 2016, effective engagement mechanisms have been established with key sectoral interests; and the most appropriate scales/mechanisms for engagement (e.g. Celtic Seas Forum, Irish Sea Platform) recognised to support delivery of ecosystem-based and integrated management.

Objective 2: By 2016, successful ecosystem-based management techniques and methods to support integrated marine management have been developed and demonstrated through multi-
stakeholder collaboration to guide practical implementation of European maritime policy including the MSFD.

Expected Results:

- **Expected Result 1:** By 2016, at least 30 stakeholders across the Celtic Seas Marine Region are familiar with the requirements of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and are willing to cooperate and coordinate activities.
- **Expected Result 2:** By 2016, transboundary governance approaches led by stakeholders demonstrate effective use of the ecosystem approach for transboundary marine management.
- **Expected Result 3:** By 2016, best practice approaches between sectors have been developed and applied to produce sustainable management of Celtic Seas Marine Region resources.
- **Expected Result 4:** By 2016, Techniques and methods have been developed for the CSMR to help monitor GES.

We used a full team meeting in early 2016 to review and refine the indicators of success for the project aim, two objectives and four expected results. This was a useful exercise because many of the indicators we wrote at the beginning of the project have evolved since the project started (see Annex C1.12 for the revised indicators). The actual wording or focus of the aim, two objectives and Expected Results have not changed – just the indicators behind them. This has not affected any of the deliverables or deadlines; it has improved the way we can measure the success of the project and provide evidence.

How we planned to achieve our objectives:

- **Stakeholder-led approach:**
  The Celtic Seas Partnership was primarily a stakeholder engagement project. The project partners facilitated the delivery of the project, but the stakeholders themselves played a key role in shaping the direction and developing the deliverables. By putting stakeholders at the heart of the project we encouraged ownership and ensured the usefulness of the project.

- **Partnership working:**
  Traditional approaches of working in silos to manage the seas has had a damaging impact on the marine environment. There was a need (as is addressed in MSFD) for sectors and countries to work together and coordinate their approaches at a regional scale - thinking about what makes sense for the environment. We encouraged cross-sector and cross-border collaboration to deliver the project objectives and inspired a commitment to continue the partnership working beyond the life of the project.

**Expected longer term results:**

This multi-stakeholder project provided expert facilitation to guide the identified group of marine stakeholders from different sectors in the UK, Republic of Ireland and France to:

- Increase their understanding of marine policy and recognise the importance of engaging with policy consultations and decision making.
- Increase their understanding and appreciation of each other’s perspectives and build relationships and trust by working together.
- Improve communication and coordination between sectors and countries in the Celtic Seas.
- Increase governments’ recognition of the role of stakeholders in supporting MSFD implementation.
- Ensure governments, EC and industry recognise the need/role of regional stakeholder forums in integrated marine management.
- Increase their understanding of the Celtic Seas marine environment and the information available for management.
- Use Celtic Seas scale information to inform implementation of MSFD and improve management practices.
- Ensure that stakeholders value the effectiveness of working in partnership.
- Ensure that marine sectors in Celtic Seas adapt management practices based on the ecosystem approach.

The results of the Celtic Seas Partnership project demonstrate successful approaches to transboundary ecosystem-based marine management through multi-stakeholder collaboration, which has guided practical implementation of MSFD and contributed to “good environmental status” of the Celtic Seas.

Please refer to Annex C1.3 for the theory of change diagrams for the project, including the contractual statement, the conceptual model and the results chain.

For more details of the project, please refer to the project Strategy (Annex 3.1).

4. Administrative part

4.1 Description of the management system

Description and schematic presentation of working method

Project phases:

1. Preparatory phase (A Actions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Name of the action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Project scoping for lessons learnt to apply to the Celtic Seas Marine Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Stakeholder mapping - sector profiling, influence mapping and engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Baseline analysis of the existing capacities and needs for capacity building for MSFD implementation - desktop review, meetings with national administrations &amp; recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Implementation phase (B Actions, C Actions, D Actions, E Actions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Name of the action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Strengthen links between national administrations and sectors to raise awareness and understanding of transboundary MSFD implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Establish Celtic Seas Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Develop Celtic Seas management measures based on PISCES ecosystem approach guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Test effective approaches to transnational collaborative action in the Irish Sea to support MSFD implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Identify best practice in designing and establishing transboundary marine governance structures for ecosystem-based marine management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Develop terrestrial planning good practice guidelines to support MSFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Demonstrate effective approaches to develop co-ordinated terrestrial and marine planning: Applying Integrated Coastal Zone Management in Dublin Bay to develop a Strategic Management Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Develop codes of best practice on marine co-location and conflict resolution to support ecosystem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Dissemination phase
The Commission approved the application for a project extension (by signing ‘Amendment No2 to Grant Agreement for project’ letter dated 30th November 2016) for three months from the end of December 2016 to the end of March 2017. The reason for the extension request was to allow for further dissemination and communication of the project outputs following the final conference in autumn 2016. We developed a dissemination communication plan (Annex 5.2.1) and tracked dissemination activities for each project output (Annex 5.2.2).

Planning
The project planning Gantt chart was used to track the progress of project activities (see Annex E1.5), and was reviewed at each Steering Group meeting where the Associated Beneficiaries were given an opportunity to report back to the group with their activities since the previous meeting, and their progress was mapped against the project Gantt chart.

The coordinating beneficiary, associated beneficiaries and project organisation
The Project Manager convened Project Core Group meetings on a monthly basis. These were held by teleconference except once every three months when the meetings were held in person at the WWF-UK headquarters in Woking. This gave an opportunity to discuss progress in person and share ideas. In the last year of the project it was a challenge to maintain good communication and information exchange between partners during a busy time for project delivery. In order to address this, the Project Manager decided to limit the team meetings with partners to one day (rather than 1.5 days), to reduce the amount of time required, but to use this time efficiently with focussed discussions targeted on specific aspects requiring input from others. We held the final full team meeting in Woking in December 2016, where we discussed options for ensuring a legacy for some of the Celtic Seas Partnership projects and initiatives into the future.

As well as the Project Core Group meetings, the Project Manager arranged short optional monthly ‘drop-in’ teleconferences for people to stay in touch with project activities if they were able or interested in joining. This meant that there was an opportunity every two weeks for the project team members to join project meetings.

The Project Manager convened Steering Group meeting once every three months (to coincide with the Project Core Group meetings). This was attended by the Project Manager, Policy Officer, Project Liaison Officer, Administrative Officer and the senior representatives from University of Liverpool, NERC-BODC, SeaWeb and EMRA.
An organogram of the project core team and the project management structure can be found in Annex 4.1. The roles and responsibilities of each Core Project Team post:

Project Manager (FT): responsible for overall strategic direction of the project, manage and oversee the project, fulfil reporting requirements, manage the core project staff, act as main point of contact for the EC, Chair the Steering Group and generally ensure the project is managed technically and financially in line with this proposal and in accordance with EC LIFE+ guidelines.

Policy Officer (FT): provided the expertise on marine policy, including ecosystem approach, marine spatial planning and marine management, plus specifically on the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, and the delivery of good environmental status. This post was the gatekeeper for UK government, ensuring dialogue is maintained throughout the project. The post worked closely with the Country Stakeholder Engagement Officers to coordinate stakeholder engagement at the regional, national and local level, and maintained flows of information from other Member State governments and stakeholders. The Policy Officer sat on the Steering Group, and was required to deputise for the Project Manager when necessary.

Project Liaison Officer (FT): responsible for monitoring and evaluation for the project, including regular updating of progress against indicators in the project logframe and monitoring plan (Action C.1), coordinating and reviewing the project’s theory of change and monitoring project risk. This post led the coordination of the technical and financial reports to the EC. The Project Liaison Officer sat on the Steering Group.

Communications Officer (FT): responsible for developing and implementing a Celtic Seas Partnership Communications Strategy (Action D.1), liaising with Country Stakeholder Engagement Officers, and acting as gatekeeper for all media activities (press enquiries, press releases, etc.). The Communications Officer was responsible for the marketing and branding of the project, ensuring consistency throughout in the design and layout of communications, briefings, reports and the key messages and style used.

Administrative Officer (PT): provided all necessary administrative support for the project and project team, organising logistics for meetings, conferences, workshops, travel, etc. The Administrative Officer managed and maintained the contacts database.

Country Stakeholder Engagement Officers for Scotland, South-west England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FT): responsible for engaging national/local stakeholders and engaging in local activities and projects. These posts maintained communication routes with relevant governance bodies, promoted the project with local stakeholders, and contributed to delivery of a range of Actions including: Sector Profiling and Engagement (Action A.2), strengthen links between national administrations and sectors to develop stakeholder capacity on MSFD (Action B.1), supporting Celtic Seas Conferences (Action B.2), development of Celtic Seas management measures based on PISCES ecosystem approach guidelines (Action B.3), piloting a transnational working group (Action B.4), exploring the use of cross-border structures (Action B.5), demonstration projects (Action B.6, Action B.7), developing and showcasing codes of best practices, and co-location case studies (Action B8) and supporting the assessment of future trends (Action B.10).
Finance Officer (PT): responsible for managing the budget, ensuring the project kept to budget, managing accounts, and preparing financial reports. The Finance Officer liaised with the Project Manager over financial aspects of the project.

Web Officer (PT): responsible for overseeing the development of the project website, liaising with subcontracted web developers; uploading material to the website; coordinating use of online meeting software (ensuring all Steering Group have had necessary training in this), and provided training to the Communication Officer and Administrative Officer in basic web editing and monitoring content appearing on discussion boards.

Eastern and Midlands Regional Assembly (EMRA): EMRA were responsible for the stakeholder engagement actions for Dublin Bay, where they took the lead on establishing relationships with relevant Irish stakeholders in Dublin Bay. They led on Action B7 – Demonstrate effective approaches to develop coordinated terrestrial and marine planning: Applying Integrated Coastal Zone Management in Dublin Bay to develop a Strategic Management Framework. This demonstration project directly informed the development of the terrestrial planning good practice guidelines under Action B6 and stakeholder engagement through the demonstration project informed the development of the strategic guide to knowledge integration and harmonised data / information management (Action B.11) and the Celtic Seas Web Portal (Action D.3). EMRA as an associated beneficiary sat on the project Steering Group. Staff changes took place at EMRA during the project, Walter Foley who was the Project Coastal Manager passed away on the 12th of January 2016. Travis O’Doherty and Susan Mahon joined the project team, and Jim Conway remained on the project as EMRA’s Director throughout.

University of Liverpool (ULIV): ULIV were responsible for stakeholder engagement for northern England and they established meetings with key contacts in marine interest groups for two-way dialogue in the project in the region. Working closely with the SEO for Wales and South West England, they supported the target stakeholder group in attendance at meetings and on the outreach activities. ULIV also led on a number of actions in the project: Action B4 – Test effective approaches to transnational collaborative action in the Irish Sea to support MSFD implementation; Action B6 – Develop terrestrial planning good practice guidelines to support MSFD; Action B9 – Ecosystem Services Assessment. ULIV as an associated beneficiary sat on the project Steering Group.

SeaWeb: SeaWeb were responsible for providing expert knowledge on the management challenges which exist in the Celtic Seas from the French perspective. Although they did not lead any of the project actions, they provided valuable technical advice and excellent connections/knowledge of the stakeholders and wider stakeholders in their region. They led on establishing meetings with Member State Government officials and other key contacts in marine interest groups for two-way dialogue in the project. They supported the target stakeholder group in attendance at meetings and on the outreach activities. SeaWeb as an associated beneficiary sat on the project Steering Group.

Natural Environment Research Council – British Oceanographic Data Centre (NERC-BODC): NERC-BODC invested in the project to support the engagement opportunities it offers to improve the exchange of information between the scientific community, government and a wide stakeholder community – particularly in relation to their Knowledge Exchange programme. They specifically led on the strategic guide to knowledge integration and harmonised data/information management (Action B.11) and the Celtic Seas Web Portal.
(Action D3) actions. NERC-BODC as an associated beneficiary sat on the project Steering Group.

**Changes due to amendments to the Grant Agreement**

We submitted a project modification in June 2016, which was approved by the Commission (by signing ‘Amendment No2 to Grant Agreement for project’ letter dated 30th November 2016). The amendment request letter summarises the changes (see Annex 4.2). Changes approved included:

- To extend the end date by three months from the end of December 2016 to the end of March 2017 to allow for further dissemination and communication of the project outputs following the final conference in autumn 2016.
- An amendment to the project budget. We re-evaluated the project budget requested changes which did not affect the total costs. The total budget of €3,963,025 remained the same and the EC’s contribution remained the same at a maximum of €1,973,546.

**Partnership agreements**

The partnership agreement was submitted to the Commission with the Inception Report September 2013. There were some changes to the Associated Beneficiaries which were included in an amendment request to be submitted in 2016: Dublin Regional Authority (DRA) was dissolved as an organisation in December 2014 and became part of Eastern and Midlands Regional Assembly (EMRA) on 1 January 2015. SeaWeb is now SeaWeb Europe, based in France rather than the UK. The Associated Beneficiary forms were updated to reflect these changes, and were submitted with the project amendment request, which was approved by the Commission (by signing ‘Amendment No2 to Grant Agreement for project’ letter dated 30th November 2016).

4.2 Evaluation of the management system

The project management process has been effective; regular communications between the Coordinating Beneficiary and Associated Beneficiaries have ensured that activities were coordinated according to schedule. In order to facilitate project management we used a shared password protected drive (Dropbox) to save and share documents. The Highrise contacts database (see Action D.1.) allowed us to share details of contacts and also include information on previous interactions. An outreach record spreadsheet (Annex D1.3) was used by all team members to record activity such as attendance at conferences and events in a central place.

Associated Beneficiaries supplied quarterly financial and technical reports to the Coordinating Beneficiary and budgets were monitored regularly by the Project Finance Officer and Project Manager.

The range of Associated Beneficiaries involved in this project working alongside the Coordinating Beneficiary enabled the collaboration of complementary bodies (statutory, non-governmental and academic) which facilitated the production of a diverse range of outputs targeted at different audiences.). The different working styles and geographical locations of these organisations presented a serious challenge early on in the project for ensuring strong cohesion of project activities, which led to a delay in commencing work on some of the deliverables. However this was addressed by implementing the useful recommendations of the mid-term review, which helped to bring the Associated Beneficiaries together to focus efforts on the key activities.
Regular communication has been maintained by phone, email and face to face meetings with the appointed EC monitor, Lynne Barratt. The EC monitor completed missions to the WWF on 15th May 2013, 15th December 2014 (with the EC financial desk officer too), 26th August 2015, 9th September 2016 and 24th March 2017. WWF-UK hosted a UK/IE LIFE National Platform meeting on 10th December 2015 at the Living Planet Centre, which was organised by NEEMO/DAI. The meeting included sessions on sustainable exits, after life planning and an ‘EU Clinic’ where participants had a chance to ask the EU officers questions.

5. Technical part

5.1. Technical progress, per task

Action A.1 – Project scoping for lessons learnt to apply to the Celtic Seas

Beneficiary responsible: WWF-UK

The detailed description of the outcomes from Action A.1 and the approach taken was submitted to the Commission in the Inception Report in September 2013. A sub-contractor was appointed to deliver work for Actions A.1 and A.3 in combination. The original proposal identified that we would use sub-contractors to deliver the three preparatory actions (A.1, A.2, A.3). We decided to combine Actions A.1 and A.3 in a single contract due to the overlap and complementarity of the two Actions. This change was approved by the Commission with the September 2013 Inception Report (Ref. Ares(2014)67790 - 14/01/2014). The contract was awarded to Coastal and Marine Research Centre (CMRC) and the final outputs were delivered by September 2013.

A.1.1. Literature search

Complete – update provided in the October 2014 Progress Report

A thorough literature review was conducted and combined with the desk-top review of MSFD implementation required under Action A3. The report was submitted with the October 2014 Progress Report and can be found in Annex A1.1.

Indicator:
Expected: Analysis of at least 25 key sources of literature and the production of a Literature review paper by March 2013
Actual: More than 90 sources of literature were cited in the report, which was completed by the deadline.

A.1.2. Review and analysis of outputs from other projects

Complete – update provided in the October 2014 Progress Report

A review of 77 related projects was completed and used to identify lessons learnt and to compare the projects with the Celtic Seas Partnership to identify the unique aspects of the project. The review was submitted with the October 2014 Progress Report and can be seen Annex A1.2. This review helped to identify a number of suitable people for the Expert Advisory Group. The study revealed that there were a range of projects and initiatives with potential for complementarily with the key activities and expected results of the Celtic Seas Partnership. This scoping exercise identified a number of synergies for collaborative opportunities. However, despite this synergism the Celtic Seas Partnership was unique in its goal to develop mechanisms, tools and relationships to build stakeholder capacity.
Indicator:
Expected: By April 2013 a review of projects has been produced. By the by January 2014 the transfer of knowledge from at least 20 projects & initiatives has started to be incorporated into the Celtic Seas Marine Region activities.
Actual: A review of 77 related projects was completed by the deadline and were incorporated into project activities.

A.1.3. Interviews to identify lessons learned
Complete – update provided in the October 2014 Progress Report
Interviews were conducted by the Celtic Seas Partnership Stakeholder Engagement Officers from August to September 2013 with key players, from 12 projects, in marine and maritime research from England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, Ireland, Isle of Man, and other EU Member States regarding lessons learnt from current and previous initiatives in marine management. The results from the interviews fed into the report in Annex A1.1.

Indicator:
Expected: By June 2013 the identification of the most appropriate people to sit on the Expert Advisory Group for the project duration has occurred.
Actual: Key players from 12 projects were identified by the deadline. By October 2013 8 people were approached.

A.1.4 Reporting of project scoping for lessons learnt to apply to the Celtic Seas
Complete – update provided in the October 2014 Progress Report
The scoping report was produced by CMRC (see Annex A1.2), which analyses the outputs from projects which were relevant to informing the work of the Celtic Seas Partnership, including some interviews with key players in marine and maritime research.

Indicator:
Expected: By July 2013 the Report ‘Project Scoping for Lessons Learnt to Apply to the Celtic Seas’ is produced. The Project lessons learnt and experiences will be shared with at least 3 relevant EC (and other) funded projects annually.
Actual: The scoping report was completed by the deadline. 2 representatives of other projects (Stephen Jay and Tom Hooper) attended the first multi-national conference in Liverpool. Celtic Seas Partnership staff attended 5 events from other 4 projects in 2013: TPEA, ISMF, Solway Partnership and CAMIS. In 2014, Lyndsey Dodds attended the STAGES/DEVOTES project event in Brussels, three Celtic Seas Partnership staff attended the EU TPEA workshop in Ireland, and Sarah Twomey attended the Clean Coast Symposium. In 2015, Natasha Barker-Bradshaw attended the Atlantic Action Plan Seminar in London, Laure Lamour attended the equivalent event in France (Plan d’Action pour l’Atlantique) and Jenny Oates and Dan Crook attended the PANACHE/VALMER final conference. In 2016, Sarah Twomey (Marei) attended the MARIBE final stakeholder event, Sam Tedcastle attended a meeting of MASTS Marine Renewables Science Group in Scotland, and Sarah Young attended the Devon Maritime Forum Summer meeting.
Action A.2 - Stakeholder mapping - sector profiling, influence mapping and engagement

Beneficiary responsible: WWF-UK

The detailed description of the outcomes and approach from Action A.2 was submitted to the Commission in the Inception Report. The main elements of Action A.2 were subcontracted to the Scottish Association for Marine Science (SAMS), following the necessary procurement policy and in line with the method identified in the proposal.

A.2.1. Stakeholder and institutional relationship influence mapping

Complete – update provided in September 2013 Inception Report

A stakeholder and policy map of the Celtic Seas was submitted as a report by SAMS with the Inception Report (see Annex A2.1).

Indicator:
Expected: A quantified map of stakeholders and institutions covering all sectors operating across the Celtic Seas has been developed (based on the application of the Rapid Policy Network Mapping, or similar methodology).
Actual: the stakeholder and policy map was developed. These were used to provide a baseline understanding of the stakeholder relationships and policy situation within the Celtic Seas, which helped us to focus project activities on key gaps in relationships and priority areas of policy.

A.2.2. Sector profiling and Engagement

Complete – update provided in September 2013 Inception Report

Alongside and as a result of the stakeholder mapping work (Annex A2.1), SEOs in each country spent time engaging with sectors through meetings/workshops to understand their opportunities & constraints for future management of activities & investment in the Celtic Seas.

Indicator:
Expected: Analysis of stakeholder relationships, policy complexity as part of a multi-dimensional socio-cultural assessment demonstrates an understanding of the broader social structures and operating context of various sectors and stakeholders in the Celtic Seas.
Actual: the analysis was complete, and helped develop the SEOs’ Country Reports.

A.2.3. Reporting and recruitment of stakeholder engagement facilitator

Complete – update provided in September 2013 Inception Report

The SEOs built on the results of the SAMS work (Annex A2.1) to develop individual Country Reports (a Country Report template was developed (Annex A2.2; the six Country Reports can be found in Annex B1.2). WWF-UK subcontracted an independent Action Learning facilitator (Carl Reynolds) to mobilise and energise the Stakeholder Engagement Officers, advise them on process and provide stimuli and a catalyst to the learning by asking questions and making descriptive observations. Carl Reynolds was recruited in November 2013.

Indicator:
Expected: Six Country reports (covering seven national administrations) and an overview report on the results of the stakeholder mapping & sector profiling & engagement action are produced.
Actual: the six Country Reports were completed.

**Action A.3 - Baseline analysis of the existing capacities for MSFD implementation - desktop review, meetings with national administrations & recommendations**

**Beneficiary responsible: WWF-UK**

As mentioned under Action A.1, we combined the contract for A.1 and A.3 into one single contract due to the similarities and overlap between the two actions. The detailed description of the outcomes and approach from Action A.3 was submitted to the Commission in the Inception Report.

A.3.1. Identifying needs for Transboundary MSFD implementation in CSR

**Complete – update provided in September 2013 Inception Report**

As stated under Action A.1, this was completed by CMRC as a joint report covering A.1 and A.3. The final version of their report is Annex A1.2. The study found that no appropriate mechanism existed at the time for transboundary stakeholder engagement at the MSFD Celtic Seas sub-regional scale. The report states that a number of transboundary platforms offered an opportunity for stakeholder dialogue at various scales such as the Irish Sea, the Channel Area, the Celtic Sea ICES boundaries etc. The Celtic Seas Partnership aimed to address this vacuum by establishing the most appropriate scale and mechanism for transboundary engagement to support delivery of ecosystem- based and integrated management. Moreover, the project designated Stakeholder Engagement Officers (SEOs) in all six countries bordering the Celtic Seas. In addition to the focused programmes of meeting, country workshops and three multinational conferences, the presence of these SEOs allowed for better coordination of efforts across the entire sub-region.

Indicator:

Expected: By the end of March 2013 Criteria for effective transboundary MSFD implementation have been identified and the current state of preparedness for transboundary management of marine sectors is understood.
Actual: this was completed by CMRC by the deadline as a joint report covering A.1 and A.3.

A.3.2. Summarising the barriers and opportunities for MSFD implementation

**Complete – update provided in September 2013 Inception Report**

This report analyses the legal and policy context of marine management in the Celtic Seas, provides an update on the current status of MSFD implementation, and identifies barriers and opportunities for implementing MSFD in the Celtic Seas. The Celtic Seas Partnership project set out to improve policy and governance through testing, evaluating and disseminating actions and methodologies to offer best practice approaches for effective transboundary engagement based on an ecosystem approach to deliver the MSFD. The unique geographic scale that the Celtic Seas Partnership functioned at was connecting, raising environmental awareness and strengthening information exchange amongst sea-users, scientists and policy makers from all of the projects and initiatives identified in the study for the first time at a Celtic Seas sub-regional scale as defined by the MSFD. The report was used to inform the scope and focus of the other activities in the project. The report was completed by CMRC (a section in Annex 3.1) and submitted with the October 2014 Progress Report.
Indicator:
Expected: By June 2013 Stakeholders in the region participating in the project are made more familiar with the opportunities and suggested ways of building capacities for MSFD implementation in their region and across the CSMR.
Actual: this was completed by CMRC by the deadline as a joint report covering A.1 and A.3.

A.3.3. Communication of the recommendations and feedback of the results to the other project activities
Complete – update provided in September 2013 Inception Report
The report submitted with the October 2014 Progress Report in A3.1 provided a fundamental baseline for design of the 1st round of Country Workshops and was used to inform the development of the Celtic Seas Web Portal (Action D.3) and Strategic Guide (Action B.11) by identifying those areas that are most useful to sectors and governments for building capacity.

Indicator:
Expected: By June 2013 information gained and suggestions for capacity building developed by the Action are used to inform project activities, in particular, B11 (Strategic Guide for Knowledge Integration) and D3 (Web-Portal).
Actual: The report provided a baseline for the design of the 1st round of Country Workshops, B.11 and D3.

Action B.1 – Strengthen links between national administrations and sectors to raise awareness and understanding of transboundary MSFD implementation

Beneficiary responsible: WWF-UK

B.1.1. Stakeholder engagement
Complete
Extensive stakeholder engagement was carried out across the Celtic Seas countries – with over 1,725 marine stakeholders from 22 sectors having been directly communicated or met with; and we’ve organised over 20 Celtic Seas Partnership events. As well as industry sectors, the Stakeholder Engagement Officers (SEOs) held regular meetings with government and statutory agency officials in each of the project countries (see also Action D.2.). Details of engagement per country from this report period can be found in Annex B1.1. Engagement for all previous reporting periods have been submitted in the previous progress reports. Annex B1.7 gives a summary of all the Country Workshops and multi-national conferences on a timeline.

The Celtic Seas Partnership was primarily a stakeholder engagement project and underpinned all Actions in the project. The project partners facilitated the delivery of the project, but the stakeholders themselves played a key role in shaping the direction and developing the deliverables. The Celtic Seas Partnership has brought together different sectors by acting as a neutral facilitator. From trying to tackle something as ambitious as stakeholder engagement with MSFD, the Celtic Seas Partnership really pushed the boundaries with regard to working across borders and across sectors. The project provided a unique platform for stakeholders from different sectors and countries to get together.

The core project team have attended 628 meetings and/or workshops reaching an audience of approximately 13,600 key stakeholders (some duplication of stakeholders at events). 87
meetings and events were held/attended with Government officials across UK, Ireland and France during the project. Through these meetings, government officials were kept up to date with developments in the project, and provided feedback on synergies with their own current and planned work.

At the end of the final multi-national conference in October 2016 we asked the delegates to fill out an evaluation form. When asked how useful they have found engaging with the Celtic Seas Partnership 83% gave a score of 4 or 5 out of 5. Positive comments to this question included providing an excellent forum for stakeholder engagement. Richard Cronin from the Irish Government and vice chair of OSPAR Commission was quoted as saying “I began very sceptical about stakeholder engagement and its benefit and through the CSP I saw its worth”.

In the final survey sent out to stakeholders in June 2017, David Johnson (Seascape Consultants and member of the Expert Advisory Board) stated: “The project has done an excellent job to start many conversations and bring together disparate stakeholders”. When asked whether they agree with some statements, 100% of respondents said that they agree that the Celtic Seas Partnership project has created a highly engaged network of stakeholders. 50% of respondents ‘strongly agree’ and 50% ‘agree’ that the stakeholder engagement mechanisms developed under the Celtic Seas Partnership project have supported Marine Strategy Framework Directive implementation.

John McCartney (member of the Expert Advisory Group) said that “Interaction between stakeholders and officials” was the key achievement/success of the Celtic Seas Partnership. Another stakeholder said that the project’s biggest achievement was “Bringing stakeholders together to work collaboratively on a regional seas basis”.

One stakeholder said that “Stakeholder engagement at the Celtic Seas regional scale” will be the legacy or lasting impact of the Celtic Seas Partnership.

We contracted Carl Reynolds to carry out an independent analysis of Stakeholder Engagement Officer’s experiences of engagement with stakeholders during project.. See Annex B1.6 for a summary of the lessons from this review). Key lessons include:

- Stakeholders engage when they perceive there is something to engage about. This might be a policy change, conflict or desire to include others in new practices. Stakeholder analysis needs to be undertaken alongside situational analysis, to ascertain what’s relevant.
- We also recognised early on the value of individual face to face meetings/workshop with our stakeholders, instead of teleconferences – including the informal networking elements. Never underestimate the value of face-to-face meetings/workshops with stakeholders.

Indicator:
Expected: By Dec 2016 at least 120 stakeholders are actively engaged in at least one of the project lead activities (e.g. workshops or conferences) and at least 20 of these stakeholders are self-motivated to apply project outputs within their sector.
Actual: 296 stakeholders were actively engaged in at least one of the project activities. More than 20 of these were engaged in the Task Groups.
B.1.2. – Develop Criteria for effective MSFD & ICZM

Complete

The criteria for effective MSFD & ICZM implementation (Annex B1.10) were developed by drawing on lessons learned from the whole project. Information was compiled from several project activities to feed into the criteria report. We analysed the approaches to stakeholder engagement which were used in different Actions within the project, focusing on B6, B7, and B8 as case studies. Based on lessons learned from the project, we identified a set of recommendations for MSFD implementation and from these, developed a set of criteria for involving stakeholders in MSFD implementation, which can be applied to other areas and contexts. This approach has been published in the ICES Journal of Marine Science (Annex B1.11), which means that others will be apply to apply and use this approach more widely in other marine regions. The paper has already received 134 page views and 49 number of downloads since February 2017.

Indicator:
Expected: By March 2017 a set of criteria for effective MSFD and ICM implementation is developed and integrated from 3 types of demonstration projects and the inputs from at least 3 other activity types is produced.
Actual: the criteria was developed by the deadline, focusing on the case study examples from B.6, B.7 and B.8. They have been shared more widely through a published academic article.

