



Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur



# MAREMED

## REPORT

### Governance of maritime affairs

Nota bene: This report has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union (EU). The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of the partners of MAREMED project and this document does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the EU.

Programma cofinanziato per lo Fondo Europeo  
di Sviluppo Regionale  
Programme cofinanced by the European  
Regional Development Fund



## Table of contents

### **Introduction** (P3)

### **1. Diagnosis: Summary of questionnaires** (P5)

#### **1.1 Overview of the current principles of governance of maritime policies in the partner Regions** (P5)

##### **1.1.1 General principles of governance of maritime policies in Italy, Spain and France** (P5)

Principles of governance of maritime policies in Italy (P5)

Principles of governance of maritime policies in Spain (P11)

Principles of governance of maritime policies in France (P17)

##### **1.1.2 General principles of governance of maritime policies in the 3 Islands forming the partnership** (P22)

Principles of governance of maritime policies in Corsica (P22)

Principles of governance of maritime policies in Crete (P26)

Principles of governance of maritime policies in Cyprus (P29)

### **2. Recommendations for renewed governance in the Mediterranean** (P33)

#### **2.1 The European project MAREMED, a concrete example acting as a best practice of renewed governance of maritime affairs** (P33)

#### **2.2 What position to adopt regarding the recent ICZM/MSP European Directive proposal?** (P38)

#### **2.3 Towards an EU macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean?** (P41)

#### **2.4 The interregional initiative "Bologna Charter 2012", a new governance tool which justifies the launching of a maritime macro-project for 2014-2020** (P42)

#### **2.5 What impacts of the future Structural Funds in the governance processes? What perspective for European territorial cooperation (ETC) in the context of the future of MED and ENI programmes?** (P44)

#### **2.6 MAREMED political conclusions on governance** (P47)

### **Conclusion** (P48)

## Introduction

The first stage of MAREMED project relied on a diagnostic phase which was built through an information collection campaign among the partners with the help of thematical questionnaires, one for each MAREMED component: maritime policy governance, fisheries, integrated coastal zone management (ICZM), adaptation to climate change in coastal areas, efforts to reduce pollution and common data management. The aim of the governance questionnaire is to precise the state of the art of the architecture of regional maritime policies within the Regions partners of MAREMED and make the overall balance by country (5 countries are represented within the project: France, Italy, Spain, Greece and Cyprus from which 3 islands: Corsica, Crete and Cyprus) and, therefore, by Region.

The primary goal of the present report is thus firstly to synthetize the results of the questionnaire in order to offer a Mediterranean overview of the actual design of maritime policies decision-making. Secondly, this report acts as an information framework to identify where the need for further action regarding maritime affairs governance lies upon, and represents an opportunity to convey political messages also in the context of the next European financial programming period to come (2014-2020).

The questionnaire was submitted to and answered by the 12 MAREMED partners (11 regional partners except Campania Region which left the partnership and, obviously, the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions (CPMR), plus Catalonia which is associate partner of the project). The sample is representative of the different Mediterranean situations.

The governance process involves a large number of stakeholders. It is at the same time an advantage but it also difficult to implement a real multiparty steering. An ideal governance process logically conducts to the fact that the decisions taken are not the result of a single decision-maker (or a group of single makers), but the result of a multiple dialogue.

More specifically, the Mediterranean is facing growing pressure on its space. It is plagued with conflicts of use and a lowering of its resources, while facing a degraded environment and the adverse effects of climate change. The parade to these problems also goes hand in hand with improving and strengthening governance of maritime affairs. This ultimate must be able to ensure sustainable growth of the area, in conjunction with the actual reflections on the notion of “blue growth” at EU level too.

This environmental challenge is particularly marked in the Mediterranean due to its oceanographic characteristics (an oligotrophic sea, narrow continental shelves, extensive biodiversity etc.) and the importance of the anthropic pressure (demographic and economic concentration on the coast, tourism, a hot spot of climate change etc.). An integrated land-sea view of public development and management policies is all the more indispensable. This need to preserve the coastal ecosystems is in permanent competition with the needs for space for a growing population, economic activity linked to the coast and the implementation of measures for adapting to climate change and the defense of the coasts.

Knowledge and analysis of the governance of maritime policies in place are the keys to development towards an Integrated Maritime Policy (IMP). It has to be recalled that MAREMED project is part of a global strategy for the fostering of an IMP in the Mediterranean basin.