B.1.3. – Develop an online tool on MSFD

Complete – update provided in October 2014 Progress Report

An online tutorial and animation to improve stakeholders’ understanding of the MSFD was published on the Celtic Seas Partnership website and the animation and videos can also be viewed on YouTube (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mHT8FTutAoE) and Vimeo (https://vimeo.com/100896833). The animation was viewed more than 3,504 times on Vimeo and 1,092 times on Youtube. Stakeholder feedback on the animation was very positive, with many people commenting on how the video clearly explained the purpose of the MSFD.

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2013 an online tutorial is developed and ready for use by stakeholders with the aim of strengthening their understanding of MSFD and GES.
Actual: The online tutorial was developed by the deadline.

B.1.4. – National stakeholder meetings on MSFD and GES – ‘country workshops’

Complete – update provided in September 2016 Progress Report

The project completed two rounds of country workshops held in each of the six countries within the Celtic Seas. The workshop reports for each country can be found in Annex B1.2. In total 181 stakeholders attended the first round of workshops and 132 stakeholders attended the second round of workshops. The feedback from the workshops was overwhelmingly positive. In response to the second round of country workshops, participants were asked to give two words that best summed up the day – interesting, informative and useful were the most given.

During the first round of Country Workshops (May - September 2014) we asked participants to focus on further developing some of the shortlisted measures in the priority descriptor areas (Action B.3). Stakeholders developed action plans for measures which considered what needs to be done, what resources are needed and who else needs to be involved. In the second round of Country Workshops (October 2015 - January 2016) the stakeholders provided input into the development of Actions B.10, B.5, B.6, B.8 and B.11.
Indicator:
Expected: By March 2014 six cross-sectoral multi-stakeholder country workshops will have been held involving at least 20 stakeholders from at least 8-10 country specific sectors.
Actual: The project completed two rounds of country workshops held in each of the six countries within the Celtic Seas, involving at 132 stakeholders from 14 country specific sectors.

B.1.5. – Lessons incorporated to inform further project actions

Complete

It was important to constantly monitor and review our stakeholder analysis. Key contacts change, sectors can become over or underrepresented, new interest can add capacity to develop the project work in a different direction. It was important not only to create and build a contact list but to also treat it as an organic entity that requires attention. With the project outputs becoming available throughout the final year of the project, we conducted a final stakeholder review to allow us to strategically plan from who and when we needed input, who we were targeting with the different products and tailor the way they were developed to the way people would prefer to receive them (the final country reports can be found in Annex B1.3).

Indicator:
Expected: By March 2017 lessons are drawn out every sixth months from at least three types of project activities, including the national stakeholder meetings on MSFD and GES and feedback into the other project actions.
Actual: we constantly monitored and reviewed our stakeholder analysis based on lessons we had learned. The lessons were used to inform Country Workshops and other project activities.

B.1.6. Pilot a civic mediation approach to build relationship between the Scottish government, ENGOs and the fishing industry.

Completed – further updates provided in the September 2016 Progress Report

A pilot civic mediation programme was run in Scotland to build better relationships between Scottish fishermen, government, and eNGOs. This was an additional element that was added under Action B.1 to support stakeholder engagement with a sector that can be most challenging to engage with. The Commission approved the addition of this piece of work with the approval of the project budget amendment (by signing ‘Amendment No2 to Grant Agreement for project’ letter dated 30th November 2016). The detailed work plan for the process (including the purpose and objectives) can be seen in Annex B1.8.

A scoping exercise took place between June 2014 and November 2014 and involved Brendan McAllister - Lead mediator and team leader (contracted by WWF), and Sam Tedcastle (Stakeholder Engagement Officer Scotland) - Co-mediator and logistical planning. The objective of the scoping phase was to explore the potential of mediation to promote good relations and help address challenges facing the Scottish fishing industry, authorities and conservationists to achieve healthy productive Scottish waters. A final report of this phase was produced which outlined options for stakeholders to consider for a potential Delivery Phase (see Annex B1.9).

The delivery phase of the work started in December 2014 and was successfully completed and evaluated in line with the proposed timescale. The process was delivered and written up by December 2015. The process involved the delivery of one-weekend workshop, three one-day workshops and 6 contact group meetings plus several one to one and stakeholder group
meetings. A funding bid was submitted to Fisheries Innovation Scotland, with the support of the contact group, however unfortunately the bid was unsuccessful.

A thorough evaluation was undertaken of the mediation process which highlighted the impact of the work (see Annex B1.4). The review revealed that one of the added benefits of the fisheries mediation work has been an increased level of trust from the fishing industry in the Celtic Seas Partnership, which has led to very strong engagement from industry in our project activities especially the Fishing4data work. Achievements identified from the review included:

- Positive engagement with the Scottish fishing sector: with the large number of meetings and engagement processes calling on people’s time, the fact that so many fishermen, skipper and businessmen attended from so many different areas attended was an achievement as their attendance cost a day’s loss of earnings
- New voices were heard: static gear fishermen, divers, deep sea skippers and local sustainable seafood businessmen emerged as leaders through the process and were able to voice their perspectives and put forward solutions that were listened to.
- Government recognised this as a valuable approach to dealing with more localised conflicts and funded more meetings with the mediator
- Stakeholders appreciated and wanted the process to continue: stakeholder valued the creation of a safe space to have conversations

A one-day Conflict and Mediation Awareness course was run for colleagues from WWF, SeaWeb and IUCN peers in January 2017 – the plan for the workshop and attendee list can be seen in Annex B1.5 (see Section 5.2 for more details).

We produced a film entitled “Using civic mediation to improve relationships in Scotland’s fishing industry”, which has received 227 views on YouTube at the time of writing. The film gives an overview of the mediation process, and features some of the stakeholders we worked with on this. We promoted the film in the final project newsletter to our stakeholders, and have been showing it at events. The film is available to watch from the Celtic Seas Partnership website: http://www.celticseaspartnership.eu/celtic-seas-partnership/fisheries-mediation/

Fisheries mediation in France

Fisheries mediation interest has also emerged in France (from the French fishery sector) after a presentation of the Scottish pilot project at the Paris multi-national conference in May 2015. A report was produced for the fisheries mediation process in France entitled “Summary of Relationship Survey Results Between the fisheries sector and NGOs in France” (Annex B1.12). The objective of the French mediation scoping exercise was to carry out a series of individual interviews with a mediator on a conflictual subject present in the French fishing industry. After consultation with stakeholders, the topic chosen for the scoping exercise was the relations between fishermen and environmental NGOs.

In the framework of the Celtic Seas Partnership project, SeaWeb were able to conduct, before the end of the project, a series of 20 interviews with all the key actors of the fishing industry, environmental NGOs and elected officials and government members concerned with this issue.
The scoping exercise showed that the stakeholders felt frustrated with the current situation and felt that relations between them were not at their optimal level and hinder good decision-making for management of the marine environment. These bad relationships were seen as barriers to effective exchange and decision-making in order to reach the good environmental status of the environment, which would be beneficial to all.

It should be noted that, apart from very extreme groups who remained in their strong point of views, both fishermen and NGOs, another larger group of representatives of these two sectors were open and interested in continuing to exchange and discuss on this topic. Therefore, SeaWeb Europe will undertake, if funding is available, a follow-up of this mediation exercise in France beyond the existence of the Celtic Seas Partnership project, which would have enabled the existence of this initiative.

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2016 Scottish stakeholders will have committed and engaged in a process of dialogue which builds relationships across sectors to enable constructive problem solving and influences policy decisions. There is an appetite for further development of mediative processes across the Celtic Seas region.
Actual: The process was delivered and written up by December 2015. There was appetite for a similar process in France.

**Action B.2 – Establishment of Celtic Seas conference**

**Beneficiary responsible:** WWF-UK

Three multinational conferences were organised and facilitated by the Celtic Seas Partnership team. The first conference was held in Liverpool in October 2013, the second in Paris in May 2015, and the final conference was held in Dublin in October 2016. They provided participants with an opportunity to discuss transboundary marine issues with participants from different countries, and as a result of the different sectors involved in the conferences, it provided an opportunity to consider issues and potential solutions from alternative points of view.

We carried out comparison of the three multi-national events, which can be seen in Annex B2.1, all three of the conferences received high evaluation scores, and participants were very positive about having the chance to engage with stakeholders from different sectors and countries – this was most apparent at the Dublin conference where people were pleased to have so much time allocated for networking. The word 'informative' was one of the top two words to describe all three events. Out of the three events, the Paris (2015) conference received the highest average score for the three quantitative questions, followed by Dublin (2016) and then Liverpool (2013). The main outcomes from each report can be seen in the sub-actions below.

**B.2.1 First Celtic Seas Conference**

**Complete – update provided in October 2014 Progress Report**

The first Celtic Seas Conference was held in Liverpool in October 2013. The conference had over 70 participants, which exceeded the target of 60 participants in the Grant Agreement (see conference report in Annex B2.2). Delegates participated in exercises to build their understanding of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) and the ecosystem
approach, and considered the relevance to their own sector. The main output that stakeholders produced at the conference was a variety of draft measures covering all 11 MSFD descriptors. These draft measures were then evaluated to determine whether they had the potential to be further developed by stakeholders in order to add value to the process of MSFD implementation in the Celtic Seas.

Indicator:
Expected: By September 2013 at least 60 stakeholders attend and participate in the 1st Celtic Seas Conference.
Actual: 70 participants attended the 1st Celtic Seas conference in October 2013.

B.2.2 Second Celtic Seas Conference

Complete – update provided in the September 2016 Progress Report

The second Celtic Seas Conference was held in Paris in May 2015. The conference had over 60 delegates (see conference report in Annex B2.3). This number of participants was lower than the 80 participants which was expected in the Grant Agreement. The reason for this was the cost of holding the event in Paris which led to limitations around being able to cover travel and accommodation costs for large numbers of stakeholders travelling to Paris from around the Celtic Seas. However it was considered important to hold one of the multi-national events in France in order to ensure attendance of French stakeholders, and Paris was the most central location for French stakeholders to travel to. We succeeded in the aim of securing attendance from French stakeholders, with 14 French stakeholders from a range of sectors in attendance.

The second conference focused on three broad areas: an update on MSFD delivery in each Celtic Seas Member State, an update on the Celtic Seas Partnership project and a review and analysis of key pieces of project work. The first day kicked off with a presentation from the Project Manager, setting the scene for the conference and sharing some project successes. This was followed by a lively and informative panel session featuring key government representatives from France, Ireland and the UK and experts from the marine science/policy community. It was a great opportunity to have these governments side-by-side talking openly about their delivery of the MSFD so far, and an opportunity for participants to ask questions. After spending most of the first afternoon listening, the second day was the opportunity for delegates to get stuck in during smaller group-working – providing invaluable feedback, ideas and guidance to the project’s work on stakeholder initiatives and case studies.

At the conference we asked delegates to support and provide feedback on the work of the task groups to date. Delegates selected which of the groups they were interested in and separated out into their chosen break-out session. Each task group presented their work including key points from an action plan that they had produced for the initiative. Delegates were then asked to provide constructive feedback through a facilitated review and generate ideas for issues such as funding and potential partners. There was interest in all of the task groups but the biodiversity and marine litter groups were most popular (see Action B.3 for more details).

Indicator:
Expected: By March 2015 at least 80 stakeholders attend and participate in the 2nd Celtic Seas Conference.
Actual: 60 participants attended the 2nd Celtic Seas conference in May 2015.
B.2.3 Third Celtic Seas Conference

Complete
The third and final multinational Celtic Seas Partnership conference was held over 18-19th October 2016 at Croke Park in Dublin and was attended by 100 stakeholders. This number of participants was lower than the 120 in the Grant Agreement. This was not due to lack of interest in the conference but rather due to the limitations on the extent to which the interactive sessions (which were essential to delivering the objectives of this conference) could be effective with large numbers of people, hence we decided to cap the number of participants at 100. See Action D.1.10 for further details of outcomes from the conference.

In order to organise this conference regular meetings were arranged with an external facilitator in order to develop the conference objectives and work plan. We tracked progress and actions from these meetings using the basecamp website. Roles were allocate within the team in order to make sure the work progressed in a coordinated way, with different people assuming responsibility for making both logistical and content arrangements.

The outputs of the conference can be found in the conference report (included in Annex B2.4). Images taken by the team on the day can be found in Annex B2.5.

Indicator:
Expected: By September 2016 at least 120 stakeholders attend and participate in the 3rd Celtic Seas Conference.
Actual: 100 participants attended the 3rd Celtic Seas conference in October 2016.

B.2.4. Final dissemination phase of Celtic Seas Partnership

Complete
The project was invited to present its findings and results to member state representatives at a Marine Strategy Coordination Group (MSCG) meeting in April 2017, in order to share its learnings and the best practice developed during the course of the project. Over 20 high level government officials from European member states attended this meeting.

See section 5.2 for details of the dissemination phase.

Indicator:
Expected: By March 2017 at least 20 stakeholders attend and participate in a high profile event on the European stage.
Actual: Presented project findings at the Marine Strategy Coordination Group meeting, where over 20 high level government officials from European member states were in attendance.

Action B.3 – Develop Celtic Seas Management measures based on PISCES best practice guidelines

Beneficiary responsible: WWF-UK

The original action in the grant agreement proposed the development and roll-out of the PISCES ecosystem approach guidelines across the Celtic Seas. This action was adapted to make it more relevant to the current policy situation, in order to produce outputs that have more potential to influence government decisions about MSFD implementation. Through this process we also achieved the original objectives of engaging sectors in ecosystem based actions to improve management of the marine environment. The changes were reflected in the
amendment to the grant agreement that was approved by the Commission in response to the October 2014 Progress Report (Ref. Ares(2015)1195729 - 18/03/2015).

B.3.1 National “country” workshops on developing measures based on Ecosystem Approach principles

Complete – update provided in October 2014 Progress Report

A series of six national workshops were held in each of the project countries between May-September 2014 and were attended by a total of 181 stakeholders (see workshop reports in Annex B3.1). We asked participants to focus on further developing some of the shortlisted measures in the priority descriptor areas. Stakeholders developed action plans for measures which considered what needed to be done, what resources were needed and who else needed to be involved.

Indicator:
Expected: By March 2014 there are draft measures based on ecosystem guidelines for the Celtic Seas Marine Region.
Actual: Between May and September 2014, 6 country workshops were held, which resulted in 181 stakeholder ideas for management measures based on the Ecosystem Approach principles.

B.3.2 Develop management measures for MSFD Programme of Measures

Complete – further updates provided in September 2016 Progress Report

The aim for concluding the work of the Task Groups by the end of the project was to reach a point whereby the initiative could be handed over to stakeholders for progressing. The three Task Groups which were taken forwards (Marine Litter, Biodiversity and Non-indigenous species) have been concluded in this way and the work has been handed over to others for taking forwards where possible. Two of the Task Groups drew to a natural conclusion in 2015 (food webs and underwater noise). The stakeholder initiatives on Marine Litter, Non-indigenous species and Biological Diversity involved 76 stakeholders across ten sectors from six countries.

Outcomes of Task Groups

Marine litter task group

This group explored how the international Eco-Schools programme could help address the problem of marine litter in the Celtic Seas. Eco-Schools are well established in all of the Celtic Seas countries. They follow a common process and set of environmental themes, including litter. This Task Group developed plans for a pilot project where Eco-Schools, working with partners in their communities, would undertake a programme of activities on marine litter. The programme would focus on: increasing awareness of the sources and causes of marine litter; changing public behaviour, policies and business practices to prevent marine litter; and directly reducing marine litter. The Task Group investigated potential sources of funding for the pilot and developed a proposal. The aim was to involve 20-25 schools from across the Celtic Seas.

The Marine Litter Eco-Schools Task Group, and its Education/Eco-Schools Operators Sub-Group developed a costed proposal for a Marine Litter Pilot Project involving Eco-Schools across the Celtic Seas involving a multi-step programme of activities to help Eco-Schools increase awareness, prevention and reduction of the problem (see Annex B3.2).
The Project Administrator took over this Task Group from the SEO for Northern Ireland, following his departure from WWF in September 2016. As outlined in the July 2016 progress report, having finalised a bid proposal for an EcoSchools Marine Litter Pilot the project then encountered problems due to staff changes at Keep Scotland Beautiful and Keep Northern Ireland Beautiful. Despite further discussions with the EcoSchools leads in England, Wales, Northern Ireland, Ireland and Scotland and there was no commitment to lead on a bid.

In terms of the prospects for continuing this action after the end of the project, Wales currently appears the most likely as a small scale pilot; however it is not impossible that another EcoSchool partner will pick this up at a later date.

We were delighted to see the Celtic Seas Partnership Marine Litter Task Group’s Eco-Schools initiative was included in the Irish government’s draft programme of measures to achieve Good Environmental Status in the Celtic Seas. This demonstrates a level of commitment to the aims of the Celtic Seas Partnership and is a significant achievement and legacy for the project.

Biodiversity Task group
The Biodiversity task group called ‘Fishing4data’ set out to establish a scheme that provides equipment and training for fishermen and other sectors to monitor the state of the marine environment. Salacia Marine was contracted to help work with the group to help clarify its focus and develop a project that was felt to be most useful for stakeholders. Two workshops were held; one in March 2016 (see Annex B3.3 for the report) and the other in October 2016 (see Annex B3.4 for the report) where a clear aim, objectives and next steps were developed. Reports of the two workshops, and the Statement of Intent can be seen in Annex B3.5. The workshops involved DEFRA, BIM, fishing representatives, scientists and eNGOs. 13 organisations including the fishing industry from Scotland, England and Wales, Retailers and processors and eNGOs agreed to work together to ‘develop a strategy to make industry-collected data scientifically credible and salient to inform policy and its implementation.’ It was felt this was a unique opportunity as there was a common purpose identified between key stakeholders, most notably industry and eNGOs, which hadn’t existed before. Salacia Marine and Celtic Seas Partnership have identified potential funding opportunities to employ a Strategy Development Officer, who will be hosted by one of the industry stakeholders. The officer will across the UK to support the further development of the strategy.

The Fishing4data Task Group engaged with 64 stakeholders from across the Celtic Seas region. The group developed a UK focus and included the key fishing representative bodies in the UK: Seafish, CEFAS, English Nature, CCWales, a range of eNGOs, fish processors and retailers. The level of engagement from France and Ireland with the group appears to have been affected by the Brexit negotiations. Brexit also posed a challenge in terms of people’s capacity to engage in the latter stages of this process, whilst all the stakeholders remain very committed to the work, they were very busy with Brexit conversations.

The future activity of the Fishing4data group will be hosted by Fishing into the Future – an industry led organisation, they have agreed to host the Strategy Development Officer (funded by EMFF). Match funding for this post has been secured from key group members in Scotland.

BODC commissioned CEFAS to undertake a study to explore the data gaps for industry collected science to identify where fisheries collected data could have the most impact. The
The report is called ‘Fishing4data; Informing the scope of the Celtic Seas fishery stakeholder data collection strategy’ (see Annex B11.4).

Please refer to July 2016 progress report for details on group formation and meetings.

Non-indigenous species Task Group
The Invasive Non-native Species (INNS) Task Group aimed to identify and address gaps in the coverage of biosecurity protocols for marine non-indigenous species, and to create an operational action plan at the Celtic Seas scale to promote best practice. Existing initiatives and legislation were already in place, such as the EU Regulation on Invasive Alien Species, the ICES Code of Practice on the Introductions and Transfers of Marine Organisms and the Marine Pathways project. However, it’s was important to evaluate how far these measures will go towards reducing the risk of the spread of invasive species. The group had 39 members from France, Ireland and the UK, many of whom met at the Paris multi-national conference. Three ‘concept notes’ were produced, by CEFAS with input from the INNS Task Group, which cover:

- Developing a Celtic Seas-wide non-native species biosecurity strategy (Annex B3.6 (English); Annex B3.7 (French))
- Developing and implementing marine non-native species monitoring programmes at high risk locations in the Celtic Seas (Annex B3.8 (English); Annex B3.9 (French))
- Eyes on the sea – developing a stakeholder based marine non-native species reporting network for the Celtic Seas (Annex B3.10 (English); Annex B3.11 (French))

It is hoped these concise, instructive concept notes will inspire the development of collaborative funding proposals to address these priority INNS issues.

These concept notes describe three key areas in which INNS work at the Celtic Seas scale could be developed jointly cross-border. Each concept note describes the issue and provides a step-by-step work plan and could be used by members of the Task Group as the basis for generating interest from potential funders for submission of a full grant proposal.

Terms of reference for the contract were sent to the INNS Task Group and Marine Pathways Group members. The contract was awarded to CEFAS in November with work being led by Paul Stebbing who chairs the OSPAR expert working group for non-native species and is the UK technical lead for marine non-native species. In December 2016 draft versions of the concept notes were sent to the INNS Task Group and Pathways Project members for review. Both WWF and external comments were then incorporated into the final version of the concept notes and delivered by CEFAS in February 2017. The three concept notes with accompanying cover letter was distributed to the appropriate MSFD leads in all countries and to interested research groups and potential funding bodies across the Celtic Seas. The concepts have been translated into French and sent to the national French government MSFD team following their interest expressed during a one-to-one meeting organised in December 2016.

A recommendation was made to INNS Task Group members not currently involved in the Marine Pathways project to register their interest with them (especially the Irish and French members) as a way for the group to continue working together into the future.
Two of the Task Groups drew to a natural conclusion:

**Food Webs**
The long-term goal of the initiative was to increase awareness and understanding of the importance of food webs, resulting in a network of sea-users that can contribute to monitoring them. After exploring a potential scheme it was decided that a stakeholder-led citizen science initiative would be limited in its ability to advance understanding of food webs to the required level. The group noted that the Marine Ecosystems Research Programme, funded by NERC and Defra, is already addressing evidence gaps in this area. Subsequent efforts to broaden the initiative to a more bottom-up approach to raising awareness were unable to identify a specific proposal. Following the Paris conference in May 2015, it was decided that the work had come to its natural end.

**Underwater Noise**
This group aimed to develop learning materials to inform and guide noise mapping in the Celtic Seas. Underwater noise is a complex emerging field and, within the group, there was a wide range of knowledge and specialisms. The group highlighted a number of important gaps in our knowledge of underwater noise and suggested a clear focus on achieving specific objectives with a specific audience was needed for a successful initiative. Following a number of discussions around these issues, the group was unable to reach a consensus on a single initiative, but an appetite for raising awareness around underwater noise in the Celtic Seas remains. At a minimum, the noise task group provided a forum for an exchange of ideas and information around the issue, and may lead to further collaboration at the Celtic Seas scale.

Indicator:
Expected: By June 2015 at least 3 measures action plans will be developed collaboratively by at least 3-5 stakeholders from each sector
Actual: action plans were developed collaboratively for 3 measures via the Task Groups, which included at least 3 stakeholders from each relevant sector.

**B.3.3 Guidance to companies to incorporate ecosystem approach into their business plan**

**Complete**
Stakeholders from a range of industries were involved in the three Task Groups described above and contributed to the development of measures to implement the MSFD. In the Biodiversity Task Group participants from both scientific, governmental and fisheries sectors have committed to the development of a strategy to make industry collected data scientifically credible and salient to inform policy and its implementation, and are investigating options for operationalising this strategy. The strategy was developed using the ecosystem approach and once implemented will be incorporated into the business plan of the various stakeholder participants. Details of the organisations that have been involved with Biodiversity Task Group can be seen in the section above (B.3.2).

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2016 at least 8-10 sectors have contributed to the development of management measures and have identified where operational activities could be adapted to implement some of these measures.
Actual: over 10 sectors contributed to the development of the measures.
Action B.4 – Test effective approaches to transnational collaboration action in the Irish Sea to Support MSFD implementation

Beneficiary responsible: ULIV

Action B.4 of the Celtic Seas Partnership project was carried out by the University of Liverpool. The action involved piloting the operation of a transnational working group for the Irish Sea focussed on supporting MSFD implementation. The University of Liverpool’s role in the Irish Sea Maritime Forum (ISMF) assisted the Celtic Seas Partnership in the delivery of this action. The initial phase of work helped identify a suitable approach to the operation of the Working Group. This highlighted the value of providing and supporting opportunities for face to face contact among working group participants and connecting their input to wider project outputs. Following discussions with the Project Manager and EC monitor a refined pattern of working was developed and this was reflected in the amendment to the grant agreement that was approved by the Commission in response to the September 2016 Progress Report (Ref. Ares(2016)7017435 - 16/12/2016).

Over the course of the project 34 stakeholders participated in the MSFD working group activities. These included 12 from England, 2 from Scotland, 6 from Wales, 9 from Northern Ireland, 4 from Ireland and 1 from the Isle of Man. 8 participants were from central government departments, 8 were from government agencies with various marine related responsibilities, 7 were from NGOs, 8 were from academic or research institutions, 1 was from the private sector and 2 were politicians with local government and EU level responsibilities. French stakeholders were not included in the working group because the work focussed on the Irish Sea, which was not relevant for French stakeholders.

The Working Group provided an opportunity for Irish Sea stakeholders to learn more about MSFD implementation and to provide specialist input to work being undertaken in Actions B.5, B.6, B.9 and B.10. It also provided an opportunity to learn about the practicalities of organising and participating in transboundary activities of this kind. Reflection on the experience highlighted the potential benefits that transboundary working groups might deliver as well as points to consider in the operation of such groups. These points are distilled in the Recommendations on Transboundary Working Groups leaflet for use by European stakeholders which are available to download on the Celtic Seas Partnership website in French and English (see Annex B4.1 (English); Annex B4.2 (French)).

In addition, the recommendations have been formally endorsed by the ISMF Steering Group as a guide to future ISMF Working Group activities. Planning for the first post Celtic Seas Partnership ISMF Working Group is underway. The intention is to hold a Working Group workshop in June 2017 to discuss how the ISMF/Celtic Seas stakeholders might respond to the closure of the Celtic Seas Partnership project and facilitate ongoing partnership activity in the Celtic Seas. The event will include discussion of the findings from the Celtic Seas Partnership closing conference in Dublin. The ISMF is planning this workshop in association with the Atlantic Action Plan Support Team as a legacy of this action (see Annex B4.3 for the Impact ISMF Steering Group Agenda).

B.4.1. Establish an MSFD Working Group for the Irish Sea
Complete – update provided in the October 2014 Progress Report
We identified potential MSFD Steering Group membership and contacted potential participants (Steering group agenda for May 2013 can be seen in Annex B4.4). We then made
all arrangements for and facilitated a start-up meeting of the Irish Sea Maritime Forum MSFD Working Group which was held in November 2013 (agenda can be seen in Annex B4.5; minutes can be seen in Annex B4.6).

Indicator:
Expected: By end of September 2013 a map of stakeholders with MSFD responsibilities and interests in the Irish Sea will have been produced.
Actual: No map/written analysis was produced as this was no longer considered necessary given the outputs of A2. However contact lists for the NW Coastal Forum and Irish Sea Maritime Forum were analysed to identify key stakeholders and their responsibilities.

B.4.2. Develop Guidelines for Operation of the Working Group

**Complete – update provided in the October 2014 Progress Report**

Drawing upon the outputs from the start up meeting (see action B.4.5) and in subsequent liaison with working group members, operational guidelines (please see page 4 of the operational guidelines supplied in Annex B4.1) for the Working Group were developed and a refinement of the proposed method of working was discussed and agreed with the Celtic Seas Partnership Project Manager, EC Monitor and the Commission (in response to the September 2016 Progress Report (Ref. Ares(2016)7017435 - 16/12/2016)) (also see Annex B4.6, point three of the ISMF MSFD working group minutes).

The recommendations have been formally endorsed by the ISMF Steering Group as a guide to future ISMF Working Group activities. Planning for the first post Celtic Seas Partnership ISMF Working Group is underway (see Section 5.2 for more details).

Indicator:
Expected: By end of January 2014 the Working Group will have been established and guidelines for the operation of the Working Group will have been set out.
Actual: the Working Group was established and guidelines were developed by the deadline.

B.4.3. Guide the project’s activities in the Irish Sea

**Complete**

In response to the arrangements made in Action B.4.1 and B.4.2 above, the Irish Sea Maritime Forum MSFD Working Group Workshops were held in Belfast in September 2015 and Cardiff in May 2016 (introductory presentations for each workshop can be seen in Annex B4.7 (Belfast) and Annex B4.8 (Cardiff)). These workshops provided an opportunity for Irish Sea stakeholders to learn more about MSFD implementation and were also designed to provide specialist input to work being undertaken in Actions B.5, B.6, B.9 and B.10.

Indicator:
Expected: By March 2014 the working group has had 1 teleconference. By September 2015 the working group has had 1 face to face meeting. By May 2016 the working group has had 2 face to face meetings supported by agendas and meeting papers.
Actual: By March 2014 the Working Group had held one face to face meeting. By September 2015 the Working Group had had a teleconference and a face to face workshop in Belfast. In May 2016 a second face to face workshop was held in Cardiff.
B.4.4. Disseminate the work of the Working Group at the Celtic Seas Conference

**Complete**

The Working Group’s draft recommendations for marine and coastal stakeholders on Transboundary Working Groups were presented at the final Celtic Seas Partnership conference in Dublin in October 2016 as part of the project showcase aspect of the event (see Annex B4.1 and Annex B4.2 for the transboundary working group recommendations in English and French). Feedback from the final conference informed the finalisation of the Transboundary Working Group Recommendations.

Indicator:
Expected: By November 2016 a report on the findings of the transnational working group including an assessment of its effectiveness as a mechanism for collaborative action promoting MSFD implementation will be presented at the final Celtic Seas Partnership Conference.
Actual: the recommendations from the Working Group were developed and launched in at the final Celtic Seas conference in October 2016.

B.4.5. Review the Operation of the Working Group

**Complete**

Following the Working Group Workshop in May 2015 a report reviewing the group’s activities during the project was prepared (see Annex B4.9) and circulated to the Working Group participants. A survey on working group operations was undertaken and the results provided the basis for the draft recommendations that were presented at the final Celtic Seas Partnership Conference. They were formally approved (see Annex B4.10 for the final version) as a guide to the operation of future ISMF Working Groups and as advice to others by the ISMF Steering Group at its meeting on 19 October 2016 (see Annex B4.11 for meeting minutes)

Indicator:
Expected: By June 2016 a Pilot Review Report will have been produced and circulated to the wider Irish Sea and Celtic Sea stakeholder community for comment.
Actual: the report reviewing the Working Group was prepared in May 2015, which was commented on by the Working group and incorporated into the recommendations which were launched at the final Celtic Seas Partnership conference in October 2016

B.4.6. Provide a secretariat to the working group

**Complete**

The ULI team supported the activities of the group by liaising with working group members and organising meeting rooms, teleconference facilities, catering and hotel accommodation for working group members. They designed and developed the workshop programmes, facilitated the workshop events and took responsibility for writing up the activities of the group. Towards the end of the project the team designed and analysed the SurveyMonkey review questionnaire and developed the Recommendations on Transboundary Working Groups from the survey responses. In addition, they led the graphic design and arrangements for final printing of the Transboundary Working Group Recommendations including a version in French (see Annex B4.2).

Indicator:
Expected: By Mar 2014 the secretariat has provided admin and communication support for 1 teleconference and documented the working group guidelines. By September 2015 the
secretariat has supported 1 face to face meeting. By May 2016 the secretariat has supported 2 face to face meetings. In addition, by Sept 2016 the secretariat has also supported the review process for the working group.
Actual: ULIV provided the admin support for the Working Group and led the review of the process.

**Action B.5 – Identify best practice in designing and establishing transboundary marine governance structures for eco-system-based marine management**

**Beneficiary responsible:** WWF-UK

Changes were made to the work carried out under Action B.5 and B.8 and the justification to the changes to the grant agreement were submitted in the September 2016 Progress Report and have also been included in Annex B5.1. The Commission approved the changes (Ref. Ares(2016)/7017435 - 16/12/2016). We changed Actions B.5 and B.8 by aligning these Actions more closely. The case study analysis carried out in Action B.8 has obvious synergies with the analysis carried out under Action B.5.

**B.5.1. Identification of existing transboundary/cross-border governance mechanisms within the CSR**

**Complete – update provided in the October 2014 Progress Report**

A draft map of existing transboundary marine governance structures and models (combined with examples of potential Celtic Seas co-location case studies relevant to Action B.8 of the project) was prepared prior to, and presented at the first Celtic Seas Partnership conference (B.2) held in Liverpool on 31 October 2013 to the stakeholders who attended. Prior to the conference we identified some case studies in and around the Celtic Seas that illustrated the challenges of transboundary governance and co-location and some of the approaches being taken to meeting these challenges. We displayed these case studies on a map at the workshop and invited delegates to add further examples. We used this to select and analyse a number of these case studies in order to draw out the lessons they offer and to inform Best Practice Guidelines for those facing similar challenges in the Celtic Seas.

The final version of this list, including additional examples supplied by stakeholders, is provided in Annex B5.2.

**Indicator:**

_Expected:_ By October 2013 a finalised map of existing transboundary marine structures is produced

_Actual:_ the map was finalised and presented to stakeholders in October 2013.

**B.5.2. Identification of 3 case studies / best practice models / stakeholder engagement and analysis**

**Complete – update provided in 2015 Mid-term Report**

Through initial scoping and subsequent research a shortlist of nine potential B.5 structures/case studies were identified for analysis (see Annex B5.6). Of these, six were approached by the Stakeholder Engagement Officers, under the co-ordination of the Northern Ireland Stakeholder Engagement Officer, to establish the viability of the case studies and to begin analysis using a standard questionnaire as the basis for their investigation (see Annex B5.7). From these discussions, four case studies (one more than the target of three) agreed to participate in this action.
The final case studies used in the Guidelines include:

- The Cross-Channel Forum (England/France)
- The Loughs Agency (Northern Ireland (UK) / Republic of Ireland)
- Solway Firth Partnership (England/Scotland)
- Wadden Sea (Germany, Denmark, Netherlands)

Indicator:
Actual: 4 case studies were identified by the deadline.

B.5.3. Development of guidelines and recommendations for transboundary governance

**Complete – update provided in the September 2016 Progress Report**

During 2015, a total of four Transboundary Marine Governance case studies were investigated and final reports completed on these (see Annex B5.3). These comprised three from across the Celtic Seas and one from the Greater North Sea, exceeding the original target of three case studies. In addition, the views, experiences and recommendations of marine stakeholders from across the Celtic Seas on Transboundary Marine Governance have been captured in dedicated, facilitated discussion sessions at six country workshops and multi-national conference during 2015, as well as at the ISMF Marine Strategy Framework Directive Workshops held in September 2015 and May 2016.

The draft Best Practice Guidelines on transboundary governance was sent out to 896 stakeholders from 10 sectors across the six Celtic Seas countries for consultation in April-May 2016, including the project Observer Board, Expert Advisory Group, ten Case Study Respondents and the project team. The final guidelines for transboundary governance were completed in June 2016 and shown at the final multinational conference in October 2016 (see Annex B5.4). The Guidelines were also produced in French (Annex B5.5).

The success of this Action (and Action B.8 too) was dependent upon having good and regular communication and consultation with stakeholders, as well as a clear timescale with interim deadlines for key milestones.

Indicator:
Expected: By June 2016 guidelines & recommendations for transboundary governance finalised.
Actual: the Best Practice Guidelines on Transboundary Governance was finalised by June 2016.

B.5.4. Showcasing and dissemination of guidelines (including at 3rd Celtic Seas Partnership conference Oct 2016)

The guidelines were finalised in June 2016 and were launched at the final multi-national conference in October 2016 where they received very positive feedback from stakeholders. The guidelines have been disseminated at various events across the UK, Europe and International, and were promoted through the final project e-newsletter and on the Celtic Seas Partnership Twitter page. For more details of dissemination, please see Section 5.2.

The project has developed a short film featuring some of the project stakeholders and their relationship with the Sea and makes the case for continuing to work together beyond the
lifespan of the Celtic Seas Partnership therefore helping to secure a legacy for this Action, the film can be viewed on YouTube and on the projects webpage.

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2016 at least 100 Stakeholders have been familiarised with the transnational best practice guidelines and recommendations through at least 3 events, including the 3rd Celtic Seas Conference.
Actual: the guidelines were presented to 100 stakeholders at the final Celtic Seas conference in October 2016, as well as multiple other events including the Coastal Futures Conference in London, Natural Capital Ireland conference and IOC-UNESCO global conference on Marine Spatial Planning.

Action B.6 – Develop terrestrial planning good practice guidelines to support MSFD

Beneficiary responsible: ULIV

Changes were made to the work carried out under this action, the justification to changes to the grant agreement were submitted in the September 2016 progress report and have also been included in Annex B.61. The Commission approved the changes (Ref. Ares(2016)7017435 - 16/12/2016).

This action was based on the premise that those involved in various ways in terrestrial planning have an important contribution to make both in terms of ensuring their activities support efforts to secure GES and in terms of encouraging wider public support and appreciation of the environmental value of the Celtic Seas. Through the Celtic Seas Partnership project the ULIV team were able to extend work undertaken through the Esatdor ESPON funded and ODEMM Framework 7 funded research projects to identify pressures that might arise from land based activities and their potential impact on MSFD Good Environmental Status descriptors. It also provided an opportunity to undertake original work connecting this understanding to the legal framework and processes associated with terrestrial planning in Celtic Seas’ countries and developing the concept of marine proofing for Good Environmental Status of the Sea. The outputs provide user friendly materials for use by non-marine specialists that enable the timely identification of marine environment issues in terrestrial planning situations and promote the delivery of landward development that protects and where possible enhances the marine environment. Feedback received from delegates at the final Celtic Seas Partnership Conference in Dublin indicated that they regarded this material as the second most useful output produced by the project.

The initial phases of work under B.6 highlighted the strength of land sea interactions and indicated that a useful focus of Celtic Seas Partnership activity would be to develop Terrestrial Planning good practice guidelines to support MSFD. This approach was reflected in the amendment to the grant agreement that was approved by (Ref. Ares(2016)7017435 - 16/12/2016).

As a result Action B.6 focussed on the production of a guide to assist local authorities, developers and their agents, coastal partnerships, wildlife trusts, community groups and others involved in terrestrial planning to build concern for the quality of the marine environment into their activities. This is accompanied by a series of national guidelines - Country Fact Sheets for countries with MSFD responsibilities which border the Celtic Seas - England, France,
Ireland, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. These provide further country specific information on the connection between terrestrial planning, MSFD delivery and marine planning.

A key component of ULIV work under this action was assistance with the organisation and facilitation of the two rounds of country workshops in England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Ireland and France (See Action B.1 for further details). In addition, ULIV organised two events in the Isle of Man (a non EU country in the Celtic Seas) connecting MSFD concerns with Isle of Man Government activities related to care for the marine environment.

The Guidelines on Terrestrial Planning and MSFD can be found in Annex B6.2 (English) and Annex B6.3 (French); the national guidelines can be seen in Annex B6.4. The terrestrial planning demonstration projects report can be found in Annex B6.17.

B.6.1. Identification of land-sea interactions related to MSFD

Complete – update provided in July 2015 Mid-term Report

This sub-action involved background research and staff discussions regarding MSFD related interactions and the form of ICZM/Terrestrial Planning Capacity Building Resources that might be helpful to be produced as a result of this action. A scientific workshop was also held at the University of Liverpool in January 2014 in relation to this sub-action (see Annex B6.5 for the Scientific workshop briefing paper, and Annex B6.6 for the workshop report). This event was attended by delegates with expertise in ICZM/Marine Ecosystem Services and MSFD matters and other interests in the Celtic Seas. The agenda for the day included a morning session designed to help in the development of ICZM good practice guidelines to support MSFD. Through a series of roundtable exercises delegates considered definitions of the coastal zone and sought to identify which MSFD descriptors were most relevant to ICZM and which coastal zone activities where most significant in influencing the health of the seas. The exercises also explored what role ICZM could play in supporting the delivery of the MSFD and what might be the most suitable focus for Action B.6 Pilot Projects.

Indicator:
Expected: By end of December 2013, Celtic Seas related ICM/Terrestrial Planning MSFD Capacity Building Resources will have been prepared. By end of January 2014 a scientific workshop will have been held.
Actual: background research was carried out by December 2013, and a scientific workshop was held in January 2014.

B.6.2. ICZM/Terrestrial Planning Capacity Building Workshops

Complete – update provided in the September 2016 Progress Report

ICZM/Terrestrial Planning Capacity Building sessions were incorporated in the first round of Celtic Seas Partnership Country Workshops from May to September 2014 (see Annex B6.7 for presentation given) to develop control case studies to test out the pressures/impact matrix.

In addition a MSFD and ICZM/ Terrestrial Planning Workshop was held at the Marine and Coastal Policy (MARCOPOL) conference in Plymouth in June 2014 (see Annex B6.8 for presentation, and Annex B6.9 for the workshop notes). Reflection on the findings of this workshop and implications for the target audience for Action B.6 outputs led to the subsequent amendment to the Grant Agreement (mentioned above). An Isle Man Biosphere Reserve Workshop in Douglas was organised and facilitated in May 2015 in association with

Indicator:
Expected: By end of June 2014, an ICM/Terrestrial Planning Capacity Building Workshop will have been held to inform the development of Terrestrial Planning Good Practice Guidelines.
Actual: The first round of Country Workshops from May to September 2014 was used to inform the development of the guidelines. An additional workshop in the Isle of Man was organised in May 2015.

B.6.3. Terrestrial Planning Demonstration Projects
Complete – update provided in the September 2016 Progress Report
This involved the development of country specific pilot materials on England and Northern Ireland. These were tested at the MSFD Working Group workshop and second Northern Ireland Country workshop held in Belfast. The draft country fact sheet materials were circulated for comment and a demonstration project report prepared.

Indicator:
Expected: By end of February 2016, two national Terrestrial Planning Demonstration Project Reports are produced.
Actual: two country specific project reports were developed.

B.6.4. Terrestrial Planning Good Practice Guidelines for MSFD
Complete
Research on the potential format of generic Celtic Seas Guidelines on Terrestrial Planning and MSFD was undertaken. A draft structure for the guidelines was developed and circulated for comment. Feedback and comments were collected from stakeholders at the second round of country workshops (see Annex B6.13 for the presentation) and an Isle of Man workshop (see Annex B6.14 for the invitation, Annex B6.15 for the delegate list, and Annex B6.16 for the presentation) in association with the Isle of Man Government to contribute to the content of B.6.4. Draft guidelines were circulated in July 2016, and the final guidelines, including a French version, were completed by the autumn of 2016 (See Annex B.61 and Annex 6.2).

Indicator:
Expected: By August 2016, final Terrestrial Planning MSFD Good Practice Guidelines for the Celtic Seas region are produced.
Actual: the final version of the Terrestrial Planning MSFD guidelines was completed in autumn 2016.

B.6.5. Geographically Tailored Good Practice Guidelines
Complete
Building on work undertaken under B.6.3, research was undertaken into the country specific legal and organisational matters related to Wales, Scotland, Ireland and France. Draft country fact sheets were developed and circulated for comment. Six final Country Fact Sheets for England, Northern Ireland, Wales, Ireland, Scotland and France were developed (see Annex B.6.4). The final versions of the country specific guidelines were completed in Autumn 2016.
Indicator:
Expected: By September 2016, 5 to 7 geographically tailored ICM/Terrestrial planning good practice resources are produced (covering a least 5 administrations).
Actual: The final versions of the country specific guidelines were completed in autumn 2016, covering 6 countries.

B.6.6. – Dissemination of the initiatives at Celtic Seas Conferences

Complete
The guidelines were disseminated at the final project conference and are available to download through the Celtic Seas Partnership website. In addition they are included on the European MSP Platform website and associated practice database where they are identified as a practice that can support MSP which has its own role to play in supporting delivery of the MSFD: http://msp-platform.eu/practices/good-practice-msfd-and-terrestrial-planning.

See Section 5.2 for more details of dissemination.

Indicator:
Expected: By the end of October 2016 the Terrestrial Guidelines will have been disseminated at the final Celtic seas conference.
Actual: the Terrestrial Guidelines were disseminated at the final Celtic Seas conference in October 2016.

**Action B.7 - Demonstrate effective approaches to develop co-ordinated terrestrial and marine planning: Applying Integrated Coastal Zone Management in Dublin Bay to develop a Strategic Management Framework**

**Beneficiary responsible:** EMRA

Changes were made to the work and budget carried out under this action, and the justification to the changes to the grant agreement can be seen in Annex B7.1. The Dublin Regional Authority (DRA) became part of a new Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly (EMRA) consisting of 12 Local Authorities. The changes were approved by the Commission (by signing ‘Amendment No2 to Grant Agreement for project’ letter dated 30th November 2016). Justification for subcontracting CMRC for work in Ireland can be found in Annex B7.2.

**B.7.1. Develop a Strategic Management Framework for Dublin Bay**

Complete
The development of a vision for Dublin Bay requires the inclusion of high level decision makers from across all sectors. As explained in the 2016 Progress Report, despite best efforts, there were a number of notable absentee’s from the Dublin Bay Steering Group and workshop attendees such as representatives from the port, biosphere, shipping and energy sectors. Time and resource constraints limited these stakeholders in participating in the Steering Group. These stakeholders need to be on board in order to gain consensus on the development of a holistic vision and to make collective decisions on the future management of Dublin Bay. Although it may be possible to proceed with a vision without all key stakeholders on board, this vision would not be inclusive. The Project Steering Group agreed that in the absence of these stakeholders the Strategic Management Framework (SMF) should deliver a plan and stakeholder engagement methods which can be used to involve stakeholders in the creation of a future vision for the management of Dublin Bay. It was agreed with the Project Manager therefore that the output for Action B.7.1 would not develop a vision for the future...
management of Dublin Bay (as stated in the original Grant Agreement), but would make recommendations.

A draft SMF was presented to EMRA Elected Members on 8th July 2016, which was followed by a detailed discussion of the document. Following an extensive consultation period, the final SMF was approved by the Elected Members on 9th September 2016 (Annex B7.3).

Create a vision for Dublin Bay that is consistent with MSFD ambitions which aims to improve the quality of life for the citizens of Dublin reflecting the views of relevant stakeholders:
Initial work in 2014 set about early stage issues identification, including the examination of strategic infrastructure development proposed for Dublin Port. Meetings were held with Local Authority staff in Dublin City Council on their work on the UNESCO Biosphere designation. The workshop on ecosystem services held in 2014 developed the initial views of relevant stakeholders, two workshops in 2016 allowed for the further development of stakeholder views; the feedback was incorporated into the SMF.

Outline the benefits and potentialities of ecosystem services in Dublin Bay:
An Issues Paper on Dublin Bay was developed in 2014 and data was collated (Annex B7.4). The paper was finalised and circulated to the stakeholders for comment by end of January 2015. The issues paper included an outline SWOT for Dublin Bay to determine strengths, opportunities, and threats in Dublin Bay. A concept outline for a Marine Maturity Model was developed to be used as part of the workshop on in November 2014 on ecosystem services (see Annex B7.5 for workshop report). The outcome from the workshop was that three pathways for future development in and around Dublin Bay were finalised. A broad range of stakeholders were contacted and they were provided with high level detail of the workshop agenda and associated subject matter. EMRA attended ecosystem mapping events in Dublin, and held meetings with the UNESCO Dublin Biosphere project, and research on ecosystem services and key assets in Dublin Bay was carried. Ecosystem services were categorised under three headings – Economic services, Environmental services and Social services. Liaison took place with the University of Liverpool (as this action feeds into Action B.9 Ecosystem Services Assessment). Feedback was incorporated into the SMF.

EMRA set up a project Steering Group in 2015 to ensure consistency between plans, processes, initiatives, management plans and sectors. Its membership maximised the policy relevance of the SMF.

The role of Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) in Dublin Bay and the Irish National reports; Our Oceans Wealth and the Enablers Taskforce were reviewed by EMRA. A meeting was conducted with Jerry Barnes to discussed MSP. Jerry Barnes is an environmental consultant engaged in an MSP project which is producing recommendations for the Irish Government for the implementation of MSP. This meeting helped frame the section in the SMF on MSP. An additional outcome from the meeting was that Jerry accepted an invitation to present at the EMRA conference on MSP on the 2nd of June. In addition, EMRA secured the Principle Officer with responsibility for MSP to present at this workshop. At the workshop a discussion was held on the implications of relevant legislation, policies and agreements in Dublin Bay for the SMF. Feedback from the workshop and meetings was incorporated into the SMF.
Seek to harmonise and provide consistency between relevant plans, processes, initiatives and management plans at sectoral level

In 2014 a review was conducted by EMRA of results of the ‘Your Dublin Your Voice’ survey on Dublin Bay (see Annex B7.6). This resulted in the development of narrative for three development scenarios in Dublin Bay. Questionnaires were distributed at the third workshop in 2016, which enabled analysis of the data gaps and requirements of participating stakeholders. The outcomes of the workshops and questionnaires were reported in the SMF.

Respond to the requirements of relevant legislation, policies and agreements in Dublin Bay and their relationship to the ecosystem based approach to coastal management:


Links with Action B.6: EMRA liaised with ULIV on the first Dublin Bay workshop on ecosystem services. EMRA wrote an Irish Country Fact Sheet for input to the Terrestrial Planning Good Practice Guidelines for MSFD (Action B.11).

Examine the spatial element of Dublin Bay (integration of land use planning and MSFD) and consider how best to marry ongoing processes for joined up land-sea interface (coastal zone) planning and management:

In order to fulfil this objective EMRA organised a workshop - ‘Workshop 2: Data and Information – the key to success’ in the EMRA offices in Dublin in 2016 (see Annex B7.7 for minutes from the workshop). The Dublin Bay data module was launched at this workshop. A discussion took place on integrating processes for joined up land-sea interface (coastal zone) planning and management. Feedback on the outline SMF was acquired from the stakeholders present. Articles on the workshop were published on EMRA’s Twitter and Facebook. Feedback was incorporated into the SMF.

Examine and integrate issues and findings relating to conflict resolution:

All Ireland teleconference calls were held at regular intervals with Sarah Twomey (MaREI) and Geoff Nutall (WWF), in which the conflict resolution guidelines (Action B.8.) were discussed, and their integration with the SMF for Dublin Bay.

Indicator:

Expected: By September 2016 develop a SMF strategy for Dublin Bay that has been guided by best practice approaches to ICZM, outlining the potential benefits of ecosystem services in Dublin Bay, and includes a stakeholder engagement process.

Actual: In September 2016 the final text of the Strategic Management Framework was finalised.

B.7.2 Production of a Dublin Bay data module

Complete

It became apparent during the early stages of action B.7 that data and information were key facilitators to knowledge based decision making and could become a key driver of success of the SMF. The data module for Dublin Bay was not included in the original project proposal. However, EMRA were able to create a data dashboard for Dublin Bay through working in collaboration with the National University of Ireland Maynooth and Dublin City Council at no additional cost for the partnership.
Initial data collection and data management meetings were held with the Irish Marine Institute and the National University of Ireland Maynooth and other bodies in 2014 and 2015 to ascertain data sources, ownership and data gaps. EMRA engaged in data cleaning and data preparation, and examination of Dashboard options for visualisation of data took place. EMRA attended ecosystem mapping events in Dublin, and held meetings with the Dublin Biosphere project regarding data sharing in the Dublin Bay area. Options were examined for the visualisation of data, and the categorisation of spatial datasets. The final Dublin Bay data dashboard was launched by EMRA at ‘Workshop 2: Data and Information – the key to success’ on 15th February 2016. The Dublin Bay data is available on the Dublin dashboard (http://www.dublindashboard.ie/pages/DublinBay). It provides links to Dublin Bay information relating to the marine economy, communities, spatial data, environmental quality and heritage, recreation and tourism.

Indicator:
Expected: By September 2016 EMRA to collaborate with National University of Ireland Maynooth and Dublin City Council in the production of a Dublin Bay data module.
Actual: The data module was created and launched ahead of schedule at the workshop on 2nd February 2016.

B.7.3. Comprehensive stakeholder engagement developed for the Dublin Bay area

Complete
In developing the SMF, EMRA worked with a wide range of stakeholders to establish a stakeholder platform, bringing together representatives of national, regional, city and local governments, statutory organisations, universities, marine, environmental, fishing, energy and transport sectors, etc. EMRA organised workshops, set up a Steering Group in 2015, gained buy-in from politically elected representatives, consulted with national government and developed a data dashboard for information sharing, monitoring and evaluation. New opportunities and actions for enhancing Dublin Bay as a resource for the Dublin region, its citizens and visitors were identified. Through these actions stakeholders have had influence over the management of Dublin Bay.

Three stakeholder workshops were held throughout the project. The first workshop was held in November 2014 and focused on nature and livelihoods (see Annex B7.5 for the workshop report). The second workshop was held in February 2016 and focussed on the subject of data acquisition and sharing as the key to success (see Annex B7.7 for minutes from the workshop). The third workshop was held in June 2016 and focussed on MSP, and stakeholders were engaged on the topics of conflict resolution and the integration of MSFD into land use planning (see Annex B7.8 for minutes from the workshop). Draft versions of the SMF were presented to the stakeholders in the workshops in 2016 where they were given a chance to give feedback. Representatives from across various sectors participated in the EMRA run workshops, with 63 participants attending the workshops.

EMRA regularly updated the Highrise online database with stakeholders who had engaged with the SMF. A total of 136 contacts have been uploaded to Highrise with the tag ‘Dublin Bay’.

Indicator:
Expected: August 2016 comprehensive stakeholder engagement developed for the Dublin Bay area at least 50 stakeholders invited to review and comment on the SMF for Dublin Bay.
Actual: 63 stakeholders attended workshops to review and comment on the SMF for Dublin Bay.

**B.7.4. Draft Strategic Management Framework for Dublin Bay presented to stakeholders**

**Complete**

The final SMF (Annex B7.3) can be downloaded from the Celtic Seas Partnership website and EMRA’s website, and was promoted through the final project e-newsletter and on the Celtic Seas Partnership and EMRA social media platforms.

See Section 5 for details of dissemination.

**Indicator:**

Expected: By September 2016 draft SMF for Dublin Bay to be presented to at least 50 stakeholders from at least 10 sectors.

Actual: 136 stakeholders from over 10 sectors engaged with the SMF for Dublin Bay.

**Action B.8 – Develop codes of best practice on marine co-location and conflict resolution to support ecosystem based management**

**Beneficiary responsible:** WWF-UK

In the light of developments since the bid was first conceived, particularly in the fast-moving area of marine renewables, we proposed to make this Action less rigidly tied to the original three country-led strands of activity under Action B.8 and instead select the six case studies from two, less rigidly geographically-defined strands: Marine renewables co-location (to help deliver renewable energy which co-exists/minimises conflict with other marine interests and users) and conflict resolution/sectoral interaction (to help deliver ecosystem-based management that will help achieve GES). Please see Annex B8.1 for full details of changes. The changes were approved by the Commission (Ares(2015)1195729 - 18/03/2015).

Although it was originally envisaged that touchtables would be used for Actions B.8 and B.10, it became apparent that this technology was very expensive and not very practical for transporting to use with stakeholders across the Celtic Seas, hence was not a cost-effective method to use for the project. Instead we used maps generated in ArcGIS spatial analysis software which could be turned into interactive maps on a laptop and printed paper maps, which could be much more easily taken to meetings with stakeholders and used as tools for engagement.

**B.8.1. Identify marine renewables co-location and sectoral interactions conflict resolution case studies**

**Complete – update provided in October 2014 Progress Report**

A draft map of Celtic Seas co-location case studies (combined with existing Action B.5 Transboundary Marine Governance structures/models) was prepared prior to, and presented at the first Celtic Seas Partnership multi-national conference in Liverpool on 31 October 2013 to the stakeholders who attended (Annex B8.8). The final version of this list of case studies from the map, including additional examples supplied by stakeholders, is provided in Annex B8.2. The final shortlist is made up of predominately tidal due to the fact that tidal is the big growth area in the Celtic Seas and as tidal devices tend to be closer to shore they have more potential for overlap with other activities so therefore are more suitable as case studies.
Stakeholder engagement officers initially identified a shortlist of 10 potential B.8 case studies for analysis, and then further two case studies were identified - bringing the total to 12 potential case studies. The Stakeholder Engagement Officers, under the co-ordination of the Northern Ireland Stakeholder Engagement Officer, then began approaching relevant stakeholders to establish the viability of the case studies and analysed using standard questionnaires as the basis for their investigation (see Annex B8.7). Through this process the SEOs engaged with stakeholders from 10 of the 12 potential case studies and secured agreement from 4 case studies to participate in the Action.

The final case studies used in the Guidelines include:

Marine renewables co-location:
- SEAGEN Tidal Energy pilot project (Strangford Lough, Northern Ireland)
- Sabella D10 Tidal Turbine (Fromveur Passage, Brittany, France)
- Fécamp Offshore Wind Farm (Normandy, France)
- Tidal Energy Limited (DeltaStream, Pembrokeshire, Wales)

Conflict Resolution:
- FishMap Môn (Wales)
- Scallop GAP 2

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2013 at least 6 potential sites have been identified. By Dec 2014 three marine renewables co-location and three sectoral interaction/conflict resolution for EBM case study sites have been selected for analysis.
Actual: A total of 12 renewables co-location and sectoral interaction/conflict resolution were identified and stakeholders from 9 of these were approached to participate in this Action. Of those approached, 5 agreed to participate (by December 2013).

B.8.2. Stakeholder engagement to develop good practice guidance for renewables and analyse co-location case studies
Complete – update provided in July 2015 Mid-term Report
The Stakeholder Engagement Officers, under the co-ordination of the Northern Ireland Stakeholder Engagement Officer, engaged with stakeholders from 10 of the 12 potential case studies to establish the viability of the case studies and to begin analysis using standard questionnaires as the basis for their investigation. They secured agreement from four case studies to participate in the Action. Case study reports can be seen in Annex B8.2.

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2015 at least 30 Stakeholders have been engaged in the analysis of the six marine renewables co-location and sectoral interaction/conflict resolution for EBM case studies drawing out at least 5 key lessons for each area.
Actual: 10 stakeholders were interviewed for the case studies for this Action.

B.8.3. Interviews with sectoral representatives in case study areas
Complete – update provided in September 2016 Progress Report
As detailed above under B.8.1, ten case study interviews were carried out with representatives from each case study area. The responses from the surveys fed into the case study reports (Annex B8.2)
Indicator:
Expected: By June 2015 at least 6 semi-structured interviews held with sectoral representatives in case study areas.
Actual: 10 interviews were held with sectoral representatives in case study areas.

B.8.5. Finalisation of Best Practice Guidelines

**Complete**

During 2015, a total of six case studies were investigated and final reports completed for marine co-location and conflict resolution (see Annex B8.2). In addition, the views, experiences and recommendations of marine stakeholders from across the Celtic Seas on marine co-location and conflict resolution have been captured in dedicated, facilitated discussion sessions at six country workshops and multi-national conference during 2015, as well as at the ISMF Marine Strategy Framework Directive Workshops held in September 2015 and May 2016.

The draft Best Practice Guidelines on marine co-location and conflict resolution were sent out to 896 stakeholders from 10 sectors across the six Celtic Seas countries for consultation in April-May 2016. The final Best Practice Guidelines on marine co-location (Annex B8.3 (English); Annex B8.4 (French)) and conflict resolution (Annex B8.5 (English); Annex B8.6 (French)) were presented at the final multi-national conference in October 2016.

Indicator:
Expected: By June 2016 two sets of best practice guidelines finalised.
Actual: The two sets of guidelines were finalised in June 2016.

B.8.6. Showcase and disseminate case studies and guidelines

**Complete**

As detailed under Action C.1.4, the Best Practice Guidelines for co-location were the focus of the socio-economic impact study. The study looks at the impact of the guidelines from an investment point of view, and how, if there guidelines were implemented, new areas could be opened up for renewable development.

The guidelines were finalised in June 2016 and were launched at the final multi-national conference in October 2016 where they received very positive feedback from stakeholders. The guidelines have been disseminated at various events across the UK, Europe and Internationally, and were promoted through the final project e-newsletter and on the Celtic Seas Partnership Twitter page.