MAREMED therefore is part of the implementation of an IMP in the Mediterranean, which requires to consider and manage the main priorities concurrently. The project is to improve the coordination of regional maritime policies among themselves and with the National, European and Mediterranean levels of governance. The transnational dimension of MAREMED, intrinsic to its structure, gains here all its meaning.

The development of the EU IMP, as promoted by the Blue Book in 2006, intends a specific management framework and a reflection on its implementation in terms of governance. This commitment was translated into reality in 2006 with the publication and implementation of the Green Paper consultation for an EU IMP, which led in 2007 to the adoption of the Blue Book and its related Action Plan. To do so, the European Commission (EC) has analyzed the interactions between sectoral policies with the scope to upgrade their coordination. The IMP is also part of the CPMR<sup>1</sup> priorities, including its Inter-Mediterranean Commission<sup>2</sup> (IMC). And it is worth recalling that for more than 10 years, the maritime Regions have greatly mobilized in the initiatives "Europe of the Sea" and "Aquamarina" in close cooperation with the European institutions and in the interests of maximum collaboration<sup>3</sup>.

That said, the governance of maritime policies in the Mediterranean still suffers from a lack of binding between the different institutional levels, and the role of the Regions, operating alongside state actors for the implementation of many aspects of international regulations, lacks of transparency and would claim enhanced synergy.

Therefore the EU took these difficulties head on with the adoption of a strategy by the EC in November 2009 "Towards an Integrated Maritime Policy for better governance in the Mediterranean" (COM(2009)0466) aiming at complement the various sectoral actions promoted by the EU in the area.

This European strategy for the Mediterranean area calls also for better cooperation with the third countries concerned. Hence the idea of a macro-regional strategy in the Mediterranean which has the merit of addressing issues at a wider and more consistent scale. It has to be recalled that the shaping of this strategy should comprehend a strong maritime dimension, important argument on which stakeholders meet.

And MAREMED project contributes to those reflections. MAREMED is indeed a project whose goal is to make progress in the field of the management of maritime policies both in an overall vision of the various thematic sections of which it is composed, cooperation and dialogue between the various levels of governance, as in its geographical composition which must extricate itself from administrative boundaries to become part of the logical dimension of managing phenomena and ecosystems.

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.crpm.org/en/index.php?act=13,32,1>,

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.medregions.com/index.php?act=1.5.3.6>

<sup>3</sup> Within the CPMR, Mediterranean Regions have established in 2006 a "Maritime Policy" working group, a network of technical departments of the member Regions which contributed to the promotion of an IMP in the Mediterranean, insisting particularly on the following topics: marine pollution, ICZM, adaptation to climate change, fisheries production, research at sea, maritime security and governance (the thematic covered by MAREMED). These studies have revealed a certain lack of coordination between the regional level and other institutional ones, identifying issues and shared priorities, as well as proposing areas of common actions. (cf. <http://www.medRegions.com/index.php?act=1.5.3.6>).

This new approach of maritime policy at EU level encourages the Regions to set aside sectoral actions in favor of an overall, more cross-sectional design. Since 2007, IMP has developed a number of tools to promote maritime governance, including maritime spatial planning (MSP) which advocates better use of marine space; ICZM which also includes the problematic of islands; the integration of research efforts led to increase in the future in accordance with the European strategy for marine and maritime research; and the integration of maritime surveillance which aims to make the Mediterranean Sea safest.

## 1. Diagnosis: Summary of questionnaires

### 1.1 Overview of the current principles of governance of maritime policies in the partner Regions

The structure of the first part of the report takes into account the answers of the different partners to the questionnaire provided. At first, it will describe in general terms the organization of governance at national level and, in a second time, a more specific and precise variation at regional level of governance reported to maritime policies will be performed, based on the following themes, namely: internal governance (political and technical organization) and the budget available; tools and instruments of maritime policies held by the Regions; relationships with the research and innovation sector, description of "bottom-up", "top-down", and transnational governance processes. This in order to draw a "mosaic of maritime governance" useful across the Mediterranean.

Institutionally, the Regions which form the MAREMED partnership are characterized by different ways of regionalization. The differences in terms of administrative organization are marked as we observe "autonomous" Regions (Italy and Spain), "administrative" ones (France and Cyprus), "administrative districts" (Greece/Crete). Therefore, if we consider maritime governance in the analysis, we face competency models distinguished by a "variable geometry" that show that a sufficient level of coordination and collaboration between the "center" and the "periphery" does not exist yet. From the individual questionnaires stand very interesting aspects of maritime governance which emphasize that each State has its own model of separation of powers between the "center" and the "periphery".