The project has developed a short film featuring some of the project stakeholders and their relationship with the Sea and makes the case for continuing to work together beyond the lifespan of the Celtic Seas Partnership therefore helping to secure a legacy for this Action, the film can be viewed on YouTube and on the projects webpage.

See Section 5.2 for further details of dissemination.

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2016 best practice guidelines will be disseminated to all countries and responsible authorities in Celtic Seas Region/EU.
Actual: the guidelines were presented to 100 stakeholders at the final Celtic Seas conference in October 2016, as well as multiple other events across the Celtic Seas and Europe.
Action B.9 – Ecosystem services assessment

Beneficiary responsible: ULIV

The initial phase of work under B9 indicated that there was particular interest in developing ‘qualitative’ ESA resources that could be used to inform stakeholder discussions about applying the Ecosystem Approach to planning and management of the Celtic Seas. This approach was reflected in the amendment to the grant agreement that was approved by the Commission (Ares(2016)7017435 - 16/12/2016).

In line with this, an Ecosystem Services Assessment resource pack was formulated to help people who live and work in the Celtic Seas catchment area develop an understanding of what Ecosystem Services are, and the many natural services that the sea provides. The pack is aimed at marine and coastal partnerships, local authorities, community and voluntary organisations and others involved in the management of coastal and marine areas. The pack includes: summary information on the ecosystem services concept; guidance on using the resource pack; guidance on the use of ESA related activities in different planning and management situations; case studies; Marine Ecosystem Service (MES) cards for use in stakeholder engagement activities and further information including recommendations on the use of ESA in MSFD related decision making.


An initial desk-based review of ecosystem services assessment (see Annex B9.1) related to the Celtic Seas area and development of material for inclusion in a Briefing Note (see Annex B9.2) that was used to support discussions at a Scientific Workshop that informed the development of both Action B.6 and B.9. This workshop was attended by delegates with expertise in ICZM/Marine Ecosystem Services and MSFD matters and other interests in the Celtic Seas. The second part of the Scientific Workshop was designed to gain expert guidance on the future direction of Celtic Seas Partnership work under Action B.9. Through a series of roundtable exercises delegates considered which marine ecosystem services were most relevant for the Celtic Seas and which of these may be threatened due to its current environmental status. Delegates also were asked to consider whether Ecosystem Services thinking can be used to support MSFD ambitions to achieve Good Environmental Status and what style of Ecosystem Services approach they might find most useful to support MSFD implementation. Finally views were sought on how the Celtic Seas Partnership project can deliver most added value in developing ES resources to support MSFD delivery in the Celtic Seas?

Perhaps the most significant guidance to emerge from the workshop was a suggested focus on developing qualitative rather than quantitative Ecosystem Services resources that could enable stakeholders to appreciate the links between Ecosystem Services and Good Environmental Status of the seas and could support stakeholder engagement in decision making related to the MSFD. It was felt that it was beyond the scope of the Celtic Seas Partnership project to make meaningful headway into addressing gaps in economic valuation coverage of ecosystem services and that more could be achieved by exploring softer applications of ecosystem services thinking. Following the Scientific Workshop the approach to taking Action B.9 forward has also been informed by a meeting with the LIFE Project Advisor and discussions with the Project Team. As a result it was decided to focus Pilot Project on Dublin Bay (linking up with Action B.7) and the North West Coast.
Indicator:
Expected: By end of December 2013 a report collating existing ecosystem assessment work related to the Celtic Sea will be produced.
Actual: the report was finalised by the deadline.

B.9.2. Workshop on the Development of ESA in the Irish Sea

Complete – update provided in September 2016 Progress Report
A scientific workshop was held at the University of Liverpool in January 2014, its findings were written up into the workshop report (see Annex B9.3 for the workshop programme and Annex B9.4 for the workshop report).

For Dublin Bay, the ES framework was used as a way of structuring stakeholder discussions about the impact of possible future development scenarios for the Bay at the first B.5 workshop as a means of piloting entry level ES tools/resources for MSFD stakeholders (see Annex B9.5 for the workshop presentation). This workshop was held on 27 November 2014 and was attended by a good range of stakeholders from the region. A workshop Report was prepared (see Annex B9.6) and fed into a more reflective report on the ESA pilot activities. The workshop evaluation can be seen in Annex B9.7.

For the North West of England, it was agreed that pilot project work should focus on Cultural Ecosystem Services which had emerged from recent reporting on UK Ecosystem Services experience as a key area of interest. Discussions between ULIV and the NWCF highlighted Wirral as a potential location for the pilot. Two meetings were held with Wirral Council officers and the Chair of the Wirral Coastal Partnership to work up and agree ideas for a survey exploring residents/visitors views of the Wirral coast and the cultural services offered and a workshop exploring cultural ecosystem services as part of a Visioning exercise for the smaller site of Hilbre Island Local Nature Reserve and SSSI in the Dee Estuary (see Annex B9.8).

ULIV also prepared and facilitated the ESA session at the ISMF Workshop in Belfast held on 16 September 2015 (see Annex B9.9 for the workshop report). This session piloted the application of the ESA resources that are being developed by the project for stakeholder engagement at a regional seas scale. Participants were also asked to undertake a SWOT analysis of the approach and resources, which provided valuable feedback to inform further development of materials in the next phases of work.

Summary of workshops held under this Action:
- Scientific workshop was held at the University of Liverpool in January 2014
- Dublin Bay ES workshop on 27 November 2014
- ESA session at the ISMF Workshop in Belfast on 16 September 2015

Indicator:
Expected: By January 2014 a scientific workshop for capacity building on ESA will be held.
By end of June 2014 a report on the outputs of the workshop will have been produced.
Actual: the scientific workshop and workshop report was held in January 2014.

B.9.3. Addressing Gaps in Valuation Coverage

Complete
Research into rapid Ecosystem Services Assessment (ESA) techniques and the information required to develop ESA resources for use in the project was undertaken, as well as research
into the ESA applications in the Celtic Seas and the different approaches to ecosystem services classifications and valuation techniques in the Celtic Seas were identified (Annex B9.10). A user friendly ecosystem services classification system was developed for testing in the ESA Pilot activities, this was then refined in light of the Pilot activities, with close checking against contemporary professional and academic understanding of ecosystem services terminology and applications. An international search of qualitative approaches to ESA that could be undertaken with non-specialists and which could provide informative examples of activities that could be undertaken by Celtic Seas stakeholders, was performed. The final findings were written up to provide detailed justification for the approach developed for the ‘Nature’s Services and the Sea’ Resource Pack (see Annex B9.11 (English); Annex B9.12 (French)).

Indicator:
Expected: By end of March 2016 a report addressing gaps in qualitative applications of ecosystem services coverage in the Irish Sea will have been produced.
Actual: the gap analysis report was finalised by the deadline.

B.9.4. Piloting ESA Policy Application
Complete – update provided in the September 2016 Progress Report
This involved the Organisation of pilot applications in Dublin Bay, Wirral in North West England and the Irish Sea (see also see Action B.6.3 for more details). These were undertaken in association with: the Eastern Midlands Regional Assembly making links to activities in Action B.7; Wirral Council/North West Coastal forum; and the MSFD Working Group linking into activities in Action B.4.

The ESA Pilot project report can be seen in Annex B9.13 along with materials that were developed to support the development of this sub-action.

Work on the pilots took place between November 2014 and November 2015 and a summary of activities and outcomes is presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection of ESA Pilots</th>
<th>MSFD Related Policy Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin Bay</td>
<td>Engaging stakeholder in the development of a Strategic Management Framework for Dublin Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Sea</td>
<td>Developing stakeholder awareness of Ecosystem Services of a regional sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirral Coast</td>
<td>Identification residents’ and visitors’ perceptions of critical cultural ecosystem services of Wirral coast and management issues that may have implications for achieving GES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator:
Expected: By October 2015 a report on the ESA Policy Pilot Applications will have been produced.
Actual: the ESA Policy Pilot report was produced by October 2015.

B.9.5. Development of ESA Resources for MSFD related decision making in the Celtic Seas
Complete
Running in parallel with the pilot work undertaken in B9.4, further research was undertaken into a suitable format for the ESA Resource pack. This considered experience from elsewhere
related to providing qualitative ecosystem services related materials for non-technical audiences and in relation to policy applications. This informed the development of core visual material and example case studies drawing upon the pilot work and gap analysis research and subsequent circulation of resource pack materials for comment. It also informed the development of recommendations on ESA use in MSFD decision making (Annex B9.14).

Indicator:
Expected: By the end of August 2016 ESA resources for the MSFD related decision making in the Irish Sea will have been developed.
Actual: the ESA rapid resource was produced by autumn 2016.

B.9.6. Dissemination of the initiative at the Celtic Seas Conference
The Draft Nature’s Services and the Sea Resource Pack was presented at the final Celtic Seas Partnership conference in Dublin October 2016.

See section 5.2 for details of dissemination.

Indicator:
Expected: By November 2016, activity under B.9 will have been disseminated at the final Celtic Seas Conference.
Actual: activities under Action B.9 were disseminated at the final Celtic Seas conference in October 2016.

Action B.10 – Future Trends in the Celtic Seas Marine Region

Beneficiary responsible: WWF-UK

The purpose of the Future trends in the Celtic Seas report was to project potential blue growth scenarios twenty years into the future and analysis the effect on the Celtic Seas region in terms of the environment, the economy and society. It aimed to highlight potential trade-offs for the different scenarios and draw out recommendations for actions that should be taken regardless of the actual type and level of blue growth. The work highlighted the need for greater communication and engagement between different sectors and for decision makers to ensure that engagement involves everyone who uses the sea – as decisions made by one sector can have knock on effects for other sectors. Similarly, it also highlighted the need different governments to work together as decisions taking in one place, can have consequences beyond national borders.

At the second round of country workshops, stakeholders were asked what their ideal future growth scenario would look like, key themes which were collected during this exercise were used to form the basis upon which the Future Trends scenarios were developed. Using baseline data collected from literature searches and through stakeholder feedback, the scenarios were then projected for 10 key sectors that currently operate or are interested in operating in the Celtic Seas. The project produced maps and details of how the different sectors might be affected by the different scenarios, interviews were then held with sector stakeholders for them to comment on the findings of the scenarios.

In keeping with one of the findings of the Future Trends project, and also with the ethos of the Celtic Seas Partnership – that all stakeholders should be engaged with marine management. It was decided to take the information and data that were produced by the consultants in five
reports, and produce an interactive and engaging website which would allow all stakeholders, regardless of their pre-existing knowledge to explore the findings.

The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) found the Celtic Seas Future Trends report really useful, in particular the approach that we used to develop scenarios. In fact, they thought the scenarios were so good that they decided to use our scenarios for their own Future Trends study to feed into the National Marine Plans! (See Section 5.2 for more details of dissemination).

As reported in the September 2016 Progress Report, the work on Action B.10 started later than originally planned due to staff chanced within the team, however the final reports were still delivered by the agreed date of December 2016.

B.10.1. Scope methodology to be applied for Future trends reporting.

**Complete – update provided in the September 2016 Progress Report**

The invitation to tender (Annex B10.1) was sent to select organisations, as well as being advertised on the project website and Twitter. The responses were evaluated and the contract was awarded to ABPmer and ICF consulting in December 2015 (the main criteria for awarding the contract can be seen in the table below). An inception meeting was held in Cardiff in January 2016 to discuss the methodology for the work, and an inception report was produced by ABPmer (see Annex B10.2 for inception notes). The methodology was scoped through a project sub-group, and subsequently through discussions with the appointed contractor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>30% Value for money 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative – Capability &amp; Competency</td>
<td>70% Understanding of requirements 25% Methodology 25% Report design 10% Previous Experience/resourcing 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2014 documented methodology on approach to future trends assessment is produced.
Actual: the methodology was produced by July 2016.

B.10.2. Interviews with stakeholders from up to 15 sectors across 7 national administrations

**Complete – update provided in the September 2016 Progress Report**

Two rounds significant ‘rounds’ of stakeholder engagement were carried out during the development of the Future Trends work. The first round involved sending out the baseline work to industry stakeholders in order for them to comment and provide more information on the relevant sections.

The second round of involved the SEO from each country carrying out face-to-face interviews with industry representatives to explain the work that had been carried out and the initial results. Stakeholder feedback from each interview was collected and fed back into the study. During this interview process, it was noted that stakeholders were focusing heavily on the maps which were produced as part of the work – rather than the overall messages and
impacts, this led us to change the way we presented the final deliverables and microsite, in order to ensure stakeholders were not distracted from the important messages of the reports.

The Future Trends work provided an opportunity to connect with some of our less engaged stakeholder groups and we now have a responsive relationship with new audiences (i.e. ports in Wales, inshore and offshore Welsh fishers, renewable energy sector, oil and gas in Ireland, the Isle of Man and recreational boating). Interviews were held across six administrations and 11 sectors. It was not possible to carry out interviews with 15 sectors (which was the target set out in the grant agreement) as this would have required significant additional resources. Interview notes can be seen in Annex B10.3.

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2015 interview reports from stakeholders for 15 sectors across 7 administrations for future trends data are produced.
Actual: Interviews were held with 10 stakeholders from 6 administrations during the summer of 2016.

B.10.3. Issue mapping using future scenario generated maps alongside ICM country workshops (Action B.6) to explore scenarios for future sustainable growth

**Completed - update provided in September 2016 Progress Report**

During the second round of country workshops (Action B.1) and the Irish Sea Maritime Forum MSFD Working Group sessions (Action B.6) were facilitated to discuss Future Trends in the Celtic Seas under three different scenarios (see Annex B10.4). Stakeholders were divided into sector groups for the discussions (see Annex B10.5). The information collected at the country workshops was analysed and fed into the Future Trends work.

Indicator:
Expected: By March 2016 at least 3 Scenarios are identified and explored as alternative development paths and their potential socio-economic impacts understood with reference to projected Good Environmental Status achievements.
Actual: 3 scenarios were developed by August 2016.

B.10.4. Produce report “Future Trends in the Celtic Seas Marine Region”

**Complete**

The contractor selected to write the Future Trends report, delivered 5 Future Trend reports in July 2016 – the baseline (Annex B10.6), methodology (Annex B10.7), scenarios (Annex B10.8), analysis (Annex B10.9) and summary report (Annex B10.10). The reports included over 30 maps showing the projected scenarios for each of the sectors included in the study.

It was felt that the best way to communicate the outputs of the Future Trends study to our stakeholders would be to create an interactive website, based on the information and messages in the Future Trends reports. The website was created by an external web design company and can be viewed here: [http://futuretrends.celticseaspartnership.eu/](http://futuretrends.celticseaspartnership.eu/). The Future Trends website will be time-proofed for five years alongside the main Celtic Seas Partnership website.

The baseline report sets out the historical and current environmental, political and industrial context in the Celtic Seas. This information was collected from literature reviews and a draft version was sent to willing stakeholders in different sectors from the different countries within the Celtic Seas in order for them to check the information for accuracy and completeness.
The methodology report sets out the process that ABPmer and WWF went through in order to produce the Future Trends study with the aim of allowing replication of the process in the future if required.

The Scenarios report details the three scenarios which were created as part of the future trends – and shows through maps how they have been interpreted for each of the 10 sectors included in the study over a twenty year timeframe. It also includes, for each scenario, a map of all sector projections considered within the study.

The scenario maps which were produced in the scenarios report were taken by stakeholder engagement officers to one on one interviews with sector representatives from each of the countries within the Celtic Seas. In total, 22 one:one interviews were held. The interviewees were shown the projection maps and through a semi structured interview process, information was collected and fed back to ABPmer to include in the analysis of the study.

The analysis report details the results of the cross cutting analysis of the different projected scenarios, in terms of environmental, social and economic conditions for the Celtic Seas region, and the range of trade-offs that are associated with each scenario. In order to produce the analysis, ABPmer made use of both their own expert knowledge, a range of literature sources, and also the information collected from the one:one stakeholder interviews.

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2016 Future Trends in the Celtic Seas Marine Region report is produced and includes 7 maps, 6 of which are country future trends maps and a regional future trends map.
Actual: the Future Trends report was produced by August 2016, containing over 7 maps.

B.10.5. Guidelines for integrating scenario planning and multi-criteria decision analysis

Complete

Change justification: This action was originally described as ‘integrated scenario planning and multi-criteria decision analysis to support MSFD / ICM implementation’ which itself replaced an action on participatory mapping using touch tables. Both of these slightly different proposals were about ways of engaging stakeholders in marine planning decisions. It was felt that rather than delivering a guide on a very specific engagement technique (multi-criteria decision analysis), at this stage for both the Celtic Seas stakeholders, and the project, there was more benefit in providing advice on a wide range of engagement tools. All the team’s experience of engagement from the last four years was pulled together into a series of ‘top tips’.

The Celtic Seas Partnership has produced a web-resource on stakeholder engagement to share our top tips for effective cross-sector, cross-border stakeholder engagement (http://www.celticseaspartnership.eu/learning/). The resource aims to capture and share the depth of stakeholder engagement experience generated through the Celtic Seas Partnership project to support MSFD / ICM implementation at the local level and across the Celtic Seas Region. The many products (guidelines, reports, websites) developed by the partnership have been complimented by this resource of information on the process of engagement. The content was developed using insights from the action learning sets, project evaluations, interviews with the stakeholder engagement officer, workshop de-briefs, the end of project reflective learning session and individual project staff experiences. It includes pages on: project planning, evaluation and monitoring, participatory methods (Task Groups and
workshops), project management, communications and governance. The aim of this resource is to enable other stakeholder focused projects to learn from our successes (and mistakes), by using the engagement tools to keep elevating the quality and effectiveness of participatory endeavours. It is particularly aimed at marine and coastal managers with less experience of stakeholder engagement at this scale, who are attempting to implement MSFD (e.g. EU countries).

Indicator:
Expected: By July 2016 Guidelines for integrating scenario planning and multi-criteria decision analysis to support MSFD / ICM implementation at the local level and the Celtic Seas Region (hard-copy documents, electronic and on-line versions) are produced.
Actual: the guidelines (‘top tips’) were produced by March 2017.

Complete
Over 100 delegates attended the third Celtic Seas Partnership conference in Dublin. The afternoon session of the first day of the conference focused on the Future Trends. It began with a presentation given by the Policy Officer and followed with an interactive session led by the Stakeholder Engagement Officer for Wales and South West England. For more information please see the workshop report in Annex B.2.4.

See Section 5.2 for further details of dissemination.

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2016 at least 75 stakeholders participate actively in the various presentations promoting the future trends report and mapping in the 3rd Celtic Seas Conference and through web site interactions.
Actual: the Future Trends work and website were presented at the final Celtic Seas conference, which had 100 participants in attendance.

Action B.11 – Strategic guide to knowledge integration and harmonised data information management the Celtic Seas Marine Region

Beneficiary responsible: NERC (BODC)

B.11.1 Collation and review of the information resources available
Complete – update provided in the September 2016 Progress Report
A report on information sources and needs was subcontracted to the Marine Biological Association (see Annex B11.1), which was reviewed and reported on within the Strategic Guide and metadata collated from these sources was used to populate the database for the Web Portal (D.3.).

Indicator:
Expected: By April 2016 Information sources are reviewed for the finalised strategic guide.
Actual: The report was produced by April 2016.

B.11.2. Formulating a preliminary strategic guide
Complete – update provided in the September 2016 Progress Report
The first draft of the Strategic Guide was delivered by December 2015. Feedback was received from stakeholders at the second round of Celtic Seas Partnership country workshops. 

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2016 the preliminary version of the Strategic Guide is prepared and discussed by stakeholders.
Actual: the first draft of the Strategic Guide was circulated to stakeholders for comments by December 2015.

B.11.3. Reviewing the initial and developing the final “Strategic Guide for Knowledge Integration for MSFD Implementation in the Celtic Seas Region”

Complete
The report was finalised and printed ahead of the Celtic Seas Partnership final conference in Dublin, October 2016 (see Annex B11.2 for final report). The report is also available in French (see Annex B11.3). The report describes the marine spatial data infrastructures currently in place around Europe that may support the implementation of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive in the Celtic Seas, as a result of stakeholder feedback, the title of the report was changed to ‘Discovering Data and information in the Celtic Seas’ to make it more engaging.

Indicator:
Expected: By May 2016 Feedback on the 1st version of the strategic guide is reviewed. By October 2016 the final version of the Strategic Guide is prepared and disseminated at the 3rd Celtic Seas Conference.
Actual: feedback on the draft version was reviewed, and the final version was launched and disseminated at the final Celtic Seas conference in October 2016.

B.11.4. Dissemination of the Strategic Guide
The report is available to download on the Celtic Seas website and was promoted through the final project e-newsletter and on the Celtic Seas Partnership Twitter page. Local French government showed an interest regarding the Discovering data guidelines as they are planning to set up an online tool to access the marine data and are looking for guidelines to build the best tool.

See Section 5.2 for details of dissemination.

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2016 stakeholders participating in the project are familiar with potential resources of information across the borders and mechanisms of obtaining data and information.
Actual: the final version of the Strategic Guide was launched and disseminated at the final Celtic Seas conference in October 2016 as well as multiple other events across the Celtic Seas and Europe.

B.11.5. Inventory and analysis of data and information support MSFD across the borders and needs for capacity building

Complete – update provided in the September 2016 Progress Report
MaREI were subcontracted to complete this sub-action, they considered integration challenges for two MSFD data types: Descriptor 2 Non-indigenous species and Descriptor 3...
Commercial Fish and Shellfish. Their findings are presented in ‘Discovering Data and Information in the Celtic Seas’ under ‘Use Case Studies’ (see Annex B11.2).

Indicator:
Expected: By August 2015 an inventory and analysis of data harmonisation issues relevant to MSFD implementation is fed into B.11.2. By October 2015 further analysis of data harmonisation issues associated with MSFD policy implementation is complete.
Actual: the inventory and analysis of data was completed by the deadline, which fed into B.11.2.

B.11.6. Identification of major bottlenecks and impediments in data/information flows
Complete
The work under this sub-action was carried out on behalf of the Biological Diversity Task group (see Action B.3.2). A contract was awarded to CEFAS to explore the mapping between data collected by commercial fishers and the data requirements of the regularity authorities. The report from this sub-action “Informing the scope of the Celtic Seas fishery stakeholder data collection strategy” (http://www.celticseaspartnership.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Fishing4Data-Final-1-1.pdf) can be seen in Annex B11.4. This report reflected stakeholder views and experiences, which were collected via interviews and questionnaires.

Originally, this was set to deliver for June 2016 but the invitation to tender was not released until September 2016. The delay was down to the time it took to write the specification for the work and the need to capture the detail (it was written by a data scientist as opposed to a fisheries expert). Further delay was incurred when the specification was sent for review by fisheries experts and scientists. The contractor, appointed at the start of October 2016, delivered the final report at the start of February 2017. The delivery date had been set to 20th January however the report could not be released until it had been internally vetted before release, hence the two week delay.

Indicator:
Expected: By June 2016 identification of innovative solutions to address data flow bottlenecks and impediments for use of commercial fisheries data are completed and reported back to stakeholders.
Actual: this report was finalised in February 2017.

Action C.1 - Monitoring the impact of the project

Beneficiary responsible: WWF-UK

Ongoing monitoring throughout the project was achieved through bi-monthly M&E meetings and quarterly Action Learning Sets. WWF-UK subcontracted an independent Action Learning facilitator (Carl Reynolds) to mobilise and energise the group, advise them on process and provide stimuli and a catalyst to the learning by asking questions and making descriptive observations. See Annex C1.1 for the proposal of the Action Learning Set. The Action Learning Set meetings helped the team to develop learning on stakeholder engagement and apply this learning to improve our methodology and sharing of learning from different countries within the Celtic Seas.
C.1.1. Project M&E
Complete

Logframe
The project logframe (Annex C1.2) has been regularly updated throughout the project. New columns were added in 2016 to ensure more thorough monitoring of impact and activities. The Project Liaison Officer and the D&I Officer facilitated multiple M&E sessions with the Celtic Seas Partnership team and Associated Beneficiaries to build their capacity and ensure they understood the benefits of M&E and contributed. The LIFE indicators in the logframe (in separate tabs) have been updated with the final project data.

Theory of Change
The Project Liaison Officer and the Design and Impact (D&I) Officer facilitated a number of discussions with the team in 2016 about the project’s theory of change, which was one of the recommendations from the mid-term review. See Annex C1.3 for the theory of change diagrams that were produced from these discussions, as well as photos from the session.

Monitoring project risks
The grant agreement outlined some expected constraints and risks (economic, social, political/governance, and project management) to the project. From 2016 these risks were monitored by the Steering Group at each meeting through a Risk Register as part of our ongoing project management (see Annex C1.4). The identified risks were plotted into the Risk Register and risk ‘scores’ were generated for each one, based on a calculation of the potential likelihood of the risk occurring and potential impact if that risk were to become reality. This allowed us to identify which risks pose the greatest threat to the project, and we were able to put suitable mitigation in place to reduce the risk. At a glance, the risk register allowed the Steering Group to see what the biggest risks are and which ones still need further action to mitigate the risk. The document in Annex C1.5 explains the headings of the Risk Register in more detail.

Team reflections & learning
The Project Liaison Officer and D&I Officer planned and facilitated a final team reflection and learning session with the wider project team on 2nd December 2016. We reflected on elements of the project that, with the benefit of hindsight, we could have been done differently – as well as discussing the things that went well. During this session we had a rich discussion, and drew some learnings from the project which could be applied more widely in WWF. Please see Annex C1.6 for the written summary from this session, the plan for the session and photos. The key lessons to come from the session were:

- Project deliverables were end-loaded. **Lesson:** stagger outputs throughout the project to create a sense of achievement with the stakeholders and have things to communicate
- The project was quite complicated and complex, with a very resource-heavy model. **Lesson:** design a less complex project, so it’s more understandable and easier to communicate. Also, design it so that it’s less resource-intensive to allow more “grass-roots” stakeholder engagement.

Mid-term review
As reported in the 2016 Progress Report, a consultant was appointed in April 2015 to carry out a mid-term review of the project. The report can be seen in Annex C1.7, and a management response was agreed with the project team and partners (see Annex C1.8). The actions in the management response to the mid-term review were regularly reviewed and
updated to ensure that all recommendations are carried forward, and progress was monitored. One of the main recommendations made in the mid-term evaluation was the need for more capacity to be earmarked for project monitoring and evaluation (M&E). As a result, the role and scope of the Project Advisor was changed in order to provide more capacity for M&E and reporting of the project activities (this became the ‘Project Liaison Officer’ role).

Final evaluation
The same consultant (Lisa Howes) who carried out the mid-term review was used to carry out the final evaluation (it was awarded as one contract). Planning for the final evaluation started in mid-2016, with the Project Liaison Officer and Project Manager having regular contact with the consultant. The report can be seen in Annex C1.9. The report makes 11 recommendations (5 of which relate to ‘relevance and design’), and a management response was produced so that WWF-UK can take forward these recommendations (see Annex C1.10).

The most significant results from the evaluation showed that the project:
- raised awareness and knowledge around the MSFD
- the project created a unique opportunity for transboundary collaboration amongst stakeholders
- demonstrated innovation – fisheries mediation and the stakeholder engagement techniques

The consultant started the Final Evaluation in October 2016, and submitted the report on 8th February 2017. 79 project stakeholders responded to the online survey and 13 external stakeholders and 7 project staff members were interviewed.

The overall results from the Final Evaluation were positive, with many comments and quotes from stakeholders indicating impact. The report states that “The Celtic Seas Partnership Project has been a popular and galvanising project amongst stakeholders. Participants have particularly valued the unique opportunity created by the project for transboundary and cross-sectoral engagement at the regional, Celtic Seas, level. The project has also made important contributions to increasing awareness and knowledge regarding the Marine Strategy Framework Directive. Both these achievements help create a stronger enabling environment for implementation of the Directive.”

The Final Evaluation report states that the project team, and particularly overall project management, have been extremely strong project assets. Praise has been given by many for the efficiency with which both the overall project and external workshops and events have been run. It also states that, “given the complex nature of the project, the team have done extremely well to remain on track as the project draws to a close, and to deliver all of the actions committed to”.

The Final Evaluation commenced straight after the final multi-national conference, towards the end of October 2016. We had no choice but to start the evaluation then because at the time we had not heard back from the Commission as to whether they had approved our project extension application. We were advised by our EC monitor to go ahead and start the Final Evaluation and get the process moving as soon as possible just in case the project did finish at the end of December, when we would need the Final Evaluation report delivered.

As it happens, we did get approval from the Commission for the three month project extension, so the project finished at the end of March. This meant that the Final Evaluation did not include the dissemination period, where more of the impact of the project will have
been demonstrated. The Final Evaluation online survey and the stakeholder interviews took place at the end of October/early November, and not all of the products had been launched by this time. Therefore the impact of these products was missing from the Final Evaluation, which states this clearly. We felt that in order to capture the dissemination period (January to March), as well as the full suite of Celtic Seas Partnership products that are now complete, we should carry out a smaller-scale analysis of the impact before the end of June.

This analysis was carried out by the Project Liaison Officer (see Annex C1.11 for the report). The Methodology included:

- A ‘desk review’ of the documents and information since December 2016
- A stakeholder survey (including the Observer Board and Expert Advisory Group)
- Review of the external dissemination
- Analysis and write-up of the impacts of the project and products

Because it’s harder to measure the impacts of policy-based actions after such a short period of time, WWF-UK plans to carry out a further evaluation of the project one year after the project end.

Indicator:

**Expected:** By December 2016 the implementation of the finalised monitoring plan ensured that at least 2 meetings per year of the steering committee results from M&E informed adaptive management of project actions and the flow of information where one action starting is dependent on the timely achievement of results from another action was closely monitored by the steering group and adjustments made to increase effectiveness.

**Actual:** results from the M&E plan informed adaptive management decisions of project actions throughout the project via Steering Group meetings.

C.1.2. Monitoring Expected Results impact

**Complete**

As reported in the 2016 Progress Report, we used a full team meeting to review and refine the indicators for the project aim, two objectives and four expected results. This was a useful exercise because many of the indicators identified in the monitoring protocol have evolved since the project started due to the improvements in refining the scope of the actions (see Annex C1.12 for the revised indicators). In particular, we proposed to change the wording for Expected Result 4 to better reflect the work that the project has delivered because the refined project actions deliver much more than the original wording.

Indicator:

**Expected:** By December 2016, the project has demonstrated the achievement and delivery of its objectives and expected results in a collaborative way so that stakeholders have participated at various stages.

**Actual:** All project objectives and expected results have been achieved the project end in a collaborative way with the stakeholders.

C.1.3. Monitoring Demonstration and Co-location case studies

**No longer applicable**

The implementation lessons from the co-location case studies were not evident during the timeframe of the project because it takes time for the lessons to be implemented. Given this, we decided to focus the socio-economic impact study (Action C.1.4) on the potential future benefits of implementation of the co-location guidelines.
Indicator:
Expected: By Mar 2016 the monitoring system ensures that implementation lessons from the demonstration sites and co-location case studies has feedback into the 2nd Celtic Seas conference activities.
Actual: no longer applicable.

C.1.4. Monitoring Socio Economic Impact
**Complete**
As explained in the last Progress Report, we proposed to change the scope of this study slightly to reflect the natural direction the project has progressed since the original proposal in the Grant Agreement. What was proposed in the original Grant Agreement is less relevant to the refined actions of the project, so a different focus of the study was considered necessary to fully capture the potential socio-economic impacts of the project. The way the project has evolved over time means that it is no longer relevant to carry out an analysis of B.9 and B.10 in order to identify the socio-economic impact of the project.

The socio-economic formed two parts:
1. A social and well-being impact study
2. A socio-economic impact study

**Social and well-being impact study**
This study was carried out by external consultant Lisa Howes (who also carried out the two project evaluations), and focused on the social and well-being impacts that the Celtic Seas Partnership project has had in the region. The report can be found in Annex C1.13. The report reviewed the impact that the project has had on individuals personally, rather than the impact of the project overall. The report concludes that “overall, the project seems to have made an overall positive contribution to social and well-being aspects for many stakeholders across the Celtic Seas”. Highly ranked impacts, as a result of the project, include:

- Improved inter-sectoral relationships:
  - The tool recorded a modest, yet significant, change of an increase in 3% in terms of value placed on improved relationships following the project
  - A very significant overall increase of 17% was observed in terms of improved relationships with other sectors
- Improved understanding and improved implementation of MSFD:
  - Almost one fifth, 19% of respondents, noted an increase in terms of enhanced understanding of MSFD
  - A significant 16% overall increase in enhanced understanding leading to improvements in implementation/practice since project engagement was observed
- Improved access to info/data/tools/guidance to aid implementation of marine policy & management:
  - A very significant 18% overall increase in data/information access, enabling improved practice, since project engagement is noted
- Improved confidence to engage/lead steps towards change in marine policy & management:
  - A significant overall increase of 15% was noted in terms of increased stakeholder confidence to engage or lead change regarding marine policy/management

The study took place in parallel to the Final Evaluation. 11 core questions were asked via an online survey, around social and wellbeing impact. The results were inputted to a new Social
and Wellbeing Indicator tool that WWF has developed for analysis. The tool facilitated a higher depth of analysis than with straightforward surveys, allowing the questions to be analysed in terms of responses from different stakeholder groups/profiles for example.

**Socio-economic impact study**

The second, and more substantial, part of the study was contracted to NEF Consulting who carried out a detailed study exploring the potential socio-economic impacts of the Celtic Seas Partnership project. In particular, the work focused on the potential impacts of the guidelines we produced on co-existence of marine renewables and how they may inform future plans for development and investment. The report can be found in Annex C1.14. The results of the model suggest an overall potential benefit from implementation of the co-existence guidelines of nearly £8 million over a five year assessment period\(^1\) (rising to over £36 million with upper bound assumptions). The model (which can be seen in Annex C1.15) was strongly based on assumptions drawn from interviews with experts and professional judgement of the consultant.

Indicator:

**Expected:** By March 2017 a study on the socio-economic effects of the project has been produced from combining key information and analysis from the project to submit with the Final Report.

**Actual:** A study and report on the social and well-being impacts of the project was delivered by February 2017. A study and report on the socio-economic effects of the project was delivered by March 2017.

**Action D.1 - Development and implementation of a Communications Strategy**

**Beneficiary responsible:** WWF-UK

The communications officer worked with the project core team to develop the communications strategy for the project (see Annex D1.1). The strategy was finalised in September 2013 and all of the different elements have been delivered successfully. Further information on the different elements are below.

**D.1.1. Outreach to core stakeholders**

**Complete**

Building strong relationships with core stakeholders was important for the delivery of the project. We used a combination of face-to-face and digital tools to communicate. The face-to-face was key in establishing the relationships and digital tools were used to support this and provide key information. Each SEO attended meetings and events to reach stakeholders and all of these interactions are recorded in the Outreach Record (Annex D1.3). Once added to our contact database we were then able to use the project e-newsletter to keep the conversation going and provide timely and interesting content.

**Newsletter**

We expected to publish 16 newsletters, actually published 19 newsletters over the course of the project (see Annex D1.2) and 41 emails about our workshops (this includes save the dates, \(^1\) Net Present Value (NPV) using a standard UK discount rate of 3.5% per annum has been applied to all figures.
invitations, programmes, reports etc.). There are currently 376 non-French email subscribers and 12 French signed up to receive the e-newsletter.

Meetings and presentations
The core project team have attended 628 meetings and/or workshops reaching a audience of approximately 13,600 key stakeholders (some duplication of stakeholders at events). 60 presentations were given on the Celtic Seas Partnership at events across Europe. Please refer to the Outreach Records in Annex D1.3 for more details. Team members have given presentations at high profile events, including the following:

- The Project Manager gave a presentation at the ICES Working Group on ecosystem assessment of Western Shelf Seas in Belfast in March 2016. The Western Shelf Seas spans a large area of the Atlantic, and includes the Celtic Seas. There are lots of synergies with the Celtic Seas Partnership project.
- WWF ran the only eNGO workshop at the European Maritime Day (EMD) held in Turku, Finland in May 2016. The Celtic Seas Partnership facilitated a discussion on conflicts in the marine environment and considered different methods of how they might be better managed in the future, which was well received. This allowed us to communicate about the project with an audience of 1,200 stakeholders in the marine economy who would otherwise be difficult to reach.
- The Policy Officer presented at the Devotes summer school on ecosystem services in San Sebastian in June 2016. The Celtic Seas Partnership project was very well received and good connections were made with institutions and projects from around Europe.
- The Scotland SEO presented the Future Trends work at Sea Scotland in Dundee in June 2016.
- The Project Manager and Policy Officer gave presentation at the ICES Annual Science Conference of Marine Science in Riga, Latvia in September 2016.
- World Ocean Council Sustainable Oceans Summit in Rotterdam in December 2016. WWF was the only international eNGO invited to present. The SEO for Wales and South West England presented the Future Trends work from the Celtic Seas Partnership to a keen audience. Interest was shown for follow up discussions on how the Celtic Seas Future Trends approach could be used to progress marine spatial planning through the EU Marine Spatial Planning Group and in South East Asia through the Coral Triangle Group.
- Chris Wood from BODC presented a poster (on Linked Data) at the European Geoscience Union General Assembly in April 2016 an Vienna. This event was attended by more than one hundred people. The poster was displayed for a 24 hour period.
- Chris Wood from BODC gave a presentation on Linked Data at the International Conference on Marine Data and Information Systems in October 2016 in Gdańsk, Poland. The event was attended by 150 participants.
- Laure Lamour from SeaWeb hosted a stand at the SeaTeachWeek event in Brest in October 2016 where the Celtic Seas Partnership outputs were displayed and distributed. The event was attended by 400 participants.
- MaREI hosted a stand at the Cork Harbour Festival in June 2016, where Celtic Seas Partnership outputs were displayed to 120 participants from multiple sectors.
- MaREI gave a presentation on the Celtic Seas Partnership to three members of the Namibian Government in April 2016, particularly focussing on the Best Practice Guidelines on Transboundary Governance.
- WWF-UK, ULIV, EMRA and MaREI hosted stands at the Atlantic Stakeholder Platform conference in Dublin in September 2016, which had 300 participants in attendance.
• EMRA gave a presentation at the Marine Spatial Planning conference in Grangegorman, Dublin in June 2016 on the Dublin Bay Strategic Management Framework. 70 delegates were in attendance.
• ULI V hosted a stand at the Marine Planning Issues and Evidence workshop in Liverpool in July 2017 to 25 delegates from a range of sectors.

(For details of presentations given during the dissemination period (January – March 2017) please refer to Section 5.2.2)

Indicator:
Expected to publish 16 newsletters, actually published 19 newsletters and 41 emails about our workshops (this includes save the dates, invitations, programmes, reports etc.)
There are currently 376 non-French email subscribers and 12 French people signed up to receive the e-newsletter.
Expected to give 15 presentations, actually gave 60

D.1.2 Outreach to wider stakeholder group
Complete

Social media
We used Twitter (https://twitter.com/celticseas) to establish an online community. We used it to signpost people to the Celtic Seas Partnership website and to share and distribute outputs of the project. We were expected to have 500 twitter followers by the end of the project, but we actually had 801 followers.

Indicator:
Expected: 500 twitter followers / Actual: 801 followers

Internal communication
We have been regularly communicating project updates and achievements to WWF UK and the wider / international network. We have had project updates featured on the WWF intranet and have had stories included in the Global Marine Update (an e-newsletter sent to everyone working on marine within the WWF global network). The project has featured in the WWF UK internal email ‘You need to know’ and the ‘Global Programmes Monthly Headlines’ – both of which go to all WWF-UK staff. We have given several presentations to the organisation.

To celebrate the end of the project we held a ‘Treasures of the Celtic Seas’ day at the Living Planet Centre on 27th March 2017. This event showcased the achievements of the project and share learning. The day included a treasure hunt, an information stand with all our outputs and two presentations (see Annex D1.11 for photos from the day).

The Celtic Seas Partnership project was featured in the 2016 WWF World Wide Overview, which was circulated to all colleagues in WWF offices around the world.

Sponsorship for events
We have sponsored key industry events, including the Coastal Futures conference three years running, the Plymouth University Marcopol conference and the European Maritime Day in Turku, Finland. The sponsorships included having a leaflet in each delegate pack and having a stand at the events.
D.1.3. Contacts database

**Complete**

We used the contact management system ‘Highrise’ as the project contact database. Contacts are organised according to location and sector allowing easy segmentation and targeting.

There were 1,725 contacts on Highrise by the end of the project, including a wide range of stakeholders from our target sectors across each of the project countries. Initially we set a target of 3,000 contacts on the database, but as we explained in the September 2016 Progress Report, this target was changed to 1,800 because it’s more beneficial to have a smaller number of highly engaged contacts than a larger number of contacts who are not engaged.

D.1.4. Development of project promotional materials, including noticeboards

**Complete**

A number of promotional materials were produced for the project (see Annex D1.4) including:

- Two leaflets in English & French
- A technical and general briefing in English and French
- A digital Notice Board in English & French
- Banners for events
- A presentation template (in English & French) (electronic only)
- A project advertisement
- Project maps

We purchased 2 images to use in the different promotional items (see Annex D1.5). We also used images that were already available within WWF to save on costs.

Indicators:

Expected: 2 Leaflets – 5000 copies / Actual: 2 leaflets 10,000 copies

Expected: 2 Posters / Actual: 6 posters (3 WWF-UK, 1 ULIV, 1 BODC 1 SeaWeb)

Expected: 1 Technical publication – Digital / Actual: 1 technical publication

Expected: 2 Pull-up banners – 6 copies / Actual: 2 banners – 6 copies

Expected: 1 Delegate folder – 500 copies / Actual: 1 folder – 600 copies

Expected: 1 Notice Board / Actual: 1 Notice Board in English and French

We decided to develop the notice board into a digital product which can be viewed more widely both on personal devices and in public locations as a digital display. It is available on the project website and we have shared using Twitter. It has also been shown on digital screens at the National Assembly for Wales and WWF’s Living Planet Centre. You can view the English version: [https://readymag.com/u83715073/570102/](https://readymag.com/u83715073/570102/); and the French version: [https://readymag.com/u83715073/692855/](https://readymag.com/u83715073/692855/)

WWF and project partners will continue to distribute project materials at upcoming meetings and events. Read more about this in the AfterLIFE plan (Annex D4.1).

D.1.5. Develop and maintain project website

**Complete**

A project website was in place by June 2013. As we developed more materials and outputs for the project we further developed the website and added more detailed information on the MSFD and the project. To reflect the end of the project the website has been re-designed and re-structured to make it easier for visitors to access the different project outputs. The website
Indicators:
Expected: No. of unique visits: 2,400 / Actual: 16,368 unique visits
Expected: Average visit duration (mins): 2 minutes / Actual: 2.84
Expected: No. of downloads: 200 / Actual: 5,437

D.1.6. Communicating with the media

Complete

A media plan was written for the project (Annex D1.7) that detailed the different media outlets that we wanted to engage and the types of stories/angles we used to engage them. The plan was agreed by the communications lead from partner organisations.

We issued six press releases with varying degree of pick up (see Annex D1.8 for Press releases and coverage). Our most successful coverage was on the Future Trends study. The news report covered all our key messages and avoided the risks we'd identified and prepared for. The launch clashed with Donald Trump’s electoral victory which meant BBC Wales News had some of its strongest viewing figures of the year, reaching over 300,000. As well as helping us to reach a much larger audience, the media also supported our advocacy. We used the media to frame the report in the current policy context. In Wales, we framed it as informing Wales’ first national marine plan. The BBC asked both the Welsh Government and DEFRA to respond to our findings. This helped to raise the profile of the report within the relevant departments, and gave us an on-the-record commitment from both governments to engage with the contents of the report. After seeing it on the news, a Plaid Cymru Assembly Member, Vicki Howells, referenced the report in an Assembly debate on the State of Nature in Wales. Using specific examples and phrases from the news report, she used it to put pressure on the government to apply equal focus to issues facing the marine environment.

Indicators:
Expected: 5 Press releases made by the project / Actual: 6 press releases issued
Expected: 10 General public article in local press / Actual: 8 general public article in local press (BBC Wales, Western Mail (x3), South Wales Evening Post, Western Morning News, The National, Press & Journal)
Expected: 4 Specialised press article / Actual: 6 specialised press article (World fishing and aquaculture, Fishing News EU, Action magazine, Family Traveller magazine, Inshore Ireland magazine x 2)
Expected: 15 Internet article / Actual: 15 articles

D.1.7. Networking with other projects

Complete

Through Action A.1 and subsequent follow-up, 12 projects were either interviewed and/or had ongoing dialogue with the project. This includes representation from some projects on the Expert Advisory Group (i.e. TPEA, CAMIS, Loughs Agency). Networking with other projects has been conducted primarily through conference attendance. Project staff held a
number of positive meetings to identify synergies between the Celtic Seas Partnership project and a new EC project called SIMCelt. SIMCelt is a project which will look at supporting implementation of maritime spatial planning in the Celtic Sea. Several areas of Celtic Seas Partnership project were identified as valuable for ongoing liaison and possible future use and development in the SIMCelt project. SIMCelt exhibited at our final conference.

The project has participated in joint initiatives such as the Welsh and Scottish Environment Links. We have also communicated with:

- Blue New Deal, a New Economics Foundation project
- The EC Joint Research Council MSFD Competence Centre
- SEACAMS2
- Fishing into the Future
- MAST’s and Scottish Governments Science Renewables Partnership
- The Future Trends work has been picked up by the Marine Management Organisation, who have not only decided to use adopt a scenario approach in all the remaining marine plan areas in England, but have specifically decided to use the ideal scenarios developed through our process.
- WWF has been actively disseminating the Celtic Seas Partnership project approach to our network offices and we set up a series of lesson sharing webinars with WWF Kenya who are working on marine spatial planning and fisheries co-management approaches.
- EMRA networked with a range of other projects including sitting on the steering group for the IMMERSE project.
- EMRA networked with the Dublin Bay UNESCO Biosphere to discuss the role of the Biosphere in the management of Dublin Bay.

Indicators:
Expected: 5 relevant projects Actual: 13

D.1.8. Layman’s Report
A Layman’s report (see Annex D1.9) has been written for the project and includes project objectives, actions and results. The report is available for people to download from the project website.

Indicator:
Expected: 50 downloads / Actual: 0

The layman’s report was finalised at the end of the project so we have not yet received any downloads.

D.1.9. Publication and translation
Complete
All promotional materials that have been produced are available in both English and French. The majority of e-newsletters have been sent in English and French. We introduced an option for people to choose their preferred language when signing up to the newsletter. We worked with SeaWeb to identify which publications were a priority to translate into French and made sure they were available in both languages on the website. There is a French section on the website that makes it easy for French speaking visitors to see which of the project materials are available in French.
D.1.10. Celtic Seas Partnership project wrap-up event (3rd Celtic Seas Conference)

**Complete**

On 18th and 19th October 2016 we held our third and final multi-national conference at Croke Park in Dublin. The conference was a great success thanks to the enthusiasm and engagement shown by delegates for the conference sessions. Some of the most commonly used words to describe the conference from participants were “networking”, “informative” “engaging” and “collaborative”. See Annex D1.12 for full conference evaluation form feedback. We had 100 delegates at the conference representing a wide range of sectors across the Celtic Seas. Delegates came from governments, statutory agencies, non-government organisations, science and research and industry. The justification for 100 participants attending (rather than 120 as stated in the Grant Agreement) is explained in Action B.2.3).

The conference was a mixture of short presentations, group working, plenary discussions and plenty of opportunity for networking. We also provided time for participants to explore some of the project’s products in more detail. On the first afternoon we heard from the Celtic Seas Partnership Project Manager Jenny Oates about project achievements and explored the findings of the Future Trends work. The day finished with an exhibition of projects from the Celtic Seas, where participants in the conference were able to display their own work areas and explain how others could become involved or contribute to that work. Plenty of time was allowed for participants to discuss potential future collaborations and network whilst refreshments were served. During the exhibition Trevor Hutchings, Director of UK & EU Advocacy from WWF-UK gave a short talk about the potential challenges and opportunities created by the UK’s vote to leave the European Union. On the second day we got delegates to feedback some of their experiences of engaging with the project and more widely with marine policy. Everyone was then invited to explore the various project products and discuss or ask questions with project staff. After lunch participants discussed whether they would like to continue working together once the Celtic Seas Partnership had finished and considered possible ways of doing so. The outputs from this exercise were used to develop the Statement of Support (see Section 5.4 for details). To end the conference we held a panel session where four expert panel members were asked questions written by delegates. The experts were:

- Dr Gemma Harper - Deputy Director for Marine Policy and Evidence and Chief Social Scientist in the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra).
- Ottilia Thoreson – Programme Manager of the WWF Baltic Ecoregion Programme.
- David Johnson - Director at Seascape Consultants Ltd, former Executive Secretary to the OSPAR Commission
- Richard Cronin - Senior Adviser in Water Division of the Irish Department of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government/Vice-chair to the OSPAR Commission

We received 42 completed evaluation forms from the conference, which were largely very positive. When asked how useful they found the event 35% of respondents gave a score of 5 out of 5 (very useful), 50% gave a score of 4 and 10% gave a score of 3. Positive feedback for the high scores was given primarily for the chance for meeting and networking with people (particularly access to government departments that they wouldn’t normally get a chance to meet). People felt that they learned a lot and were pleased to be able to discuss common issues with fellow marine peers. They also found seeing the outputs of the project useful. The particular sessions that were highlighted as the most useful were the Future Trends, the panel discussion and the declaration session.

When asked about the extent to which they had an opportunity to engage with others and share their views/experiences, 100% of the respondents gave a rating of either 5 (to a great
extent) or 4. They were generally very pleased to be given so many opportunities to network in break-out sessions, and fed back that there was a good mix of structure and networking.

The Final multi-national conference report can be seen in Annex D1.10 (with delegate list in appendix). The results from the stakeholder evaluation form can be found in Annex D1.12. Images taken by the team on the day can be found in Annex B2.5.

During the declaration section of the conference, participants discussed in facilitated groups the value of different sectors, stakeholders, and countries coming together to be able to discuss issues and share experience – an opportunity which had been provided by the Celtic Seas Partnership for the last 4 years. It was discussed if there was appetite to continue providing an opportunity to bring people together, and how this could be achieved. It was clear from the discussions at the conference that there exists sufficient appetite to take something forward, through the Celtic Seas Partnership Statement of Support – we are documenting this level of support in order to encourage organisations to provide resources in order to create future opportunities.

Indicator:
Expected: 120 delegates / Actual: 100 delegates

Action D.2 – Communication with national administrations and regional bodies

Beneficiary responsible: WWF-UK

D.2.1. Establish an Observer Board
Complete
As reported in previous EC reports, regular teleconferences and in person meetings were organised and held within this project. These meetings were held at key stages in the project timeline (e.g. during the planning stages for the workshops), and were very important in terms of providing guidance to ensure that the project activities are relevant and useful. Advice from the government officials on the Observer Board was used in the development of the Actions B.5, B.8 and B.10. The Observer Board also provided useful information on relevant ongoing work and dates of key policy deadlines in each of the project countries. Observer Board members were very helpful in identifying and securing relevant senior Government representatives to sit on the expert panel at the Celtic Seas Partnership final conference in Dublin. The minutes from the last two teleconferences can be seen in Annex D2.1 and D.2.2.

Indicator:
Expected: Observer Board established by the March 2013 and 2 meetings held per year, one conference call and another in person (where possible alongside another conference or government event).
Actual: Commitment to being involved in the Observer Board was secured in October 2014, from government departments in each of the Celtic Seas countries (including the UK devolved administrations), OSPAR and the European Commission (DG Environment). Regular meetings and teleconferences were held throughout the project.

D.2.2. Advocacy Plans & Celtic Seas Partnership stakeholder Engagement "country" officers
Complete
The SEOs implemented the advocacy plans, which were updated with relevant changes to the policy situation in each country (see Annex D2.3). The SEOs and other team members
engaged with government officials through meetings, phone calls and informal discussions at government-held events (see summaries in Annex D2.3 and details in Outreach record, Annex D1.3). 87 meetings and events were held/attended with Government officials across UK, Ireland and France during the project. Through these meetings, government officials were kept up to date with developments in the project, and provided feedback on synergies with their own current and planned work.

Indicator:
Expected: Government officials provide constructive feedback on direction of project recognising its complementarity to national processes throughout the project
Actual: Advocacy plans were implemented throughout the project, and constructive feedback was received by government.

D.2.3 Celtic Seas Partnership communications media & report dissemination
Complete
See Action D.1.1 for an update.

Indicator:
Expected: Celtic Seas Partnership Newsletter distributed to officials in France, Ireland, England Wales, Isle of Man, Northern Ireland and Scotland quarterly throughout the project
Actual: newsletters were distributed to officials in France, Ireland, England Wales, Isle of Man, Northern Ireland and Scotland regularly throughout the project.

Action D.3 - Develop Celtic Seas Web Portal

Beneficiary responsible: NERC (BODC)

Changes were made to the work carried out under this action and were submitted with the Mid-term Report. The justification to the changes to the grant agreement can be seen in Annex D3.1. The changes were approved by the Commission (letter reference: Ares(2015)5496784 - 01/12/2015).

D.3.1. Baseline analysis of the end user requirements for the web resource
Complete
Feedback from the first set of Country Workshops (May - June 2014) was used to inform the requirements of the portal. The workshop feedback questionnaires examined in respect of the data/information question, found that there was user support for transboundary data and information sharing across the Celtic Seas. Key data themes where data were most sought included species, fishing stock and effort, non-native species, seabed habitat, pressures, biodiversity and socioeconomic.

In October 2014, expert opinion was also sought on the proposed Celtic Seas Web Portal from ICES (International Council for the Exploration of the Sea), the Directorate-General for the Environment (European Commission), National Resources Wales and OSPAR. Their feedback suggested that they would not be direct users of the portal. Based on the wider user feedback from stakeholders, the decision was made to build an information portal for the general marine user.

Later in the build (November 2015), the decision was made to have a resource library sitting alongside the data portal. To understand the requirements of users for a resource library,
external assistance was used and the Marine Biological Association (UK) won the bid through competitive tender to collate the resource library content using stakeholder questionnaires and interviews to gather the information.

Initial portal planning did not get underway until mid-way through 2014, the delay being due to the requirement to obtain UK Cabinet Office approval for the build, which was a new requirement that came into being after the Celtic Seas Partnership proposal was submitted.

The UK Government requires that any expenditure on publicly accessible web-based information, tools and services through external contracts needs to be approved by the Cabinet Office before expenditure is committed. At the start of the project, NERC-BODC applied for approval via the UK Shared Business Service (UKSBS) who are mandated to deal with procurements for all Research Councils. At the time, the UK Shared Business Service were newly appointed and excessive delays were incurred due to uncertainties surrounding the requirements for the approval and UKSBS staffing issues. Eventually, after dealing directly with the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills who administer the approval process, a ‘Cabinet Office Technology and Digital Spend Control Form’ was submitted. However, as described below (section D3.2), after discussion with project partners, the Celtic Seas web portal was redefined and development of a “signposting” portal was carried out by BODC in-house, therefore Cabinet Office approval was no longer required.

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2014 the participants of the Celtic Seas conference and Irish Sea Platform are familiar and comfortable with the content and purpose of the resource and willing to use it for decision support and communication.
Actual: a working prototype of the Celtic Seas Web Portal was demonstrated at the final Celtic Seas conference, where participants were able to have a play around with the site on iPads and get a feel for what it could do. Positive feedback was received on the usefulness of the resource for decision making.

D.3.2. Defining architecture business rules and operations of the platform

Complete

A high-level architecture document describing the agreed functionality of the Celtic Seas Web Portal was produced for December 2014 with mock-up pictures of how the interface could look. The Celtic Seas Web Portal as defined in the original grant proposal was ‘a one-stop distributive system of data, data products and information from different sources’. The grant proposal was written at a time (2011 / 2012) when many other one-stop portals delivering data and information were already in development. When the specification document for the Celtic Seas Web portal was later written in 2014, it was generally accepted by the team that a ‘Celtic Seas Web Portal’ as originally defined was no longer valid given the abundance of web portals already in existence. Furthermore, advances in IT services has meant that data sharing, which is effectively what a portal does, is now done via the internet and using web services so there is no longer the requirement for a portal to host the data it wishes to share. In other words, there are technologies available to allow sharing of data and information held on servers other than the one hosting the website.

The steer from the Celtic Seas Partnership team was to build a web portal that would act as a ‘signposting’ service where users would be able to discover datasets and information relevant to MSFD reporting. The revised specification for the web portal was produced to meet this requirement. The Celtic Seas Web Portal was envisaged as a set of webpages for users to
browse data set records under each of the 11 Descriptors, data set information being provided by a ‘behind-the-scenes’ metadatabase populated with records of transboundary dataset metadata for the Celtic Seas. The user would access information and data related to a record by following URLs to other existing metadata portals.

In addition to users accessing this information via a user interface, it was decided to use an innovative approach to allow more technical users access to content of the metadatabase using Linked Data. Linked Data is promoted by the UK’s Cabinet Office Open Data Strategy, to allow freely discoverable metadata by third party applications. This is useful as it allows each metadata record to be discoverable and ‘linkable to’ as a single entity outside of the portal interface and the metadatabase. Thus the metadata record becomes part of the Web of data (as opposed to a just a standalone collection of metadata).

The build proceeded to time during phase December 2014 to October 2015. Unstyled portal pages (i.e. without design layout) were demonstrated to the team during the partner meeting in October 2015.

The change in the nature of the portal from the original grant proposal meant that a) the portal could be built in–house at BODC and b) only a fraction of the external assistance budget originally forecast would be needed. A project amendment letter was there submitted to the EC detailing the proposed changes and was approved by the Commission - please refer to the response letter, reference number: Ares(2015)5496784 - 01/12/2015.

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2014 broader stakeholder groups (participants of the demonstration projects, national and international academic community) are familiar and comfortable with the content and purpose of the resource and willing to use it for decision support and communication.
Actual: the Web Portal has been demonstrated to stakeholders at multiple events across the Celtic Seas and Europe. IPads were available for stakeholders to have a play with the site and get a feel for what it can do.

D.3.3. Developing the Web Portal content and data management system

Complete
The metadata content for the data catalogue (http://resources.celticseaspartnership.eu/data_catalogue/) was provided under contract by MaREI (see Action B11a. above) and the spreadsheets containing the metadata were delivered August 2015. The content for the resource library (http://resources.celticseaspartnership.eu/resource_library/) was supplied under contract by the Marine Biological Association (see D3.1) and delivered December 2015.

Indicator:
Expected: Prototype version of the Celtic Seas Web Portal by the end of Year 3 (December 2015).
Actual: a working prototype of the Celtic Seas Web Portal was demonstrated at the final Celtic Seas conference in October 2016.
D.3.4. Web design and development

**Complete**

March through to June 2016 saw commencement of BODC internal tasks to develop database systems to facilitate the availability of data in the National Oceanographic Database through Linked Data and SPARQL technology. The SPARQL Endpoint is available at [http://linkeddev.bodc.ac.uk/](http://linkeddev.bodc.ac.uk/) and documentation is at: [http://linkeddev.bodc.ac.uk/documentation/](http://linkeddev.bodc.ac.uk/documentation/). This will allow a technical user access to BODC oceanographic data holdings through searching by date and area. This work was in direct response to the requirement in the grant application: “NERC-BODC will provide access to, and technical support for, the existing quality assured data available through their National Oceanographic Database, much of which originates from NERC’s marine research programme, but also includes data from a large number of other data originators.”

The design of the portal pages were completed under contract by Polar10 in April 2016. The quality control and checking of the metadata content spreadsheets provided by MaREI occurred July to December 2016.

The Information Portal was demonstrated at the Final Celtic Seas Conference in Dublin, October 2016 as a development version. Feedback and errors were reacted to following the Conference and deployment checks made. The portal was deployed in January 2017 and can be accessed here: [http://resources.celticseaspartnership.eu/](http://resources.celticseaspartnership.eu/).