#### 1.1.1 General principles of governance of maritime policies in Italy, Spain and France

- **Principles of governance of maritime policies in Italy**

In terms of **global political governance**, each Region in **Italy** can count on a Regional Council exercising specific legislative powers and a Regional entity called "Giunta Regionale" which represents the executive body. The "Giunta" is classically headed by a President, normally elected by direct universal suffrage. Article 121 of the Italian Constitution provides indeed in each "ordinary status" Region the establishment of three bodies: the Regional Council ("Consiglio Regionale") elected for 5 years and led by the "Giunta", and the President surrounded by a college of Vice-Presidents called "Assessori" (6 to 12). The Regional Council is elected for 4 years in "special status" Regions. 80% of Regional Council members are elected by direct universal suffrage and 20% on the President's list. Italy is representative of a dynamic process of regionalization that operates on several levers, still in evolution. However, this does not mean

that the national political game, which keeps the role of arbitrator, does not hold a pivotal role in the process.

For example, through the implementation of multi-annual action plans, like the Partnership Contracts between the State and the Regions (CPER) in effect in France, the Italian central State retains control over certain matters such as environmental protection. The Italian regional model has long been perceived as original in Europe, as the crossroads between the centralized model of governance embodied by France and the federal German model. Nevertheless, the Italian case is primarily representative of a dynamic at work in Europe, namely the rise of the regional level with the resulting increased powers devolved to the Regions. The regionalization process in Italy sees a dilution of national power to Europe and, in parallel, is accompanied by a partial displacement of national power to the Regions and local authorities. This raises questions about the place left to the nation-State as a regulatory body and as the ideal scale of the sense of belonging, which in return echoes a sense of regional identity traditionally and historically strong in Italy.

As mentioned above, the EU, through its regional policy, also plays an important role in these new articulations of power, with the establishment of a Europe-State-Region partnership to achieve the objectives of European territorial cohesion through the Structural Funds (SF), which helps to establish the Italian regional action in terms of spatial planning (approximately 70% are given to this level), but also in terms of legitimacy, since overall territorial management in Italy tends to be based on EU priorities.

Of course this dynamic process cannot only be confined to the regional level. Because, essentially, Italian federalism is both “local” and “regional”.

Most recently, the debate on the future of the provinces in Italy underwent new important developments. In Italy, the questions of the abolition of certain provinces and, more generally, of the reorganization of the system of sub-national governments within the country, have been present for more than two decades and bounces in the debate. A measure targeting to eliminate the provinces with less than 350,000 inhabitants has been put on the table: the areas of competences of the provinces would be mainly transferred to the Regions and the provinces replaced by Metropolitan cities and Unions of Municipalities.

In general, concerning **maritime policies**, one can observe a rather pronounced fragmentation of governance in **Italy**, with the direct consequence of a lack of targeted budgets. Human and financial available resources, but somewhat scattered, nevertheless exist. Today, like most EU Member States (MS), we do not find a truly integrated national maritime policy. The 5 Italian Regions partners of MAREMED (Liguria, Emilia-Romagna, Tuscany, Marche and Lazio) are experiencing similar situations, namely a partitioning/splitting of maritime themes into different levels of governance and different technical offices/departments. This ascertainment prevails in terms of political representation as evidenced by the fact that the Regions mentioned do not have a single political representative delegated to maritime affairs, or a maritime policy clearly identified with a singular strategic document that would guide actions at the regional level for instance.

Of course, this does not imply that maritime affairs are not treated with importance in these territories since these coastal Regions take notorious resources from their shores and coastlines, whether it is for tourism activities and/or for those most concerned as Marche Region for

example, fishing and shellfish activities. In addition to this, the influence of EU Law, by its obligations, which fully associates Italian Regions in the decision-making and implementation/enforcement processes, has to be noted. To set an example, it should be remarked the efforts made at regional level regarding environmental protection, like on the ICZM theme or on the transposition of the Marine Strategic Framework Directive (MSFD), which both widely involve the regional scale in terms of governance.