Work did not proceed to plan for the January 2016 to December 2016 phase. The Grant Agreement deadline for delivery of an online portal was the end of September 2016 whereas the portal went live at the beginning of January 2017. There are several reasons for this delay in delivery.

- Work by the webmaster at BODC to create webpages from the Polar10 designs was scheduled for March 2016 and the designer did not deliver the final proofs until April 2016. This delay was due to the production of a longer and more detailed specification document than was actually required. This resulted in the loss of the scheduling slot for webmaster time. The work was therefore delayed until another slot became available several months later.

- In terms of project management, in retrospect, the creation of metadata for the data catalogue should have been obtained under a separate contract and the specification for the work more tightly controlled. The data catalogue metadata required considerably more work on quality control by the BODC team than anticipated. The consequence for this was that without a portal fully populated with the final quality controlled metadata, some functional errors only became apparent at a late stage.

- BODC time was used throughout 2016 to initiate and manage ongoing contracts under B11. This was especially the case for the Fishing4Data contract where the specification and external review of the specification took time away from pressing D3 tasks like checking and adding to the metadata content for the data catalogue.

The [http://resources.celticseaspartnership.eu/](http://resources.celticseaspartnership.eu/) website will continue to be maintained for the next five years on BODC servers. The content will be reviewed quarterly and URLs checked for broken links.

**Indicator:**

**Expected:** By June 2016 the Celtic sea web portal will be ready to launch at the 3rd Celtic Seas conference in September 2016.
Actual: a working prototype of the Celtic Seas Web Portal was demonstrated at the final Celtic Seas conference in October 2016, where participants were able to have a play around with the site on iPads and get a feel for what it could do. The final portal went live at the beginning of January 2017.

D.3.5. Dissemination and communication

**Complete**
The Celtic Seas Web Portal has been disseminated at events across the UK and Europe, and people respond very positively towards it.

See Section 5.2 for more details of dissemination.

Indicator:
Expected: CSWP is promoted at the EU level and connected with the existing systems of data management by the end of the project.
Actual: the Web Portal has been demonstrated and promoted at events and conferences across the Celtic Seas and Europe to connect with the existing systems of data management.

**Action D.4 – AfterLIFE Communication Plan**

**Beneficiary responsible:** WWF-UK

An AfterLIFE Communication plan (Annex D4.1) has been produced and includes information on how each of the project partners will continue to promote the project’s outputs and achievements after the project has finished.

Indicator:
Expected: By March 2017 the AfterLIFE communication plan is disseminated as a separate chapter in the final report.
Actual: the AfterLIFE communication plan was completed by March 2017.

**Action E.1 - Effective project management by Coordinating Beneficiary, WWF-UK**

**Beneficiary responsible:** WWF-UK

E.1.1. Recruitment of Celtic Seas Partnership project team

**Complete**
The Celtic Seas Partnership Project Manager was recruited by 1st January 2013 and the full WWF Celtic Seas Partnership team was in place by 1st July 2013. The Project Manager (Lyndsey Dodds) was replaced by Jenny Oates in May 2015.

Indicator:
Expected: By July 2013 Celtic Seas Partnership team is complete.
Actual: the full Celtic Seas Partnership team was in place by 1st July 2013.

E.1.2. Establish Governance Structures

**Steering Group**

**Complete**
The Project Steering Group was set up and had its first official meeting on 21 August 2013. They met in person on a quarterly basis throughout the project at the WWF-UK head office.
The meetings have been well attended by the Associated Beneficiaries (see minutes in Annex E1.1).

**Expert Advisory Group established**

**Complete**

The ten initial recruits to the Expert Advisory Group (EAG) have all been active and engaged with the Celtic Seas Partnership during this reporting period. As previously report, the EAG has held regular meetings by teleconference and in person (see Annex E1.2 for the minutes from the meetings). The advisors have provided invaluable support in the development of the project products and activities, including: B2, B3, B5, B8, B9, B10 and D3. The group also shared their experience to improve the effectiveness of the exit strategy. More recently the EAG provided much needed context and up-to-date information regarding the post-Brexit policy landscape. The EAG held their final meeting after the final conference in Dublin and in conjunction with the Observer Board (see Annex E1.3 for the minutes from this meeting). Certain members of the group have been very enthusiastic champions on the project products and project approach, e.g. Ed Maltby referencing Liverpool’s work in a major publication of the Natural Capital Committee. Members of the EAG were particularly helpful guiding development of the final conference and the stakeholder engagement top tips product. They also contributed to the project evaluation through one to one interviews.

**Indicator:**

**Expected:** Celtic Seas Partnership steering group meet on a quarterly basis throughout the project, chaired by Project Manager. By July 2013 an Expert Advisory group is established

**Actual:** the Celtic Seas Partnership Steering Group met on a quarterly basis throughout the project, chaired by the Project Manager. The Expert Advisory Group was established by October 2013.

**E.1.3. Project inception event**

**Complete**

The project inception meeting was held in March 2013 and was attended by representatives of all associated beneficiaries. The minutes from the meetings can be seen in Annex E1.4.

**Indicator:**

**Expected:** By March 2013 a successful inception meeting is held, and attended by representatives of all Associated Beneficiaries.

**Actual:** the inception meeting was held in March 2013 and was attended by representatives of all Associated Beneficiaries.

**E.1.4. Internal communication systems**

**Complete**

Dropbox was used for all beneficiaries to access and store documents relating to the project. Basecamp was used to coordinate project activities. Monthly team teleconferences were held and two-weekly drop in teleconference slots were available for team discussions on specific issues. (See Section 4 for more detail).

**Indicator:**

**Expected:** By July 2013 internal communication systems / tools are set up.

**Actual:** internal project communication systems and tools were set up by July 2013.
E.1.5. Establish effective project management systems in WWF-UK

**Complete**

As the Co-ordinating Beneficiary, WWF-UK assumed overall responsibility for ensuring that the project met its stated objectives, ran on time, met reporting and financial requirements and adopted strategic adaptive management processes to ensure the project delivered as set out in the Grant Agreement. WWF-UK was the single point of contact for the Commission and led on the management of the project. The project planning Gantt chart was used to track the progress of project activates (see Annex E1.5). (See Section 4 for more detail)

Indicator:
Expected: Detailed workplan finalised by March 2013.
Actual: a detailed work plan and Gantt chart was finalised by March 2013 and used throughout the project.

E.1.6. Celtic Seas Partnership Project Team Training

**Complete**

Training has been undertaken as required for staff members to deliver their roles (see Annex E1.6).

Indicator:
Expected: Celtic Seas Partnership project team receive training (throughout the project).
Actual: the project team received relevant training throughout the project.

**Action E.2 - Effective project delivery by Associated Beneficiaries - ULIV, EMRA, SeaWeb & NERC-BODC**

**Beneficiary responsible:** WWF-UK

The Associated Beneficiaries attended all project meetings, including the quarterly in-person meetings. The Associated Beneficiaries maintained regular contact with the Project Manager and other team members by email, teleconferences and Skype meetings. Good working relations developed and various management and reporting systems were refined over time in response to team feedback.

The Project Manager visited all Associated Beneficiaries (accompanied by a different Celtic Seas Partnership staff member) at various points in the project to emphasise the need for prompt financial and technical reporting, and to check that all activities were on track, according to the Gantt chart. During these meetings, any issues were identified and subsequently addressed to ensure that the activities kept on track.

E.2.1. Report timing

**Complete**

Quarterly activity and financial reports have been submitted by the Associated Beneficiaries in line with the Partnership Agreement.

Indicator:
Expected: Associated Beneficiaries provide necessary information for EC progress, mid-term and final reports in a timely and accurate manner.
Actual: Associated Beneficiaries provided necessary information for EC progress, mid-term and final reports in a timely and accurate manner.
E.2.2. Steering group meetings

Complete
Please also refer to action E.1.2. At each meeting the Associated Beneficiaries were given an opportunity to report back to the group with their activities since the previous meeting, and their progress was mapped against the project Gantt chart (Annex E1.5).

Indicator:
Expected: Associated beneficiary representatives attend and contribute to quarterly steering group meetings.
Actual: Associated Beneficiary representatives attended and contributed to quarterly Steering Group meetings.

E.2.3. Financial reporting & technical reporting

Complete
Please also refer to Action E.2.1. The Finance Officer has been in regular contact with the Associated Beneficiaries on their financial reporting, and has escalated to the Project Manager where appropriate.

Indicator:
Expected: Associated Beneficiaries submit quarterly financial reports and 6 monthly technical reports to coordinating beneficiary according to the reporting schedule in the partnership agreement.
Actual: Associated Beneficiaries submitted quarterly financial reports and technical reports to the Coordinating Beneficiary according to the reporting schedule in the Partnership Agreement.

E.2.4. Internal communication

Complete
Associated Beneficiaries highlighted problems promptly, and generally responded to queries on their deliverables promptly.

Indicator:
Expected: Any problems are brought to the attention of the coordinating beneficiary without delay. Associated beneficiaries respond to queries on their deliverables within a reasonable timescale.
Actual: problems were brought to the attention of the Coordinating Beneficiary without delay. Associated Beneficiaries responded to queries on their deliverables within a reasonable timescale.

Action E.3 - Monitoring of project progress and reporting

Beneficiary responsible: WWF-UK

E.3.1. Monitoring Protocol

Complete
The Monitoring Protocol was finalised in December 2013, and can been seen in Annex E3.1.

Indicator:
Expected: By December 2013 a monitoring protocol is developed.
Actual: a monitoring protocol was finalised by December 2013.
E.3.2. Reporting

Complete

The following reports were submitted to the Commission:

- Inception Report – September 2013
- Progress Report – October 2014
- Progress Report – September 2016
- Final Report – June 2017

The Commission responded to the Mid-term report (Ref. Ares(2015)5496784 - 01/12/2015) and the September 2016 Progress Report (Ref. Ares(2016)7017435 - 16/12/2016), which we have responded to, providing explanation and verification on the issues raised (see the explanation tables in Annex E3.2 and supporting documents in Annex E3.3).

Indicator:

Expected: Reports are submitted on time and to required quality, according to timescales outlined above.
Actual: Reports were submitted on time and to required quality, according to timescales outlined above.

Action E.4 – Project Audit

Beneficiary responsible: WWF-UK

Complete

The final project audit took place at the Living Planet Centre between 2nd – 8th May 2017. Following a tender process, Mazars was awarded the contract (see Annex E4.1 for their submitted proposal). See section 6.4 for more detail and for the report.

Indicator:

Expected: By June 2017, an independent auditor has verified the final statement of expenditure and income to confirm all monies have been spent in accordance with EC guidelines
Actual: By June 2017, an independent auditor verified the final statement of expenditure and income to confirm all monies were spent in accordance with EC guidelines.

5.2 Dissemination actions

5.2.1 Objectives

Summary of dissemination plan in the Grant Agreement:

Communicating the findings to government bodies, policy makers, stakeholders from key sectors and the general public will be a critical component of the project to ensure continued synergies between the project and the evolving marine policy environment and promotion of the results of the project for use in other marine regions. Regional Celtic Seas Conferences will provide a vehicle for widespread dissemination of the project results to a wide range of stakeholders across the region. An Observer Board will be established for the project, comprising policy makers from each of the administrations surrounding the CSMR as well as regional bodies such as the OSPAR Commission. This will present an effective means to reach additional policy makers within these administrations and at a regional level to enable the project to share lessons and project results. A variety of other means will be used to
ensure outreach and dissemination of the project results is as widespread as possible. Actions D1, D2 and D3 of the project present the project’s dissemination framework in detail, including the Communication Strategy.

The Commission approved the application for a project extension (by signing ‘Amendment No2 to Grant Agreement for project’ letter dated 30th November 2016) for three months from the end of December 2016 to the end of March 2017. The reason for the extension request was to allow for further dissemination and communication of the project outputs following the final conference in autumn 2016.

Aims for the three month dissemination period:
1. Increase awareness of the Celtic Seas Partnership’s outputs and achievements
2. Encourage use of our products
3. Secure continued commitment to working together at the Celtic Seas scale
4. Ensure reputational value for WWF from its investment and leadership of the project
5. Share lessons from the project both internally and with the wider marine community

Dissemination activities beyond the duration of the project are detailed in the After-LIFE Communications Plan (Annex D4.1).

5.2.2 Dissemination: overview per activity

We developed a dissemination communication plan for January to March 2017 (Annex 5.2.1) and dissemination data was tracked for each project output (Annex 5.2.2). Annex 5.2.3 gives an overview of ULIV’s dissemination activities between January and March 2017. We produced a list of all the project products with an explanation for each, to help each Associated Beneficiary to explain to stakeholders what each other had produced (Annex 5.2.4).

Once finalised, each product produced from the project was disseminated via the Celtic Seas Partnership Twitter account, and are available to download/view on the project website. A final e-newsletter (see Annex 5.2.5) was sent out to our stakeholders with links to all of the products. This e-newsletter also pointed them towards the final version of Celtic Seas Partnership website, providing easy access to all of the final project outputs.

The Celtic Seas Partnership final multi-national conference provided us with a platform from which to communicate the project outputs to our stakeholders in October 2016. In the stakeholder feedback evaluation forms, we asked them to rank the usefulness of the project products (see Annex 5.2.6). The Best Practice Guidelines on conflict resolution came out as the “most useful”.

The Final Evaluation revealed that the highest rated outputs in terms of usefulness (scoring highly in terms of potential usefulness in the future) were: ‘Best Practice Guidelines on Transboundary Marine Governance’; ‘Recommendations on Transboundary Working Groups’; ‘Future Trends Report and Microsite’; ‘Discovering Data and Information in the Celtic Seas’ (Report) and ‘Best Practice Guidelines on Co-location of Marine Renewables’. The Celtic Seas Web Portal received the most ratings at the level of ‘somewhat useful’ (32%), with the online tutorial/animation on MSFD receiving the most ratings at the level of ‘very useful’ (22%). Respondents were subsequently asked whether they would recommend or share the various outputs. One third responded ‘yes’, with particular outputs to be shared
being ‘Best Practice Guidelines for Conflict Resolution’ and ‘Good Practice Guidelines for Local Planning Authorities’.

All Associated Beneficiaries have been disseminating/presenting the products at conferences and events throughout the UK, Europe and international, including (see below, section D1.1 and the Outreach Records (Annex D1.3) for more details):

- The Project Manager and Policy Officer presented the results of the Celtic Seas Partnership project and showed the ‘Guardians of the Sea’ film to senior marine government officials from over 20 European countries at the European Commission Marine Strategy Coordination Group meeting in Brussels in April 2017.
- WWF hosted a stand The Project Manager gave a speed pitch on the project at the Coastal Futures conference in London in January 2017 – an important marine policy conference in the UK. We handed out lots of Celtic Seas Partnership reports to delegates. Around 260 delegates were in attendance, from all of the key marine stakeholder sectors in the UK.
- The Policy Officer Attended the Seas At Risk NGO meeting in Brussels in February 2017, where opportunities for disseminating Celtic Seas Partnership outputs at a European level were identified.
- Following the end of the project, MaREI will be presenting the project as a case study at two major marine conferences in April and July 2017:
- The Scotland SEO attended the MAST’s and Scottish Governments Science & Renewables Partnership event on 20th February. There was a lot of interest in the Celtic Seas Partnership project and how the stakeholder engagement is structured generally, as well as there being a lot of interest in the Fishing4 data work. The group felt this was a model they would like to explore to develop a similar project around science for Marine Renewables.
- The Irish National Parks and Wildlife Service were given the Celtic Seas Partnership outputs; they were enthusiastic and said they would use them to inform their project on ecosystem services – Enroute.
- Collaborative workshop on stakeholder engagement for EU Maritime Day in Poole 15th – 19th May 2017 (2,000 delegates).
- A one-to-one meeting was organised with the local French government in Nantes on 8th February 2017 to present all project outputs. They were well by the local team and all products were forwarded to the people in charge at the local and national governmental level, as well as scientific bodies which could be interested in some outputs.
- SeaWeb participated to a national consultation event in Paris on 1st March 2017 with many stakeholders and national government. They talked to stakeholders about the Celtic Seas Partnership outputs whom showed interested.
- Graham Rees, the Deputy Director of Marine and Fisheries, offered his personal praise and thanks to the Celtic Seas Partnership, in front of the whole Wales Marine Strategic Advisory Group, for the contribution made to progressing action on MSFD.

We successfully developed and launched three Celtic Seas Partnership films at the end of the project:
• “Guardians of the Sea” (https://youtu.be/yJDmt1nMHac)
• “Building a sustainable future for the Celtic Seas” (https://youtu.be/66VY_U04RuY)
• “Using civic mediation to improve relationships in Scotland’s fishing industry” (https://youtu.be/6C6T_V550j4)

The films were promoted on the Celtic Seas Partnership Twitter account and have already collectively received 688 views on YouTube. The films can also be found on the project website. These films feature project stakeholders talking about their relationship with the sea and why they got involved with the project. All three films been subtitled in French (SeaWeb Europe reviewed the translation). The films provide an effective legacy for the Celtic Seas Partnership.

Within WWF, we held several internal events to embed our outputs and approaches in the organisation to ensure that they have a legacy. This has included a presentation about stakeholder engagement approaches to the whole of the Global Programmes department, which was so well received that the Communications and Fundraising department requested that we provide a similar presentation to them. We held a ‘Takeover day’ at the Living Planet Centre WWF Headquarters in Woking on 27th March 2017 (see section D1.1 for more details). We also published a piece for supporters in the summer edition of WWF’s membership magazine *Action*, in the ‘Together we did it’ section (Annex 5.2.7).

The Project Manager wrote an end of project blog called “Celebrating the end of the Celtic Seas Partnership”. The blog can be seen on WWF’s website here: http://blogs.wwf.org.uk/blog/habitats/oceans/celebrating-celtic-seas-partnership/?platform=hootsuite. The blog was promoted on Twitter by the Celtic Seas Partnership, WWF-UK and WWF Cymru. The blog has received 85 visits, with 3 minutes and 45 seconds as the average time spent on the page. It has received 32 referrals from Twitter, 22 referrals from Facebook, 12 organic shares, 8 direct shares and 3 shares from the blog itself.

WWF has been actively disseminating the Celtic Seas Partnership project approach to our network offices by setting set up a series of lesson sharing webinars with the WWF Kenya coastal programme who are working on marine spatial planning and fisheries co-management approaches. The webinars took place between March and May 2017, each one being led by a different team member on different topics:

1. Communications (8th March): Laura leading
2. Project strategy and stakeholder engagement approaches (22nd March): Jenny / Sam / Sarah leading
3. Monitoring and evaluation (5th April): Dawn leading
4. Use of data/information in management (21st April): Penny leading
5. Next steps (12th May): Jenny leading

The notes, background information and presentations can be found in Annex 5.2.8. Although Kenya is a completely different country, with a different culture and policy to the Celtic Seas, our Kenyan colleagues immediately saw the connections with what they were trying to do and particularly picked up on how the Celtic Seas Partnership had managed to bring together different sectors by acting as a neutral facilitator. From trying to tackle something as ambitious as stakeholder engagement with MSFD, the Celtic Seas Partnership really pushed the boundaries with regard to working across borders and across sectors. The lessons learnt from this experience are useful in ways even the Partnership didn’t anticipate.
The Project Manager co-authored a journal article ‘Assessing the ecological coherence of a marine protected area network in the Celtic Seas’ which was published in the journal *Ecosphere* (Annex 5.2.19). She published a journal article with former Project Manager, Lyndsey Dodds, in the *ICES Journal of Marine Science* about the Celtic Seas Partnership and LIFE+ PISCES Projects: "An approach for effective stakeholder engagement as an essential component of the ecosystem approach", which can be accessed here (and in Annex B1.11): https://academic.oup.com/icesjms/article/74/1/391/2967555/An-approach-for-effective-stakeholder-engagement?guestAccessKey=eed675f1-bfa1-4443-9b62-b7b354c54515. The paper has had 134 page views and 49 number of downloads since February 2017.

The Celtic Seas Partnership (MaREI) has also published two pieces in the *Inshore Ireland* magazine. One was published in their spring edition: ‘Call for more cooperation as the seas get busier’ (Annex 5.2.9), and the other in their summer edition: “Achievements of the Celtic Seas Partnership” (Annex 5.2.10). Inshore Ireland has a readership in excess of 2,500, covering stakeholders ranging from marine users and industries, coastal communities and NGOs from both the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. The project and LIFE logos are clearly visible in the articles.

After four years working around the Celtic Seas, we produced some web pages for our top tips for anyone wanting to involve people in regional marine policy: http://www.celticseaspartnership.eu/learning/ . We gathered personal experiences and insights from all Celtic Seas Partnership staff. This information was collated and organised into something accessible to a wider audience and built the web platform for dissemination. Topics include project management, designing a workshop and partnership working. The end result is aesthetically pleasing and full of useful content. The honesty and originality of the material makes this a valuable Celtic Seas Partnership output - one that will hopefully keep inspiring improved engagement into the future.

The link to the top tips web pages was promoted in the final e-newsletter to stakeholders and through the Celtic Seas Partnership Twitter page. We directly contacted WWF Kenya for their comments and feedback on the web pages, as well as all Associated Beneficiaries and previous SEO and engagement consultants. The web pages were have been disseminated, including:

- Highlighted through a presentation to the Wales Marine Strategic Advisory Group (all key marine stakeholders in Wales).
- SIMCelt (through Rhona Fairgrieve) are planning to build on the resource, which they describe as ‘very practical help with stakeholder engagement’ with some complimentary recommendations to Irish and French governments on delivering engagement for marine plans. It was also presented to the Wales Environment Link.
- Distributed to the MMMPA (Monitoring Mediterranean Marine Protected Areas)
- Distributed to WWF European Policy Office and NOAA Leaders in Marine Conservation Network (40 young professionals in influential Government, Business and NGO positions from across Europe who have responsibility for Marine Protected Area Management).
- Shared with the European Marine Site Officers network in the UK, including possible webinar.
- Showcased as part of our collaborative workshop on stakeholder engagement for EU Maritime Day in Poole 15th – 19th May 2017 (2,000 delegates).
- A meeting with *Well Being of Future Generations Commissioners* office to discuss how the engagement strategy developed through Celtic Seas Partnership could be used to

The Celtic Seas Partnership is now featured as a case study on two websites:
- Ecosystems knowledge network: [http://ecosystemsknowledge.net/celtic-seas-partnership](http://ecosystemsknowledge.net/celtic-seas-partnership)

**Dissemination: Action B.1. Strengthen links between national administrations and sectors to raise awareness and understanding of transboundary MSFD implementation**

**Outputs under this action:**
- MSFD animation and interview online tutorials (WWF)
  - These have been a very useful tool for increasing stakeholder awareness and knowledge on MSFD. They’ve had 4,817 collective views by the end of February 2017, which is way above what we expected. The results from the Final Evaluation showed that the online tutorial/animation on MSFD was rated ‘very useful’ by 22% of the stakeholders who took part in the survey. The online tutorials can be found on the Celtic Seas Partnership website: [http://www.celticseaspartnership.eu/library/?filter=1&dltype=7](http://www.celticseaspartnership.eu/library/?filter=1&dltype=7)
- Fisheries mediation process carried out in Scotland (WWF) and France (SeaWeb):
  - Stakeholder film: “Using civic mediation to improve relationships in Scotland’s fishing industry” ([https://youtu.be/6C6T_V550j4](https://youtu.be/6C6T_V550j4)) (WWF). At the time of writing it had received 200 views on YouTube. It was disseminated on Twitter and is available to watch from the Celtic Seas Partnership website.
  - A poster detailing the fisheries mediation process in Scotland, which has been used to present at events (see Annex 5.2.11).
  - The Scotland SEO delivered a workshop for Planning Aid Scotland at Planning & Mediation Conference on the use of civic mediation as a tool to support quality policy development using the Celtic Seas Partnership fisheries mediation as a case study. Approximately 50 participants attended the conference including senior Scottish Government Planners.
  - The Scotland SEO delivered a very successful Conflict and Mediation Awareness workshop at WWF’s Living Planet Centre, where 21 individuals from teams across WWF UK, WWF Netherlands, IUCN, SeaWeb and Marine Conservation Society joined. Feedback on the workshop was very positive with many participants keen to build further understanding of how WWF can use mediation as a process to support collaborative partnership building across a range of WWF programmes including People & Wildlife Conflict, organisational development, the Amazon programme, marine work and land-use planning. The plan for the workshop and the attendees list can be seen in Annex B1.5.
  - The Scotland SEO has written a paper of the Fisheries Mediation Case study; we’re awaiting acceptance for publishing.
The Scotland SEO shared learned from the fisheries mediation process at the European Maritime Forum in Turku in May 2016 and at the Planning and Mediation Conference in Edinburgh.

The fisheries mediation process in France gave SeaWeb a ‘hook’ to access new stakeholders in France. A fisheries mediation report was produced in French (Annex 5.2.12) with Equalogy consultants, which SeaWeb have been disseminating to French stakeholders.

- Two rounds of Country Workshop reports (Annex B1.2)
  - The project and LIFE logos were clearly visible at all Country Workshops. These reports are all available to download from the Celtic Seas Partnership website. The project and LIFE logos can clearly be seen in all reports.

**Dissemination: Action B.2. Establish Celtic Seas Conference**

Outsuts under this action:

- 3 Multi-national Conference reports (Annexes B2.2, B2.3 and B2.4)

These reports are all available to download from the Celtic Seas Partnership website. The project and LIFE logos can clearly be seen in all reports. Images taken by the team at the final conference can be found in Annex D1.11. Positive feedback was given from the stakeholders on all three multi-national events – please refer to Annex B2.1 for the comparison of the events. The word ‘informative’ was one of the top two words to describe all three events. The final multi-national conference gave an opportunity to launch the final products of the project to our stakeholders. The project and LIFE logos were clearly visible at all multi-national conferences.

**Dissemination: Action B.3. Develop Celtic Seas management measures based on PISCES ecosystem approach guidelines**

Outsuts under this action:

- Task Groups (WWF)
  - A poster was developed to present the work carried out by the Task Groups, which was used at the final multi-national conference (Annex 5.2.13).

We were delighted to see the Celtic Seas Partnership Marine Litter Task Group’s Eco-Schools initiative included in the Irish government’s draft programme of measures to achieve Good Environmental Status in the Celtic Seas. The Celtic Seas Partnership is also cited within the draft measures as an example of where the Irish Government has engaged with stakeholders. These inclusions demonstrate a level of commitment to the aims of the Celtic Seas Partnership – a significant achievement and legacy for the project!

**Dissemination: Action B.4. Test effective approaches to transnational collaborative action in the Irish Sea to support MSFD implementation**

Outsuts under this action:


Downloads from Celtic Seas Partnership website: 28
Physical copies: 50

During the development of the project application, transboundary working groups had been identified by Irish Sea stakeholders as potentially an important way of bringing people
together to discuss issues related to sustainable marine management. EU Directives such as the MSFD had been suggested as one area where working group activity might be particularly valuable. The Celtic Seas Partnership project was important in enabling the piloting of such transboundary working groups in the Irish Sea.

The Working Group provided an opportunity for Irish Sea stakeholders to learn more about MSFD implementation and to provide specialist input to work being undertaken in Actions B.5, B.6, B.9 and B.10. It also provided an opportunity to learn about the practicalities of organising and participating in transboundary activities of this kind. Reflection on the experience highlighted the potential benefits that transboundary working groups might deliver as well as points to consider in the operation of such groups. These points are distilled in the Recommendations on Transboundary Working Groups leaflet for use by European stakeholders, which are available to download on the Celtic Seas Partnership website.

The recommendations have been formally endorsed by the ISMF Steering Group as a guide to future ISMF Working Group activities. Planning for the first post Celtic Seas Partnership ISMF Working Group is underway. The intention is to hold a Working Group workshop in June 2017 to discuss how the ISMF/Celtic Seas stakeholders might respond to the closure of the Celtic Seas Partnership project and facilitate ongoing partnership activity in the Celtic Seas. The event will include discussion of the findings from the Celtic Seas Partnership closing conference in Dublin. The ISMF is planning this workshop in association with the Atlantic Action Plan Support Team.

The recommendations for transboundary working group are available to download from the Celtic Seas Partnership website, and was promoted through the final project e-newsletter and on the Celtic Seas Partnership Twitter page. The recommendations for transboundary working group has been translated to French and has been disseminated to French stakeholders through the Celtic Seas Partnership website, SeaWeb Europe website and SeaWeb Europe Facebook page. Both versions of the recommendations contain the project and LIFE logos clearly visible.

**Dissemination: Action B.5. Identify best practice in designing and establishing transboundary marine governance structures for ecosystem-based marine management**

Outputs under this action:

- Best Practice Guidelines on transboundary marine governance (WWF) (Annex B5.4 for English and Annex B5.5 for French)

Downloads from website: 127
Physical copies disseminated: 380

The Best Practice Guidelines on transboundary marine governance was produced in consultation with stakeholders, who provided input and feedback into the content (see Action B.5 update for more details). The guidelines were finalised in June 2016 and were launched at the final multi-national conference in October 2016 where they received very positive feedback from stakeholders. The guidelines have been disseminated at various events across the UK, Europe and International, and were promoted through the final project e-newsletter and on the Celtic Seas Partnership Twitter page.

The guidelines were translated into French and have been presented at a national event on 2\textsuperscript{nd} of February 2017 in Paris (Cerema event on coastal protection). There was interest from
around 20 people at the event to receive the digital or printed version. Both versions of the guidelines contain the project and LIFE logos clearly visible.

Best Practice Guidelines on Transboundary Marine Governance was the highest rated output in terms of usefulness (scoring highly on potential usefulness in the future) from the Final Evaluation.

The final transboundary governance guidelines were showcased at the final multi-national conference in October 2014. The guidelines were also disseminated at:

- The ICES Annual Science conference in Riga, Latvia in September 2016;
- The Seas-at-risk MSFD/MPA workshop in Feb 2017;
- A meeting with the Marine Management Organisation in January 2017;
- Coastal Futures conference in London in January 2017;
- IOC-UNESCO global conference on Marine Spatial Planning in Paris in March 2017

Dissemination: Action B.6. Develop terrestrial planning good practice guidelines to support MSFD

Outputs under this action:

- National Guidelines related to MSFD (ULIV) (Annex B6.4)

Terrestrial Planning Guidelines:

Downloads from Celtic Seas Partnership website: 62
Physical copies disseminated: 360

Country factsheets:

Physical copies disseminated: 100

The guidelines are available to download through the Celtic Seas Partnership website. In addition they are included on the European MSP Platform website and associated practice database where they are identified as a practice that can support MSP which has its own role to play in supporting delivery of the MSFD: [http://msp-platform.eu/practices/good-practice-msfd-and-terrestrial-planning](http://msp-platform.eu/practices/good-practice-msfd-and-terrestrial-planning)

The guidelines all clearly show the project and LIFE logos. They have been disseminated and presented at various events, including the events attended by ULIV in Annex 5.2.3. They have also been promoted through the final project e-newsletter and on the Celtic Seas Partnership Twitter page.

Work undertaken as part of B6.2 (particularly the second round of Celtic Seas Partnership Country Workshops) and B6.3 demonstration projects has itself played a part in extending understanding about how careful control of landward developments can assist in meeting MSFD Good Environmental Status ambitions. These activities directly engaged with over 140 Celtic Seas stakeholders.

This action has also been significant in drawing stakeholders in the Isle of Man into the Celtic Seas partnership project and connecting initiatives being undertaken by the Isle of Man Government, in partnership with others to MSFD agendas. These include the designation of
the Isle of Man as a Biosphere Reserve and the introduction of a new Marine BioSecurity Strategy for the Island. 41 delegates attended the first workshop held in Douglas and 20 the second event held in Peel. These included 27 people from Isle of Man Government departments and agencies; 19 people from NGOs working on the island, 7 industry representatives and 5 people from academic and research institutions.

The guidelines were voted the second ‘most useful’ Celtic Seas Partnership product from the stakeholder evaluation form from the final multi-national conference (see Annex 5.2.6 for full results). It was also one of the project outputs that were highlighted in the Final Evaluation as being of particular interest to stakeholders.

The guidelines and the French fact sheet have been translated into French, and disseminated to French stakeholders, including being presented at a national event on 2nd of February 2017 in Paris (Cerema event on coastal protection). Both English and French versions of the guidelines contain the project and LIFE logos clearly visible.

**Dissemination: Action B.7. Demonstrate effective approaches to develop co-ordinated terrestrial and marine planning: Applying Integrated Coastal Zone Management in Dublin Bay to develop a Strategic Management Framework**

Outputs under this action:

- Dublin Bay Dashboard (EMRA) ([http://www.dublindashboard.ie/pages/dublin_bay](http://www.dublindashboard.ie/pages/dublin_bay))
- Strategic Management Framework (EMRA) (Annex B7.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dublin Bay Dashboard:</th>
<th>Strategic Management Framework:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web page visits: 195</td>
<td>Downloads from Celtic Seas Partnership website: 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 data providers supplying data sets</td>
<td>Downloads from EMRA website: 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 datasets on the dashboard</td>
<td>Physical copies disseminated: 125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SMF went through a considerable stakeholder consultation process. EMRA have networked and promoted the SMF at a wide variety of events, most notably the ‘Conference on the Socio–Economic Dimensions of Maritime Spatial Planning’ which had over 70 attendees. In addition EMRA presented the SMF to Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council Councillor and the Irish Sea Maritime Forum Bi-annual conference.


The SMF can be downloaded from the Celtic Seas Partnership website and EMRA’s website, and was promoted through the final project e-newsletter and on the Celtic Seas Partnership and EMRA social media platforms. The document clearly displays the project and LIFE logos. It was one of the project outputs that were highlighted in the Final Evaluation as being of particular interest to stakeholders.

EMRA promoted the Celtic Seas Partnership through a dedicated page on their website and through their Facebook and Twitter pages.
**Dissemination: Action B.8. Develop codes of best practice on marine co-location and conflict resolution to support ecosystem based management**

Outputs under this action:
- Best Practice Guidelines on co-location of marine renewables (WWF) (Annex B8.3 for English and Annex B8.4 for French)
- Best Practice Guidelines on conflict resolution (WWF) (Annex B8.5 for English and Annex B8.6 for French)

Best Practice Guidelines on co-location of marine renewables:
- Downloads from website: 110
- Physical copies disseminated: 401

Best Practice Guidelines on conflict resolution:
- Downloads from website: 121
- Physical copies disseminated: 372

The Best Practice Guidelines on co-location of marine renewables and conflict resolution were produced in consultation with stakeholders, who provided input and feedback into the content (see Action B.5 update for more details). The reports were finalised in June and were launched at the final multi-national conference in October 2016 where they received very positive feedback from stakeholders. They were also promoted through the final project e-newsletter and on the Celtic Seas Partnership Twitter page. The guidelines have been distributed at events in the UK, Europe and International and they always receive positive feedback and spark useful conversations.

Both guidelines were highlighted in the Final Evaluation as being of particular interest to stakeholders, with some saying that they would adopt the guidelines and/or share them with other colleagues. In the Final Evaluation survey, one stakeholder wrote: “The conflict resolution guidelines – these were addressed/addressed the issues very well. We encounter difficult audiences time and time again, and we haven’t had till now a ‘one-stop shop’ to go to regarding how to approach this”.

Both guidelines have been translated into French and have been disseminated to French stakeholders, including being presented at a national event on 2nd February 2017 in Paris (Cerema event on coastal protection). Both English and French versions of the guidelines contain the project and LIFE logos clearly visible.

**Dissemination: Action B.9. Ecosystem services assessment**

Outputs under this action:
- Report collating existing ecosystem services assessment work (ULIV) (Annex B9.1)
- Gaps in ecosystem assessment coverage (ULIV) (Annex B9.10)
- Ecosystem services poster (ULIV) (Annex 5.2.14)

- Downloads from Celtic Seas Partnership website: 63
Physical copies disseminated: 120

ESA related activities are core features of MSFD delivery and Action B9 of the Celtic Seas partnership project highlights that the MSFD has the potential to become a focus of significant learning about the development and application of ESA tools related to marine ecosystems as well as other aspects of management of the marine environment. The project reveals, however, that many people find ecosystem services related terminology and concepts difficult to understand. It recommends that consideration should be given to further development and promotion of entry level ecosystem services assessment materials (such as those provided in the resource pack) that: enable non specialists to gain a better understanding of marine ecosystems and ESA techniques; and facilitate their engagement in the delivery of the MSFD and wider ecosystem based management of the sea. Feedback received from delegates (via the evaluation form) at the final multi-nation conference in Dublin confirmed the interest in material of this type with the Nature’s Services and the Sea Resource Pack assessed as the joint third “most useful” output produced by the Celtic Seas Partnership project (see Annex 5.2.6 for full results).

The guidelines are available to download through the Celtic Sea Partnership website and were promoted through the final project e-newsletter and on the Celtic Seas Partnership Twitter page. The guidelines have been distributed at events in the UK, Europe and International.

Pilot activity undertaken as part of Action B.9, itself played a role in extending understanding of marine ecosystem services in the Celtic Seas and the importance of the Good Environmental Status ambitions of the MSFD. The pilot work directly engaged with over 350 Celtic Seas stakeholders. This included 30 Irish participants at the Dublin Bay workshop, 18 Irish Sea related stakeholders at the MSFD Working Group Workshop in Belfast and 306 residents of Wirral who completed the online survey of Wirral Coast Cultural Services.

The ESA report has been translated into French and has been disseminated to French stakeholders, including national government. Both English and French versions of the guidelines contain the project and LIFE logos clearly visible. A poster was created by ULIV to present this work at events (Annex 5.2.14).

Dissemination: Action B.10. Future trends in the Celtic Seas Marine Region

Outputs under this action:
- Five Future Trends reports (WWF) (the baseline (Annex B10.6), methodology (Annex B10.7), scenarios (Annex B10.8), analysis (Annex B10.9) and summary report (Annex B10.10).)
- Future Trends micro site (WWF) (http://futuretrends.celticseaspartnership.eu/ (English); http://futuretrends.celticseaspartnership.eu/index_french.html (French))

Unique visits to micro site: 236
Average time on page: 03:45 minutes

As explained under Action 10 above, the Future Trends reports were very long and technical, which meant they were not engaging for stakeholders. This is why the Future Trends microsite was created. It allowed the data and information to be viewed and explored in a much more engaging way. When we disseminated the Future Trends microsite at events and conferences we use iPods to let people have a play around with the statistics on the site.
The full reports are available to view from the site if the stakeholders wish to see the detail. The micro site can be accessed in both English and French, and was promoted through the final project e-newsletter and on the Celtic Seas Partnership Twitter page. The reports and micro site clearly display the project and LIFE logos.

The Future Trends micro site has been demonstrated at many events and conferences in the UK, Europe and International, and it has caused much positive discussions and conversations, including:

- The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) found the Celtic Seas Future Trends report really useful, in particular the approach that we used to develop scenarios. In fact, they thought the scenarios were so good that they decided to use our scenarios for their own Future Trends study to feed into the National Marine Plans!
- Wendy Dodds and Sean Evans from the Welsh Government Research Services who prepare briefings for Welsh Government Assembly members, said that the Celtic Seas Partnership products have been really useful to them. Wendy wrote a blog that includes the Celtic Seas Partnership Future Trends work, which went live the day before there was a big debate on marine planning and the Blue Economy at the Senedd: https://assemblyinbrief.wordpress.com/2017/03/21/making-the-most-of-marine/
- The Future Trends work was highlighted in Bob Earl’s CMS Marine & Coastal News email, which has a huge reach of marine stakeholders: http://www.cmscoms.com/?p=9624
- The launch of the Future Trends study received great media coverage, including a piece on BBC Wales news: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-37910855. The Project Manager was also interviewed for a news report for BBC Wales Today (http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-37910852), which received one of the highest viewing figures from the year so far – over 356,000 people tuned in, which was 35% of everyone watching TV in Wales at the time!
- Steve Hull, from ABPmer who is one of the contractors who worked on the Future Trends project, praised the progressive nature of the Celtic Seas Partnership scenarios and said he used the website when pitching for new work and helping persuade the Marine Management Organisation to be more ambitious in developing their scenarios for the new English plan areas.

In November 2016 the SEO for Wales and South West England wrote a blog on the Future Trends work, which sits under the WWF-UK website: http://blogs.wwf.org.uk/blog/business-government/future-hold-seas/. This blog was disseminated on the Celtic Seas Partnership and WWF-UK Twitter accounts. In November alone, the blog had 138 visits, 40 Facebook referrals, 20 referrals from Twitter and 7 shares from the blog site.

**Dissemination: Action B.11. Strategic guide to knowledge integration and harmonised data/information management for the Celtic Seas Marine Region**

Outputs under this action:

- Discovering Data and Information in the Celtic Seas (BODC) (Annex B11.2 for English and Annex B11.3 for French)
- Discovering Data and Information poster (Annex 5.2.15)

Downloads from Celtic Seas Partnership website: 123
Physical copies disseminated: 139
The proofed version of Discovering Data and Information in the Celtic Seas was complete in June 2016 and was sent to SeaWeb for translation into French. 139 physical copies of the English version of the have been disseminated, many of which were picked up at the Final multi-national conference in October 2016. Both the English and French versions of the report clearly display the project and LIFE logos.

The report is available to download on the Celtic Seas website and was promoted through the final project e-newsletter and on the Celtic Seas Partnership Twitter page. The results of the report have been put forward for potential use in a scientific paper. Life+ funding will be acknowledged with any further use of the material.

Local French government showed an interest regarding the Discovering data guidelines as they are planning to set up an online tool to access the marine data and are looking for guidelines to build the best tool.

**Dissemination: Action D.1. Development and implementation of a Communications Strategy**

Outputs under this action:

- Promotional materials (Annex D1.4), including folder template, summary 2-pager etc – all with the Celtic Seas Partnership and Life logos.
- We produced a leaflet to summarise the final results of the project (Annex 5.2.16). 691 leaflets were disseminated at events and conferences.
- The Celtic Seas Partnership website (http://www.celticseaspartnership.eu/) has been used to share all of the project products. The website was revamp at the end of the project. A French page of the new website has been prepared with links to all the documents translated into French.
- The digital brochure: We decided to develop the notice board into a digital product which can be viewed more widely both on personal devices and in public locations as a digital display. It is available on the project website and we have shared using Twitter. It has shown on digital screens at the National Assembly for Wales (the Senedd in Cardiff Bay), making marine conservation issues unavoidable to the 100 plus ministers’ assembly members and staff passing through each day. It has also been showed at WWF’s Living Planet Centre (which attracts more than 8,000 public visitors a year). You can view the [English version](http://www.celticseaspartnership.eu/) and the [French version](http://www.celticseaspartnership.eu/). SeaWeb sent out a link to the digital brochure with their organisational newsletter.
- E-newsletters have been sent out during the project can be found in Annex D1.2. A final end of project e-newsletter was sent out to thank the stakeholders for engaging in the project, and included links to all of the final project products.
- Press releases and media coverage throughout the project can be found in Annex D1.8.

Throughout the project the ULIV team mainly through the NWCF stakeholder engagement officer subcontract has made ongoing contributions to the development and implementation of the project communication strategy. A core contribution in this regard was the introduction of Celtic Seas Partnership project link on the main page of the North West Coastal Forum (NWCF) website. [http://www.nwcoastalforum.org.uk](http://www.nwcoastalforum.org.uk). This has been in place since August 2013. It should be noted this website receives between 15,000 and 16,000 visits per month. In addition Celtic Seas Partnership news items have appeared in four NWCF newsletters since summer 2013 (see Annex 5.2.17). These newsletters are emailed directly to over 700 subscribers (free subscription) who are a mix of professionals from a range of coastal and...
maritime sectors and interested individuals. They are mostly, but not exclusively, from the North West of England.

Similarly, the Celtic Seas Partnership has also appeared as a linked project on the Irish Sea Maritime Forum’s website since summer 2013: http://www.irishseamaritimeforum.org/priority-themes/. This website receives around 200 hits per month.

Dissemination: Action D.3. Develop Celtic Seas Web Portal

Outputs under this action:

- Celtic Seas Web Portal (BODC) (http://resources.celticseaspartnership.eu/)
- Web Portal poster (Annex 5.2.15)

Celtic Seas Web Portal visits: 417
Average time on site: 10 minutes (see Annex 5.2.17 for more details)

The Celtic Seas Web Portal has been disseminated at events across the UK and Europe, and people respond very positively towards it. We use iPods to let people have a play around with the Web Portal. The project and LIFE logos are clearly visible on the Web Portal. It was one of the project outputs that were highlighted in the Final Evaluation as being of particular interest to stakeholders.

Dissemination activity includes:

- SIMCelt held a project meeting in University of Liverpool. There is a data and information component of SIMCelt lead by the Service hydrographique et océanographique de la Marine (SHOM) in France and the French partners in particular wanted to discuss how their work could make use of/build on the work that we have done at BODC for the Celtic Seas Partnership. The linked data approach that was taken was explained as this is likely to be route for them to harvest and use the metadata we have collated for the Celtic Seas Web portal (see Annex 5.1.18 for presentation). They were pleased that we had already produced something that they could use/build on fairly easily
- The Celtic Seas Web Portal was included in a MEDIN (Marine Environmental Data and Information Partnership) Marine Data News article: http://us5.campaign-archive1.com/?u=95bba54a67968c29065adc3e0&id=4cf5298199&e=a3990e9437#celticseaspartnership. This has a readership of 500+.
- The Web Portal was discussed with the Marine Management Organisation and the link sent to their policy officers for use in identifying datasets that they were not familiar with.
- Contact was made with the Chair of the ICES Working Group on Ecosystem Assessment of Western European Shelf Seas and on request was sent a Web Portal presentation that was delivered at the next annual meeting of the group in April 2017.
- The Carhamb’ar meeting at Ifremer, Brest, was attended by Chris Wood from BODC on 14th – 16th March 2017 and a poster was presented on the information portal (see Annex 5.2.15). Carhamb’ar is a conference organised by IFREMER every 4 years to highlight the current state of benthic marine habitat mapping.
- Daniel Crook, who is the Principal Marine Ecosystem Advisor on MSFD for Natural Resources Wales, said that he was impressed with the Celtic Seas Web Portal and that it contained a lot of useful information.
• The Celtic Seas Web Portal was promoted on Bob Earl’s email list, which has a huge reach of marine stakeholders:  http://mailchi.mp/coastms.co.uk/information-portal-for-the-celtic-seas?e=5bc32095a7

The Web Portal website will continue to be maintained for the next five years on BODC servers. The content will be reviewed quarterly and URLs checked for broken links. BODC will maintain the information portal for the next five years. The linked data system, which drives the information portal, will be available beyond five years so that the information and data are freely available for future users.

5.3 Evaluation of Project Implementation

5.3.1 Methodology applied:

The methodology used during the project demonstrated that partnership working across sectors and borders is an effective approach to marine management. As discussed in more detail in Section 5.4 below, stakeholders saw the value of working together and took action to carry on this engagement after the project ends. We carried out a number of activities to support the delivery of GES in the Celtic Seas, including:

• Facilitating engagement between sectors and across borders
• Providing guidance and recommendations to stakeholders so that they have a better understanding of marine policy and management
• Facilitating stakeholders to engage with marine policy consultations and decision making.
• Providing a Celtic Seas scale platform for stakeholders to work in partnership

The Celtic Seas Partnership was primarily a stakeholder engagement project. The project partners facilitated the delivery of the project, but the stakeholders themselves played a key role in shaping the direction and developing the deliverables. By putting stakeholders at the heart of the project we encouraged ownership and ensured the usefulness of the project.

At the end of the final multi-national conference in October 2016 we asked the delegates to fill out an evaluation form. When asked how useful they have found engaging with the Celtic Seas Partnership 31% gave a score of 5 out of 5 (very useful), 52% gave a score of 4, 12% gave a score of 3 and 5% gave a score of 2. Positive comments to this question included the project being friendly, approachable, and responsive, providing an excellent forum for stakeholder engagement and being interesting for sharing experiences and awareness.

When we asked the open question of whether the project has provided anything that would not have been available or evident otherwise, the predominant response was bringing stakeholders together for cross-collaboration from other sectors and countries with diverse backgrounds. Other things included the project outputs (e.g. the Best Practice Guidelines, the Web Portal) and the information the project has provided. However, some people felt it was too early to tell yet.

We commissioned a review of the stakeholder engagement techniques used throughout the project (a summary of the lessons can be found in Annex 5.3.1). A range of approaches were used and SEOs identified what worked and didn’t. Key issues to emerge were:
- resourcing (having a budget to enable site visits and outreach, effective database, common understanding of engagement planning and delivery, experience of engagement),
- access (existing network of contacts or willingness to attend other related fora, incentives to participate for self-employed or lower resourced participants); and
- incentives to engage (ability of stakeholders to change or develop responses to marine policy or operations).

5.3.2 Compare the results achieved against the objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Objectives</th>
<th>Expected Result</th>
<th>Actual Results/evidence of evaluation score</th>
<th>Evaluation Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Objective/Goal:</strong> ‘Demonstrate successful approaches and Best Practice through multi-stakeholder collaboration, to guide practical implementation of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) and contribute to ‘Good Environmental Status’ of the Celtic Seas Marine Region (CSMR)’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indicator 1: No. stakeholders and sectors involved in project activities | - Project stakeholder database organises by sector / geographical area and records engagement over time of individuals. Over 1,544 stakeholders from 22 broad sectors recorded  
- Country and Multi-national Workshop Reports show good attendance and diversity in general  
- FE consultees highlight discontinuity of stakeholder cohort and key gaps in network (industry; direct sea users; grassroots organisations/stakeholders) | MET - Significant number of sign-ups to Statement of Support (41 signatories at time of writing)  
- Project created a wide stakeholder network that has been valued by many.  
- A certain amount of ‘flux’ is to be expected when building and managing networks, however had objectives been clearer or fewer in number stakeholder continuity may have been stronger. |
| Indicator 2: % stakeholders that consider involvement in project to have provided effective mechanism for integrated maritime policy implementation | - FE survey – 21/43 respondents (49%) state this project impact was reasonably significant. This impact scored on a par with most other potential project impacts. It was not rated as one of the most significant impacts, but still was considered of limited to reasonable significance overall.  
- Multi-national conferences  
- Task Groups | MET - The multi-national events were a unique forum for stakeholders to network with others from different sectors and countries. The word “networking” was the most frequent word used to describe the final conference.  
- The Task Group work was a great example of multi-sector, multi-country collaboration. They integrated policy implementation and came up with consensus as a group.  
- Opinion from FE consultees |

---

2 This score was reached bearing in mind the scores from the Final Evaluation (Annex C1.9, page 41) and the results from the WWF-UK review in June (Annex C1.11).
was mixed on this. Overall, the project has demonstrated a mechanism/s for integrated implementation, but due to mixed responses and time of completion of outputs and evaluation, it is as yet inconclusive as to whether mechanism/s are ‘effective’.

**Indicator 3:** No. stakeholders referring to guidelines/recommendations/good practices developed by project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MET</th>
<th>Chart in Annex C of the FE shows one third of stakeholders say would use/share/recommend project outputs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of FE interviewees also say they intend to use/share/recommend outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ‘top-tips’ website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The download figures of the outputs from the website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Webinar series with WWF Kenya colleagues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 4:** % stakeholders who intend to use guidelines/recommendations/good practices developed by project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCEEDED</th>
<th>See above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest and most rated projects outputs by project consultees (30%) were in category ‘not used yet, but intend to use in the future’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of FE interviewees state intent to use particular outputs in the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- High level of enthusiasm/interest in project outputs.
- The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) found the Celtic Seas Future Trends report really useful, in particular the approach that we used to develop scenarios. In fact, they thought the scenarios were so good that they decided to use our scenarios for their own Future Trends study to feed into the National Marine Plans.
- The Future Trends game at the final conference received high praise and people said they would replicate it in their events in the future.
- The Irish National Parks and
Wildlife Service were given the Celtic Seas Partnership outputs; they were enthusiastic and said they would use them to inform their project on ecosystem services – Enroute.
- Richard Cronin from the Irish Government and vice chair of OSPAR Commission was quoted as saying “I began very sceptical about stakeholder engagement and its benefit and through the CSP I saw its worth”

| Indicator 5: No. stakeholders per country/sector contributing to MSFD measures for GES | - Project Task Group records/minutes  
- Project country workshop reports | MET  
- From FE review and consultation, project has been successful in prioritising measures and task groups and facilitating action planning. Participation has therefore been good. |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Indicator 6: Evidence of multi-stakeholder collaboration (and stakeholders/sector s involved) in development of outputs | - Workshop reports  
- Observer Board (OB) and Expert Advisory Group (EAG) minutes  
- Evaluator observance at OB and EAG meetings  
- FE interviewees shared inputs sought and provided to outputs | MET  
- The project has made considerable effort to create an inclusive and participatory process in the development of outputs. Granted, gaps can be identified, but with such a large and diverse network this is expected.  
- Project structures such as the OB and EAG have encouraged regular inputs to project product development (see also MTR)  
- The multi-national events were a unique forum for stakeholders to network with others from different sectors and countries. The word “networking” was the most frequent word used to describe the final conference.  
- The Task Group work was a great example of multi-sector, multi-country collaboration. They integrated policy implementation and came up with consensus as a group. |
| Indicator 7: Stakeholders identify GES Descriptors to | - Task Group minutes  
- Workshop Reports  
- Task Group Proposals | MET  
- Existence of Task Groups and proposals demonstrate project has successfully prioritised |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Indicator 8:</strong> Stakeholders and national administrations recognise the role of stakeholder engagement and EBM approaches developed under the project in supporting MSFD implementation</th>
<th><strong>MET</strong></th>
<th><strong>EXCEEDED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>collaborate on descriptors/measures to collaborate on</td>
<td>- Task Group proposals/plans yet to be fully disseminated so success of these collaborations still to be assessed.</td>
<td>- Stakeholders have valued both engagement and the EBM approach (and products aware of so far).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Marine Litter Task Group cited in Republic of Ireland Government Programme of Measures</td>
<td>- Significant sign-up to Statement of Support (41 signatories at time of writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Richard Cronin from the Irish Government and vice chair of OSPAR Commission was quoted as saying “I began very sceptical about stakeholder engagement and its benefit and through the CSP I saw its worth”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Again, the MMO using the Future Trends scenarios in their marine plans – as stated above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The Irish National Parks and Wildlife Service were given the Celtic Seas Partnership outputs; they were enthusiastic and said they would use them to inform their project on ecosystem services – Enroute.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Indicator 9:</strong> No. stakeholders from different sectors/countries working together to develop practical initiatives to contribute to GES</th>
<th><strong>MET</strong></th>
<th><strong>MET</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- See Indicator 7</td>
<td>- As per Indicator 7, existence of Task Group proposals is evidence of meeting indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT – OVERALL GOAL**

**MET**
| Objective 1: Development of transboundary multi-stakeholder engagement mechanisms for the Celtic Seas Marine Region | By 2016, effective engagement mechanisms have been established with key sectoral interests; and the most appropriate scales/mechanisms for engagement (e.g. Celtic Seas Forum, Irish Sea Platform) recognised to support delivery of ecosystem-based and integrated management. | - Workshop Reports – excellent feedback from MTR and FE on workshop co-ordination 
  - FE consultees rate increased transboundary and cross-sectoral engagement highly as project impact 
  - Significant number of FE consultees express value of network established |
| Objective 2: Demonstration of ecosystem-based management (EBM) approaches | By 2016, successful ecosystem-based management techniques and methods to support integrated marine management have been developed and demonstrated through multi-stakeholder collaboration to guide practical implementation of European maritime policy including the MSFD. | - High interest for EBM outputs shown by FE consultees. 
  - Outputs (and related documents/meeting minutes) show evidence of multi-stakeholder approach to production 
  - FE interviewees involved in outputs valued involvement. |
| Expected Result 1: CELTIC SEAS ENGAGEMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING ('Negotiation and Conflict Resolution') | By 2016, at least 30 stakeholders across the Celtic Seas Marine Region are familiar with the requirements of the Marine | - FE assessed increased awareness of MSFD (34/43 survey respondents rated as reasonably or highly significant) 
  - Task groups minutes and |
| MET | - Strong feedback from MTR and FE on innovative and effective approaches to facilitation/engagement 
  - Gaps in network identified but unrealistic to have no gaps, and those identified acknowledged to be challenging to all 
  - Unclear currently how network may be taken forward – some have suggested a smaller (e.g. Irish Seas) scale may be more realistic/manageable. Significant sign-up to Statement of Support (41 signatories at time of writing) |
| MET | - High interest in project outputs, which the stakeholder themselves helped to shape and develop. 
  - The project itself has demonstrated successful multi-stakeholder collaboration, e.g. the Biodiversity Task Group has been taken forward, and the Future Trends work. |
| MET | - Increased awareness of MSFD is a significant project achievement 
  - The online tutorials have had 4,817 collective views. 
  - Initial work of task groups and initial |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Result 2: TRANSBOUNDARY PARTNERSHIP (‘Governance and policies’)</th>
<th>By 2016, transboundary governance approaches led by stakeholders demonstrate effective use of the ecosystem approach for transboundary marine management</th>
<th>MET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 2016, transboundary governance approaches led by stakeholders demonstrate effective use of the ecosystem approach for transboundary marine management</td>
<td>- Multi-national conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Task groups minutes and proposals demonstrate evidence of approaches and transboundary collaboration</td>
<td>- Approaches have been demonstrated, e.g. multi-national conferences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Irish Seas outputs and transboundary guidelines have been produced as ‘demo’ products, but late launch means full impact cannot be assessed</td>
<td>- Reasonable enthusiasm for the guidelines, so this result is expected to be reasonably met in time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Best Practice Guidelines for Transboundary Governance’ rated highly in FE survey in terms of potential usefulness in the future (16/43 respondents – 37%) Multi-national conference Reports</td>
<td>- The Irish Sea Maritime Forum have agreed to continue to host workshops at a Celtic Sea scale after the Celtic Seas Partnership project has ended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Task Groups demonstrate the EBM approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Result 3: TRANSBOUNDARY SECTORAL GOOD PRACTICE (‘Stakeholders / Users’)</th>
<th>By 2016, best practice approaches between sectors have been developed and applied to produce sustainable management of Celtic Seas Marine Region resources</th>
<th>EXCEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 2016, best practice approaches between sectors have been developed and applied to produce sustainable management of Celtic Seas Marine Region resources</td>
<td>- Best Practice Guidelines and related documents/minutes show cross-sectoral consultation/production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Late launch of outputs however means many consultees unable to verify if inputs were sufficiently taken on board. Also, means products have not had time for uptake/application/testing.</td>
<td>- Best Practice Guidelines cited as particular product that FE consultees intended to recommend/share in future. Hence, reasonable enthusiasm/interest in outputs, but insufficient time due to late launch to test impact/effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fishing4data work</td>
<td>- A pilot project was set up with Scottish fisheries, Scottish government and environmental organisations to see whether mediation could help build trust between groups with challenging relationships and break down the barriers that stop them working together. This was considered as a positive step in building these relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fisheries mediation</td>
<td>- The Irish Sea Maritime Forum have agreed to continue to host workshops at a Celtic Sea scale after the Celtic Seas Partnership project has ended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Observer Board</td>
<td>- The Task Groups demonstrate the EBM approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dublin Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Strategic Overview (B.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and a similar project also took place in France led by Seaweb Europe.
- The fishing4data work is a great example of this.
- The Observer Board – cross-sector and cross-country, demonstrating government and NGO working together.
- Improved relationships in Dublin Bay as a result of the project – collaboration on the SMF document is a good example of this.
- The Strategic Overview (B.11) demonstrates this well – lots of sectors held different data.