So there are different elected officials who deal with maritime affairs within Italian Regions, to the extent that there is no clear political entity specifically dedicated to IMP. Conventionally, responsibility is dispersed and shared between urban policy, spatial planning, the environment, transport, fisheries and tourism. In Italy, Regions detain more skills in coastal areas than in traditional centralist States, such as France. This results in significant differences in terms of governance of maritime affairs. Broadly speaking, there is a specific political delegate in charge of each topic (or two) addressed in the project. For Marche Region, as an illustration, the "assessore" to the environment covers ICZM and anti-pollution thematics and the "assessore" responsible for civil protection deals with, among other things, the portfolio of data collection (GIS), as well as adaptation to climate change.

In Tuscany, a peculiar specificity needs to be highlighted. The IMP is headed by the President of the Regional Executive Council on a secondary basis. The new Executive Council of the Region of Tuscany (which took office in May 2010) does not have an appointed Councillor for maritime issues. This reflects a strong desire to coordinate the topics related to the Sea in a Region for which maritime affairs are of particular importance. However, if we take one by one the themes valorized within MAREMED, the distribution is similar to that observed in the other Italian Regions (fishing → Regional Department of Agriculture; pollution control → Regional Department of the Environment; adaptation to climate change → joint management by the Regional Department of the Environment and the Regional Department of Territorial and Urban development, which differs from the Marchesan context where the definition of adaptation to climate change policies is done by the Regional Department of Civil Protection).

More specifically, regarding technical organization of marine and maritime affairs (regional competent technical services, maritime tools available, relations with the research sector), and the budget, the summary is as follows:

We should highlight that no technical office (taken separately) is in charge of the overall management of maritime affairs. However, the 5 Italian Regions partners of MAREMED stress quite good coordination between the various technical offices which deal separately with coastal, maritime, and marine themes (ICZM, fishing, coastal management, cartography, transportation). Like general political governance (inexistence of a unique political representative to maritime affairs), it is natural that the services are different. The overall architecture remains the same with some minor differences between Regions. In a nutshell, as for political delegates, technical offices too are different, but there is a good coordination among technical staff on the coastal matters.

For example, in Emilia-Romagna, ICZM is managed by the Regional Department of the Environment, geographic and cartographic information is run by the Regional Service of Information Systems, and fishing issues by a dedicated Fisheries Service.

This lack of homogeneity in the treatment is counteracted by a stronger coordination, allowing increased mobilization and anticipation/proaction.

In Tuscany, another peculiarity has to be underlined: On an administrative level an ad hoc sector for integrated maritime policies, namely “Tools for Local and Regional Programming”, was put in place as part of the Presidency of the Directorate General with the aim of guaranteeing coordination between all of the activities linked to maritime issues. A number of sectors in the Directorate Generals are responsible for individual maritime issues (fishing, coastal erosion, agriculture, tourism, energy, etc.) and form an internal network that works towards collaboration, the reciprocal exchange of information and participation in numerous projects as part of transnational cooperation, cross-border programmes and local political issues. There are specific sectors in the “Territorial, environmental and mobility policies” of the Directorate General that head IMP themes: ICZM, fishing, cartography or GIS, transport.

Still in Italy, The Lazio Region put in place a European project team, the “ICZM monitoring center” has demonstrated in the past its effectiveness in the management of European projects (BEACHMED, BEACHMED-e, COASTANCE, MAREMED, and now COASTGAP), whether launched under MED or ENPI programs. This structure represents an ideal structure to manage projects.

In terms of available maritime tools, the 5 Regions have Geographic Information Systems (GIS) with variations on the form. For example, in Emilia-Romagna, a “Coastal and Marine Information System” was put into place. It is similar to a GIS. Within the “Coastal and Marine Information System”, there is a database dedicated to the Sea-Use, but it is not yet completed, and not yet published on the web interface.

In Lazio Region, the “ICZM Monitoring Center” takes care of the processing of geographic information. In Liguria, the Region is very concerned with this issue, as evidenced by the existence of a vast internal GIS which meets the needs of the territory with satisfaction and another more succinct available for third parties, and the fact that Liguria pilots effectively the “common data management” MAREMED component. Moreover, it must be evoked that in Italy, a law states that regional authorities hold competences in terms of information systems to create, organize and present alphanumeric data spatially referenced (geomatics processing activities, sharing and dissemination of geographical information), i.e. georeferenced and in terms of producing related plans and maps. This allows greater control over spatial planning policies. Unlike France, where Regions do not have the same prerogatives but put in place in some Regions, multilevel and multifunded organizations like CRIGE PACA, partially funded by the Regional Council). In Tuscany, the Region does not have a GIS in itself, but the data theme is managed separately for each sector. From now on, the establishment of a comprehensive GIS is however under study.

At strategic level, given the dispersed nature of maritime governance, regional technical services do not rely on a publishable strategic guidance document serving as an integrated action plan. In Tuscany, under the previous legislature the “Document on integrated policies for the Tuscan coast 2008-2010” was approved with a resolution by the Regional Council (February, 12, 2008), that defines the coordinating actions for the integrated regional policies for the Tuscan coast, on



the basis of the guidelines of regional policies in the sector, and are followed up by the programmed implementation in terms of maritime policies. This document is available only in Italian. In order to implement the above document the Sea Agenda was prepared; an annual document that presents a complete and updated look at regional policies affecting the Tuscan “sea system”, in terms of activities that have been carried out, those that are currently in progress (with relative implementation tools, costs and completion times) and it also indicates which actions are given the priority in each sector, in order to favor an approach that is across-the-board and integrated in the governance of maritime affairs. Under the current legislature documents dealing with maritime policies have not yet been approved. Take note that the financial crisis and the spending review on the budget radically changed the policy approach on any financial statement. But this does not imply that regional laws in favor of coastal protection do not exist in Italy anyway (e.g. In Lazio, la Legge Regionale n° 1 del 2001 “Norme per la valorizzazione e lo sviluppo del litorale laziale” (Rules for the valorization and development of Lazio’s coasts).

In terms of public information (development of specific publications, existence of consultation structures), we can figure out heterogeneous situations in Italy with the following main observation: Emilia-Romagna and Tuscany are characterized by the absence of consultative bodies (an instance existed in Tuscany but was not renewed). In addition, these two Regions (plus Marche Region) do not provide regular consultation of the public and professionals. Marche Region and Liguria have however various consultative structures: an Advisory Committee for Fisheries and Aquaculture distinguished by a comprehensive representation (representatives of the Regions and the private sector, associations of fishermen, coastguards, Universities) but no regular public consultation in Liguria; multiple instances of consultation with representatives from the public and private sectors, even if they rarely interact with each other, and a public consultation through the production of publications regarding each component of Maritime Policy for Marche Region. It must be remarked that Lazio Region, through its “ICZM Monitoring Center”, publishes a newsletter every six months containing detailed information for the general public, professionals (including stakeholders), and regional elected representatives.

About relationships with the research sector, the 5 Italian Regions build strong links with these organizations, whether public or private (mostly private Universities and Institutes, including local ones). These constants relations, occurring in a win-win relationship, are very useful for regional executives who reap significant benefits in terms of data and scientific contributions to the development of their administrative tools and public policies (including for arbitration and forecasting). Of course, the favorite topics in this context of reciprocal exchanges appear to be the areas of construction, logistics, adaptation to climate change, shipping, and GIS to name a few.

Another example with Lazio Region which in 2008 started a “Work Program” on the aim of marine ecosystem sustainable development. The Program includes four research conventions with four different research Institutes. Some private collaboration is started for the management of WEB GIS tools and technical consulting. Emilia-Romagna Region work with Universities (Bologna, Ferrara, Ravenna), with research centers (CNR-ISMAR) and Regional Agencies (ARPA) on specific projects, project by project. Research in Tuscany is transversal and each sector carries out its specific research (there is no single sector dedicated solely to maritime research). And in Tuscany, under the previous period of programming, some research institutes, especially

IRPET (Regional Institute for Economic Programming in Tuscany) which is responsible for the structural interpretation of the economic and social system of Tuscany, and for the past while also the economic situation, and produces an Annual report on the Tuscan economy and a series of Sectorial Reports and LAMMA (Laboratory for Environmental Monitoring and Modelling for sustainable development) with the aim of creating an interface between the world of the institutions, elements of scientific and technologic excellence, the industry and the various structures operating in the sectors of meteorology, climatology, geographic information systems (GIS) and geology. All these Institutes have performed research and studies on topics linked to the IMP.

The main institutions collaborating with the Tuscany Region regarding the management of maritime affairs include also ARPAT (Regional Agency for the Environmental Protection of Tuscany) which guarantees the implementation of regional guidelines in the field of environmental prevention and protection, and a network of institutes for surveyors of the Tuscan coast, (I.GE.CO, Coastal Surveyor Institutes) which partakes in the activities of the cross border project known as PERLA, with the aim of improving accessibility, use and safety of the public access points to the seaside along the Tuscan coast. CNR (National Research Council) has the task of performing, promoting, providing, transferring and improving research activity in the main sectors of the development of knowledge and its applications for scientific, technologic, economic and social development.