**Expected Result 4:**
**TRANSBOUNDARY INFORMATION RESOURCES**
(‘Scientific and local knowledge bases’)

By 2016, techniques and methods (resources) have been developed and data/information is accessible and available in the Celtic Seas to help achieve Good Environmental Status

- Final drafts of related products (e.g. web portal, strategic guide) are evidence of development.
- Future Trends work and Strategic Guide scored amongst highest in FE survey in terms of ‘potential usefulness in the future’ (highest scored category for outputs), so enthusiasm for these products and potential for uptake is reasonably high
  - The Web Portal (D.3)
  - Online tutorials

**MET**
- Related outputs (resources) have been produced and initial feedback regarding potential usefulness is good.
- Significant interest in project outputs
- The Strategic Overview (B.11) demonstrates this well – lots of sectors held different data
- The project has put a lot of effort into disseminating and communicating the products – in the Celtic Seas, Europe and International.
- Project’s own review of this Expected Result recognises it will be challenging or impossible to measure linkages to GES achievement, especially given GES attainment is tied to measurement in 2020.

**5.3.3 Indicate which project results have been immediately visible and which results will only become apparent after a certain time period.**

With a policy focussed project, it can be difficult to see immediate impacts from actions/activities – the majority of the results will become apparent after a certain time period. The Final Evaluation states that some stakeholders felt it was too early to assess whether the project has made significant contributions to developing (and implementing) a strong marine governance and policy framework for the region’, but potentially significant contributions may have been made. However, as highlighted in Section 5.4 understanding of marine policy has increased and provides a significant step towards influencing development/implementation in the future.
As detailed in Section 5.4, the biggest achievements of the project are that it created a unique opportunity for transboundary, cross-sector collaboration amongst stakeholders, as well as increasing knowledge and awareness of marine policy and MSFD across the Celtic Seas. Better understanding of marine policy leads to better management of the environment in the long term.

The project developed various best practice guidelines and recommendations, which have received great feedback and interest from the stakeholders (see Section 5.2 for more details). If these project outputs are taken on board and implemented, their future impact in terms of assisting with MSFD implementation and broader marine policy and management could be significant.

A specific example of where the project will have impact in the future is that the MMO found the Celtic Seas Future Trends report really useful, in particular the approach that we used to develop scenarios. They are going to use the scenarios we developed for their own Future Trends study to feed into the National Marine Plans.

As detailed in Section 5.4 below, the Task Groups (Action B.3) are another tangible example of where the Celtic Seas Partnership project will have an influence on policy in the future. The project supported the stakeholders to set up specific initiatives and facilitated the process, but they were led by the stakeholders to enable the Task Groups to carry on after the project has finished. If the proposals from the Task Groups are taken forward then this will contribute towards GES in the Celtic Seas under the MSFD.

In the final survey sent out to stakeholders in June 2017, when asked what changes they had noted as a result of the Celtic Seas Partnership, 3 of the respondents (out of 4) said that they had noted new information emerging and 3 of the respondents said that they had noted new mechanisms for engagement of marine stakeholders emerging. Three respondents gave a rating of ‘somewhat’ for noting changes in the way in which marine policy/management is approached and/or discussed. David Johnson (Seascape Consultants and member of the Expert Advisory Board) stated: “My concern as voiced in the final conference is that this work should extend beyond the life of the project - trust building takes time and continuity. The project has done an excellent job to start many conversations and bring together disparate stakeholders”.

Bruno Thenail (member of the Expert Advisory Board said that the biggest achievement/success of the project is: “Confirmation of the relevance of holistic and transboundary approaches involving marine stakeholders”.

David Johnson said that the project’s biggest achievement was the “Promotion of partnership dialogue, focus on stakeholder priorities for GES, sub-regional coordination of value to future MSP”.

In the Final Evaluation survey, when asked what the next steps should be after project end to secure a legacy, the majority (59% of 22 question respondents) of stakeholders thought the Celtic Seas stakeholder network should be sustained in some form; with several pointing out that a strategy, lead organisation and resources would be required. 23% thought the project’s outputs and their dissemination could be used and built upon towards further progress. 9% provided some technical direction for any next steps (e.g. applying an integrated catchment
management approach to MSFD). A further 9% indicated they were unsure if any next steps or iterations of the project would be useful, or that they had insufficient information/awareness to respond.

In the final survey sent out to stakeholders in June 2017, when asked what they felt is the biggest legacy for the Celtic Seas Partnership we received the following quotes:

“Sharing approaches and methodologies”, Bruno Thenail

“Stakeholder engagement at the Celtic Seas regional scale”, Anonymous

“A good practice example of what can be achieved at the Celtic Seas scale and hopefully lasting partnerships between users”, David Johnson, Seascape Consultants

“Relationships” John McCartney

5.3.4 If relevant, clearly indicate how a project amendment led to the results achieved and what would have been different if the amendment had not been agreed upon.

The amendment to extend the project by three months from the end of December 2016 to the end of March 2017 enabled more intensive and impactful dissemination of the project’s products and outputs (see Section 5.2 for details of dissemination). Without this amendment the dissemination would not have been so effective since many of the deliverables were only completed at the end of 2016.

5.3.5 Indicate effectiveness of the dissemination and comment on any major drawbacks.

As reported in detail in Section 5, the dissemination of the project’s products and outputs has been extensive. The approval of the three month project extension enabled us to focus the last three months of the project on dissemination. As a result of late delivery of some of the deliverables, it was not possible to achieve as extensive dissemination of these compared to those deliverables which were completed earlier in the project.

The table below gives a summary of the dissemination figures for each project product/output (see Annex 5.2.2 for more details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>No. reached by end of the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digital products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSFD animation + interviews</td>
<td>4,817 collective views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital brochure of Celtic Seas Partnership outputs and achievements</td>
<td>We displayed in the Senedd in Cardiff Bay throughout October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Displayed at the Living Planet Centre, which has over 8,000 visitors a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Celtic Seas Partnership films</td>
<td>688 collective views on YouTube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future trends interactive website</td>
<td>236 unique visits average time on page - 03.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtic Seas statement of support</td>
<td>39 people/organisations 7 sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exporting Celtic Seas Partnership</td>
<td>Shared with WWF Kenya, at events and with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>digital package</td>
<td>other projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web portal</td>
<td>417 visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 minutes average time on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin Bay dashboard</td>
<td>195 Hits on Dublin Bay Dashboard, 20 data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>providers supplying data sets, 360 datasets on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the dashboard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Printed products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final project summary poster/leaflet</th>
<th>691 leaflets disseminated.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice Guidelines x 3</td>
<td>Transboundary Governance: Digital downloads: 127 / 380 physical copies distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-location: Digital downloads 110 / 401 physical copies distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict Resolution: Digital downloads: 121 / 372 physical copies distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Guidelines</td>
<td>62 digital downloads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical: 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country factsheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem Services</td>
<td>63 digital downloads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical: 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for working groups</td>
<td>28 digital downloads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical: 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data + information discovery guide</td>
<td>139 distributed 123 downloads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management Framework for Dublin Bay</td>
<td>39 downloads, 125 hard copies distributed, 136 digital copies sent by email, webpage views 40 (51 downloads from Celtic Seas Partnership website)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high download figures and pick-up of physical copies at events indicated that the stakeholders are interested in the outputs from the Celtic Seas Partnership.
5.4 Analysis of long-term benefits

5.4.1 Environmental benefits

a. Direct / quantitative environmental benefits:

Due to the policy nature of the Celtic Seas Partnership project, there is a less tangible and direct impact on environmental conservation targets. Nevertheless, the project has made some significant contributions towards environmental benefits. One of project’s most significant achievement (as documented in the Final Evaluation) is increased co-operation and engagement amongst Celtic Seas stakeholders. The project has provided a unique platform for marine stakeholders across the UK, Ireland and France and across different sectors. The other most significant achievement/impact of the project is the increased understanding of marine policy and MSFD amongst the stakeholders in the Celtic Seas.

One stakeholder commented in the Final Evaluation: “From a local authority perspective, the project has been invaluable in creating an awareness of emerging marine spatial planning policy and legislative context, particularly with regard to the EU Directive of MSP [Marine Spatial Planning] which has just been transposed into Irish Legislation”.

An increased understanding of policy provides a significant step towards influencing development/implementation in the future. 48% of the stakeholders who took part in the Final Evaluation survey said that there have been ‘changes in the way in which marine policy/management is approached and/or discussed’ since the Celtic Seas Partnership started; and 45% said that there have been “increased levels of engagement in marine policy/management” due to the project.

When asked to provide an example of a change that the project has brought about, one stakeholder stated that the project ‘really helped us to understand the competing uses within the marine environment and engage not only with policy makers but other legitimate sea users to understand how we can make more sustainable engineering decisions’.

Increased awareness, knowledge and capacity that will enable Celtic Seas stakeholders to engage more fully and meaningfully with MSFD implementation is an essential building block towards the ultimate end-point of MSFD implementation: Good Environmental Status of European seas. Likewise, in order to implement MSFD this requires active and strategic cross-sectoral and transboundary engagement, and the project has significantly helped towards establishing this interaction at the Celtic Seas regional level.

Tangible examples of where the Celtic Seas Partnership project has influenced policy:

- The Task Groups (Action B.3) are a great example of where stakeholders wanted to make more of a difference and input/engage into specific issues in the MSFD policy process. The work of the Task Groups is evidence of this stakeholder commitment to ongoing co-operation to implement integrated marine policy/management. The project supported the stakeholders to set up specific initiatives, and facilitated the process, but they were led by the stakeholders.
  - In particular, the Marine Litter Task Group’s Eco-Schools initiative was included in the Irish government’s draft programme of measures to achieve Good Environmental Status in the Celtic Seas. The Celtic Seas Partnership is also cited within the draft measures as an example of where the Irish Government has
engaged with stakeholders. These inclusions demonstrate a level of commitment to the aims of the Celtic Seas Partnership.

- The Fishing4data Task Group is also one step further in influencing policy decisions on the way fisheries data is collected, by writing a national strategy for sea users to collect data when out at sea. The data collected will be used by authorities when making policy decisions (e.g. on fishing quotas, levels of stock etc.). This will enable the policy decisions around quotas or sizes of fish catch to be more accurate and the fishermen are more bought into the decisions.

- The Future Trends (Action B.10) work has been picked up by the Marine Management Organisation, who have not only decided to use adopt a scenario approach in all the remaining marine plan areas in England, but have specifically decided to use the ideal scenarios developed through our process.

- The Irish National Parks and Wildlife Service were given the Celtic Seas Partnership outputs; they were enthusiastic and said they would use them to inform their project on ecosystem services – Enroute.

- Many of the guidelines and recommendations produced by the project, if taken on board and implemented will all have an impact on policy and marine practice in the future.

Given the enthusiasm for and interest in the various project outputs (e.g. Best Practice Guidelines; recommendations; Web Portal), there is every reason to assume that their future impact in terms of assisting with MSFD implementation and broader marine policy and management will be significant.

b. Relevance for environmentally significant issues or policy areas

The Observer Board was particularly instrumental in helping to frame the project and get support for work on MFSD development. Having an Observer Board populated with government policy ensured project relevance and connection to emerging policy needs.

The project has been relevant and useful to government, as highlighted in the Final Evaluation where an Irish stakeholder responded: “The project is coming at a good time. Ireland needs to develop its MSP – the CSP outputs will inform this – I don’t think anything will be lost or go to waste... The project has demonstrated on a local scale what works and what doesn’t. Good lessons to inform future planning and engagement”.

The Future Trends work, the Best Practice Guidelines on conflict resolution and the Best Practice Guidelines on co-existence are relevant for industries with potentially significant environmental impacts.

The project is relevant to the EU MSFD legislative framework. The project was invited to present its findings and results to member state representatives at a Marine Strategy Coordination Group (MSCG) meeting in April 2017, in order to share its learnings and the best practice developed during the course of the project.

Gary Douch, Head of MSFD and Marine Licencing in the Welsh Government made a point of saying that he is making sure that all his staff have access to and use the Celtic Seas Partnership Products to support their current work reviewing the MSFD initial assessment.
Similarly, Richard Cronin from the Irish Government and vice chair of OSPAR Commission was quoted as saying “I began very sceptical about stakeholder engagement and its benefit and through the CSP I saw its worth”.

Bruno Thenail (member of the Expert Advisory Group) says: “The project has addressed all relevant issues with valuable outputs. Need for stronger involvement of government agencies remains the most difficult issue.”

5.4.2 Long-term benefits and sustainability

a. Long-term / qualitative environmental benefits:

As mentioned above, the biggest achievements of the project are that it created a unique opportunity for transboundary, cross-sector collaboration amongst stakeholders, as well as increasing knowledge and awareness of marine policy and MSFD across the Celtic Seas. These in themselves are a great legacy for the project. Better understanding of marine policy leads to better management of the environment in the long term – which has been further facilitated by the project bringing the stakeholders together. This is backed up from the Final Evaluation, where 59% of survey respondents indicated that increased communications, contacts, networks and the overall ‘framework’ developed by the project would be the legacy. 18% indicated the legacy would be the project’s outputs (Dublin Bay framework, recommendations, guidelines and Task Groups’ work/proposals were specifically cited). 9% thought increased awareness levels (of policies and core marine issues) would be significant. 14% were unsure what legacy the project would leave, if any.

Specific examples of long-term environmental benefits:

- As mentioned above in Section 5.2, the Task Groups are a great example of where the project has created a legacy. The project has facilitated the process and built the capacity of the stakeholders to enable the Task Groups to carry on after the project has finished – led by the stakeholders. If the proposals from the Task Groups are taken forward then this will lead to environmental benefits in the marine environment – particularly contributing toward GES in the Celtic Seas under the MSFD.

- The innovative work carried out on Future Trends (Action B.10) will leave long-term benefits to the marine environment, particularly the micro site. The information and data displayed on the micro site (back up by a huge amount of detail in the written reports) will provide advice and guidance to aid policy decisions in the future. In fact, as already mentioned, the three scenarios created through the Future Trends work is already being used by the MMO to help them develop the remaining marine plan areas in England. Better marine plans will lead to a healthier marine environment.

- The Guidelines on Terrestrial Planning and MSFD help to guide policy for better management of the coastal area where the marine plans and the terrestrial plans meet. The guidelines provide user friendly materials for use by non-marine specialists that enable the timely identification of marine environment issues in terrestrial planning situations and promote the delivery of landward development that protects and where possible enhances the marine environment. If taken on board, this will have positive, and lasting, environmental benefits.

- The Celtic Seas Web Portal has been developed using Linked Data and SPARQL technology. It’s a comprehensive resource that stakeholders and policy makers can refer to in order to aid decisions that will affect the marine environment. The more information and data available, the better informed the decisions will be – leading to a healthier
marine environment in the long term. The Web Portal will be available on the BODC servers for the next five years.

- Many of the guidelines and recommendations produced by the project, if taken on board and implemented will all have an impact on policy and marine practice in the future – leading to a healthier marine environment. These guidelines and recommendations are to help stakeholders work together to make progress towards the EU target of GES under the MSFD. All of the products produced by the project can be downloaded from the Celtic Seas Partnership website.

b. Long-term / qualitative economic benefits:

The socio-economic impact study in Annex C.1.14 (Action C.1.4) focused on assessing the potential impacts of the guidelines we produced on co-existence of marine renewables and how they may inform future plans for development and investment. The results of the model suggest an overall potential benefit from implementation of the co-existence guidelines of nearly £8 million over a five year assessment period (rising to over £36 million with upper bound assumptions, or £18 million as an alternative upper estimate with sensitivity testing). The results are presented with a lower estimate, referring to the benefits under more conservative, lower-bound assumptions, and an upper estimate, which makes use of more optimistic, upper-bound assumptions. The results of the study were created by a detailed model, which is strongly based on assumptions drawn from interviews with experts and professional judgement of the consultant.

Of the benefits identified in the initial benefit assessment of the co-existence guidelines, six were modelled as these were considered to be the most material and realistic to measure:
- Value from economic contribution of marine renewables
- Social value of job creation in maritime economy
- Value from reduced CO\textsubscript{2} emissions through a shift towards renewables
- Value from reducing the costs of offshore wind
- Value from increased wellbeing
- Value from improved environment and ecosystem services

The results from the model indicate that there is considerable potential economic and environmental benefit from implementing the recommendations set out in the co-existence guidelines.

For the project overall, provided lead organisation/s and resources can be identified, the stakeholder enthusiasm for continued engagement after the project ends seems ready to be harnessed towards more integrated marine policy and management, which will have the longer terms result of economic sustainability (e.g. investment in marine renewables, protection of marine livelihood assets) and environmental sustainability (e.g. more integrated ecosystem-based approaches to management/policy being applied; better monitoring of environmental impacts of industries and status of environmental/marine assets).

c. Long-term / qualitative social benefits:

A separate study of the project’s social and wellbeing impacts on project stakeholders (Action C.1.4) was undertaken by Lisa M Howes Consulting Ltd in February 2017 (Annex C.1.13). The study consulted a sample of project stakeholders regarding change in three broad areas
(or categories) of social impact and wellbeing following engagement in the project: relationships; confidence and understanding.

Significant improvements in social impact and wellbeing were identified for each category of impact, and for each individual question/aspect examined. The study therefore concluded that overall the project seems to have made an overall positive contribution to social/wellbeing aspects for many stakeholders across the Celtic Seas.

Highly ranked social impacts included:
- Improved inter-sectoral relationships; improved understanding and improved implementation of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive;
- Improved access to information/data/tools guidance to aid implementation of marine policy/management;
- Improved confidence to engage/lead steps towards change in marine policy/management.

In the final survey sent out to stakeholders in June 2017, when asked whether they agree with some statements, 100% of respondents said that they agree that the Celtic Seas Partnership project has created a highly engaged network of stakeholders. 50% of respondents ‘strongly agree’ and 50% ‘agree’ that the stakeholder engagement mechanisms developed under the Celtic Seas Partnership project have supported Marine Strategy Framework Directive implementation. John McCartney (member of the Expert Advisory Group) said that “Interaction between stakeholders and officials” was the key achievement/success of the Celtic Seas Partnership. Another stakeholder said that the project’s biggest achievement was “Bringing stakeholders together to work collaboratively on a regional seas basis”.

d. Continuation of the project actions by the beneficiary or by other stakeholders:

Many of our stakeholders told us that they would like to see face-to-face engagement at the Celtic Seas scale continue after the project has finished. In today’s economic climate getting the resources to make this happen will be a challenge, however there are definitely risks and costs to not engaging at this scale. To support the case for resources we created a Statement of Support to demonstrate the level of support that exists for engagement at this scale to continue: [http://www.celticseaspartnership.eu/about-us/statement-of-support/](http://www.celticseaspartnership.eu/about-us/statement-of-support/). At the time of writing, 41 organisations/individuals had signed up to the following statement: “The Celtic Seas Partnership has given me the opportunity to build important relationships across borders and with different sectors, and to collaborate on worthwhile projects. The workshops have provided a neutral place to have open conversations and problem solve for issues facing the Celtic Seas. I would like to see the workshops continue and commit to being an engaged stakeholder”.

The majority of our stakeholders have a positive attitude and found huge value in meeting people from different sectors/countries. It’s great to see the willingness of our stakeholders – people are keen and interested to engage. They want to contribute and achieve something. In July 2017, the University of Liverpool will be holding an event as part of the Irish Sea Maritime Forum ‘Future Celtic Seas Collaboration’. This workshop aims to build on the Celtic Seas Partnership and bring stakeholders together to develop mechanisms for future collaboration at the Celtic Seas scale.
We’ve thought a lot about how to create a lasting legacy for the project, and have developed a sustainable exit strategy (Annex 5.4.1). In this exit strategy we’ve highlighted areas of work that WWF-UK can carry forwards into the future.

There is a strong and obvious link between Celtic Seas Partnership and the SimCelt project, which focuses on MSP in the Irish Sea. We’ve had multiple meetings and conversations with SIMCelt to identify synergies and ensure that SIMCelt builds and adds to the work of the Celtic Seas Partnership rather than replicating it.

The Celtic Seas Partnership top tips website mentioned in Section 5.2.2 is a great legacy for the project, and will continue to offer advice and tips to other projects starting out in this field of work.

All of the Associated Beneficiaries have committed to continue to disseminate the project products at events and conferences after the project. They are great advocates for the Celtic Seas Partnership and will continue to promote the great work that the project has achieved.

David Johnson (Seascape Consultants) says that the lasting legacy from the Celtic Seas Partnership is “A good practice example of what can be achieved at the Celtic Seas scale and hopefully lasting partnerships between users”. He also said “My concern as voiced in the final conference is that this work should extend beyond the life of the project - trust building takes time and continuity. The project has done an excellent job to start many conversations and bring together disparate stakeholders”.

5.4.3 Replicability, demonstration, transferability, cooperation:

A major part of the project was that of demonstrating innovative approaches to stakeholder engagement and marine policy/management implementation that could be taken forward by others. In this sense, the demonstrational elements of the project are strong (as stated in the Final Evaluation). There is enthusiasm and demand for the outputs of the project so there is reason to believe that elements of the project will be replicated/transferred in some respect. Again, the Celtic Seas Partnership top tips website already mentioned in Section 5.2.2 is a great example of where we are transferring our lessons and advice to other projects starting out in this field of work.

Several of the stakeholders interviewed for the Final Evaluation indicated intent to replicate aspects of project stakeholder engagement or to use project outputs going forward, such as: “We would adopt most of the conflict resolution guidelines. We would also adopt many of the stakeholder engagement techniques and approach – getting small groups together to discuss first and then opening it out, etc.”

There is already evidence that this is happening, for example the project’s second multi-national conference in Paris led to interest from French fishery stakeholders in replicating aspects of the Fisheries Mediation work carried out in Scotland (see Action B1 for more details). This mediation technique had strong potential to be transferred to other countries/areas. The SEO for Scotland held a Conflict & Mediation Awareness training session at the Living Planet Centre in January 2017, where she identified a range of environmental conflicts where Civic mediation could be applied to support the development of effective problem solving partnerships. Feedback on the conference was very positive with many participants keen to build further understanding of how WWF can use mediation as a
process to support collaborative partnership building across a range of WWF programmes including People & Wildlife Conflict, organisational development, the Amazon programme, wider marine work and land-use planning in WWF’s Priority Places.

As mentioned in Section 5.2.2 we have held a webinar series with colleagues in the WWF Kenya office who work in the coastal programme. We transferred our experiences and knowledge with them so that they are able to replicate the project’s good practices and techniques.

The Celtic Seas Partnership was mentioned as a model of good stakeholder engagement by the Wales Environment Link representative, as evidence presented at the Marine Protected Areas inquiry conducted by the Climate Change, Energy and Rural Affairs Committee, 30th March 2017. In June 2017 the Welsh Government asked WWF to present our best practice for stakeholder engagement from the Celtic Seas Partnership to a reference group of stakeholders in order to learn about how best the Welsh Government can engage with stakeholders in future.

WWF Cymru is interested in using the Celtic Seas Partnership as an example of just how much can be delivered in four years through a workshop session with the Well-Being of Future Generations Commissioners office. They are hoping that the Celtic Seas Partnership will inspire more ambition in the Welsh government’s change programme for the Well-Being of Future Generations Act.

There have been other, subtle, but perhaps more lasting, impacts on our stakeholders. We often hear people talking about ‘relationships’ which were rarely discussed in the past. Groups, particularly Wales Environment Link, are now commenting on and criticising engagement ‘processes’ in a more confident and articulate way. Since seeing how the Celtic Seas Partnership has operated, they have higher standards for meetings and collaborative working. They refuse to have Welsh Government dominate meetings with PowerPoint updates and are taking a much more affirmative role in shaping agendas and bringing in other stakeholders usually left out of discussions. The Wales Environment Link have confessed that working closely with the Celtic Seas Stakeholder Engagement Officer is partly responsible for this, but also attending the events and mediation training offered by the Partnership.

As highlighted in the Final Evaluation, in the grand scheme of things the Celtic Seas Partnership may appear to have been a very niche project. It was focused on a specific piece of policy, the MSFD (which only applies in Europe), and aimed to engage with people in government and industry who were interested in, or responsible for delivering that piece of policy. However, more fundamentally, the project was about building relationships between people at a regional scale. The way in which it was done is relevant to anybody trying to empower people, whether that is about a different piece of marine policy, such as marine spatial planning or marine protected area management, or even something completely unrelated such as health issues across borders. The techniques used to:

- Raise awareness of the issue
- Communicate in a language people understand
- Bring people together in workshops and forums
- Project manage a large team
- Evaluate the success of what you have done
In the final survey sent out to stakeholders in June 2017, one person said that they have already used the online tutorial/animation on Marine Strategy Framework Directive, and one person said that they have already used the Recommendations on Transboundary Working Groups. People are also using the Best Practice Guidelines on Transboundary Marine Governance, Co-location and Conflict Resolution, the Good Practice Guidelines for Local Planning Authorities, the Nature’s Services and the Sea pack and the Web Portal. Four people said that they intend to use the Discovering Data and Information in the Celtic Seas in the future, and three people said that they intend to use the Recommendations on Transboundary Working Groups in the future. When asked what they have used the products for, John McCartney (member of the Expert Advisory Group) said “As background for work on the EU ATLAS Project and in connection with the EU MSP Platform” – which shows that they have a practical application in the ‘real world’.

5.4.4 Best Practice lessons:

We held a full final team reflection and learning session with the wider project team on 2\textsuperscript{nd} December 2016. We reflected on elements of the project that, with the benefit of hindsight, we could have been done differently – as well as discussing the things that went well (see Action C1 for more details). Annex 5.4.2 lists the lessons we’ve learned throughout the project, including:

- Project deliverables were end-loaded. \textbf{Lesson:} stagger outputs throughout the project to create a sense of achievement with the stakeholders and have things to communicate
- The project was quite complicated and complex, with a very resource-heavy model. \textbf{Lesson:} design a less complex project, so it’s more understandable and easier to communicate. Also, design it so that it’s less resource-intensive to allow more “grass-roots” stakeholder engagement.

As detailed under Action B1, we commissioned a review of the stakeholder engagement techniques from the project (see Annex B1.6 for a summary of the lessons from this review). Key lessons include:

- Stakeholders engage when they perceive there is something to engage about. This might be a policy change, conflict or desire to include others in new practices. Stakeholder analysis needs to be undertaken alongside situational analysis, to ascertain what’s relevant.
- We also recognised early on the value of individual face to face meetings/workshop with our stakeholders, instead of teleconferences – including the informal networking elements. Never underestimate the value of face-to-face meetings/workshops with stakeholders.

The Celtic Seas Partnership top tips website (detailed in Section 5.2) was specifically created for us to share our experiences and tips – based on what we’ve learned from working on the project.

Annex 5.3.1 gives an overview of the changes made during the project, including why the changes were made and whether they had an impact on the result.

5.4.5 Innovation and demonstration value:

An excellent example of innovation in the project was the Fisheries Mediation work in Scotland (and the related Conflict Resolution Guidelines). This was an interesting,
experimental and challenging piece of work which yielded clear results and lessons. As mentioned under Action B.1, a review of the fisheries mediation process in Scotland was carried out (Annex B1.4), which highlights achievements such as: resolution of tension; pulling together disparate people; keeping constructive conversation going, and improving awareness.

Another example of innovation in the project (as raised in the Final Evaluation) was some of the stakeholder engagement techniques employed by the project (see Action B1 for more details), for instance one interviewee stated: ‘We would also adopt many of the project’s stakeholder engagement techniques and approaches [going forward] – getting small groups together to discuss first and then opening it out, etc.’

The value added by EU funding at national and international level is that it enabled transboundary collaboration at a larger scale than previously seen. There was no other forum to do this at this scale before the project. The innovative stakeholder engagement approach used for this project made this a reality, i.e. having a dedicated SEO in each of the countries. Each SEO brought something different to the team – different skills and experiences. Participants have particularly valued the unique opportunity created by the project for transboundary and cross-sectoral engagement at the regional, Celtic Seas, level. In the Final Evaluation, one stakeholder stated: “Value for Money-wise – this has been quite good, especially from an EU perspective – it has given them reach in to areas they wouldn’t normally have”

The Celtic Seas Web Portal has been developed using Linked Data and SPARQL technology, which other organisations have been very keen to understand and learn how this innovative approach has worked.

In the Final Evaluation, one stakeholder said: “I don’t know of any other project at this point in time which is transboundary and gets all the relevant organisations and administrations together like this.. It has given people the feeling and understanding of a wider area of co-operation”.

5.4.6 Long term indicators of the project success:

The project goal is to demonstrate successful approaches to transboundary ecosystem-based marine management through multi-stakeholder collaboration to guide practical implementation of MSFD and contribute to “good environmental status” of the Celtic Seas Marine Region. The overall theory of change for the project that leads to a conservation impact could be considered as the level of multi-sector stakeholder involvement in MSFD implementation resulting in the achievement of good environmental status of the Celtic Seas. In this case, quantifiable impact indicators to be achieved within 10 years could be:

- GES status is achieved in the Celtic Seas for all of the 11 descriptors.
- Increased number of marine user stakeholders, from multiple sectors and multiple countries that are actively involved in marine policy implementation activities.
- The Celtic Seas Partnership project outputs have been used to inform better management of the marine environment in the Celtic Seas.

Suggested indicators for future evaluation of PISCES against the project objectives:
Objective 1: By 2016, effective engagement mechanisms have been established with key sectoral interests; and the most appropriate scales /mechanisms for engagement (e.g. Celtic Seas Forum, Irish Sea Platform) recognised to support delivery of ecosystem-based and integrated management.

- Extent that stakeholder relationships are continued that were established through Celtic Seas Partnership
- Type/frequency of collaborative interactions across sectors and countries, resulting from Celtic Seas Partnership contacts.
- The extent to which the stakeholders are engaging at an appropriate regional scale to support the delivery of ecosystem-based management in the Celtic Seas.

Objective 2: By 2016, successful ecosystem-based management techniques and methods to support integrated marine management have been developed and demonstrated through multi-stakeholder collaboration to guide practical implementation of European maritime policy including the MSFD.

- Extent that the recommendations in the project outputs are applied by stakeholders and policy makers.
- The amount of information available to the stakeholders on MSFD and marine policy in the Celtic Seas.
- Extent that policy makers implement Celtic Seas Partnership recommendations in other marine regions, outside the Celtic Seas.