As budget for maritime affairs is concerned, like what we can notice for the governance processes at technical and political levels, there is no uniform budget dedicated but the existence of a plurality of sectorised budgets to finance actions (e.g. 72 M€ dedicated to ICZM in Lazio Region). The fragmentation of the budget appears logical but is not far from being desirable. There is also no "earmarked" budget. This concept of "earmarking" returns to targeting intervention credits on limited items in order to maximize leverage (in other words, a legislative provision that directs funds to be spent on specific subjects/areas/projects...) It is also difficult to extract/isolate what concerns the financing of maritime affairs in each unit, maritime policy affecting many fields of public policy (environment, spatial planning, economy, transport, fisheries etc.) For each maritime thematic taken separately, the budget seems somewhat underestimated, especially regarding cross-cutting issues. It should also be pointed out the impact of the current economic and financial crisis and the growth slowdown that follows as an aggravating factor that may not be in favor of increased budgets devoted to maritime policies, in Italy, but also in other MS whose MAREMED Regions partners are from (Greece, Cyprus, Spain, France).

Regarding the transnational aspect of maritime affairs governance, that can be specified as a participation in European projects, international agreements (Agreement concerning the exploitation of resources at the Adriatic Sea level between Italy, Slovenia and Croatia, which involves Emilia-Romagna Region too. This agreement, originally signed for natural gas wells exploitation, now concerns the exploitation of sand deposits too. Emilia-Romagna has particular interest for sand deposits for beach nourishment purposes; RAMOGE International agreement engaging Liguria; PELAGOS agreement with Corsica, PACA, Liguria, Tuscany and Sardinia), being a Euroregion member (administrative structure of cross-border cooperation between two or more Regions: Euroregions "Adriatic" for Marche and Emilia-Romagna or "Alpes-Med" for Liguria), or even being indirectly a party to international conventions (such as the Barcelona Convention and its additional Protocols like on ICZM whose application requires close collaboration between central and decentralized levels, and between the regional action

centers established under the Convention, such as PAP/RAC located in Split, Croatia). In Italy, the international aspect of maritime policies led by the Regions is of paramount importance, as evidenced by their active participation in European projects, including those specialized in ICZM and adaptation to climate change whether they meet the objective for transnational (as MAREMED, BEACHMED-e, RESMAR, COASTANCE) or transboundary (France-Italy Maritime Programme for Liguria particular) cooperation, affect the EU Neighborhood policy (e.g. SHAPE project<sup>4</sup> on ICZM including Emilia-Romagna as lead partner), or come from other EU thematic cofinanced programmes. Membership in European-oriented networks such as CPMR, which through its geographical commissions and the existence of working groups related to maritime policies relays the regional action towards the EU institutions, concerns all the 5 Italian Regions members of MAREMED partnership.

The Italian Regions, via their powers on maritime policy (which does not mean total absence of relationships with other local levels of governance), combined with their right to intervene in the European legislative process when the EU Law regards areas of public policy within their jurisdiction, demonstrate strong international commitment and often engage their executive officials in “umbrella” policy initiatives, as can be the “Bologna Charter 2012” (BC 2012).

- **Principles of governance of maritime policies in Spain**

In terms of **global political governance**, in **Spain**, following the vanishing of the Franco regime, autonomy to the Regions and local authorities and a new division of powers between the central government and the autonomous communities (“autonomías”) has been granted. The purpose of such a distribution was to seek to strengthen decentralization and devolution of powers to the “autonomous communities” and other local communities.

The 1978 constitution allowed three paths towards regional “autonomy”. Initially made for and the Basque country, it gave birth to the creation of 17 autonomous Regions in 1983. Each region enjoys its own statute of autonomy, with its own regional institutions: a President, an Executive, a Parliament, an Administration and a High Court of Justice.

In Spain, beyond the 50 supra-municipal provinces, there are structures of “vertical” governance, the “consortia” (vertical partnerships between municipalities, provinces, autonomous communities and the state) for enhanced interaction between actors inside the political game. In 1986, the entry of Spain into the EU has also had an impact on the distribution of powers in activity fields such as land policy and management of coastal areas.

We can consider that/then Spanish intergovernmental relations are characterized by three levels of interaction:

A first “macro” level including policy interactions between regional and national leaders. In particular, it addresses the major issues related to the division of the territory, skills, finance, and major matters related to the country’s identity and those linked to foreign policy issues. The current debate on the independence or not of Catalonia takes place at this level.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.shape-ipaproject.eu/>

Then, a level that could be described as an "intermediary" one encompasses, among other, activities between officials negotiating grants and contracts, or the establishment of governmental partnerships. The Spanish system is highly interdependent in the sense that the center develops framework laws while the autonomous communities adopt laws complementary to these regulations. The process of implementation therefore greatly involves an order of government as well as the other. This process is carried out mainly by the senior officials of the two scales of government that constantly converse, thus establishing a form of administrative federalism. Intergovernmental issues at intermediate level, that previously took place under the direction center-autonomous communities, are now essentially located in the field of relations between autonomous communities and local authorities.

Finally, the "micro" level: this is the operational level where projects are negotiated, building permits issued, contracts managed, and regulations and standards implemented. This step strongly commits autonomous communities since one often finds the approval of the latter when public policies are decided at the municipal level for example.

The watchword is flexibility in the dynamics of intergovernmental relations in Spain, as the sharing of most of powers between central and regional governments has an impact on several scales. For instance, framework laws adopted by the central Parliament involve multiple levels of governance. The implementation of policies thus has a dual nature. In the latter category are some policies like environmental protection and transportation.

In all cases, the regional level embodied by the autonomous communities is massively associated in the definition and development of public policies, broadly along the lines of Italy, though of course the administrative organization is proving to be different between these two "regionalist" States. In Spain, the guarantee of autonomy ensures interaction between different levels of government. As evidenced by the existence of intergovernmental mechanisms such as the organization of sectoral conferences on specific policy fields to encourage collaboration, dialogue, and problem solving between the autonomous communities and the central government (particularly in areas of joint jurisdiction, for example those related to the implementation of EU Directives). Interactions also take the form of bilateral and multilateral cooperation, through contracts binding two or more governments. This is the most common mechanism. To set an example, the regional governments and Madrid have indeed reached over 5 000 collaboration agreements, without forgetting many other agreements passed between provinces and municipalities.

If we add to this warranty of autonomy the fact that the Spanish political culture is traditionally based on the importance of the local scale (hence the tendency to develop multiple relationships at different levels of governance), the existence of framework legislation in major policy areas, the Europeanization process that gives free rein to the regional governments to administer the European SF, as well as electoral competition and rotation of political forces in place that have supported the position of the autonomous communities and have fostered local processes; it is relevant to assert that the combination of these factors limits the top down approach control and that it is rather the local political culture which prevails in the Spanish institutional and administrative apparatus. The administrative federalism and executive federalism thus represent the most common patterns of interaction. And this fact only reinforces the propensity to the federalization of Iberian intergovernmental relations.

In general concerning **maritime policies** can be observed in **Spain** quite pronounced fragmentation of governance on the Italian model. The information provided by the partner FEPORTS from the Valencian Community and comments made by Catalonia (associate partner) tell us that in terms of political representation, there is no single representative in charge of a maritime policy (understood as a whole), but many elected officials who share the different portfolios.

In other words, maritime affairs are regulated by sector and these are not integrated with each other. ICZM issue isn't being faced as a whole. There are no links among departments facing this issue and the cooperation with the State Government is reduced only to some outdated agreement. There is neither a defined maritime policy nor department involved in maritime issues. Competences are distributed among different departments that, although they have experienced a higher cooperation among them during the last years (due to the lack of funds and staff), these departments are still more "isolated" departments managing their own business. The motto for the future could be "dealing with maritime and marine issues as a whole and not as disassociated issues, with innovation and shared knowledge at the heart of public management".

The term "integration" should rather be used instead of "coordination". In Spain, "Consellers" are for French regional "Vice-Presidents" and Italian "Assessori".

More specifically, regarding technical organization of marine and maritime affairs (regional competent technical services), and the budget, the summary is as follows: the "Consellerías" include General Directorates and on maritime policy, responsibilities are shared. The theme of ICZM for instance jointly managed by the Directorate General of Ports, Airports and Coasts, itself part of the "Consellería" Infrastructure and Transport (also competent regarding maritime transport), and the Directorate General of Planning and Landscape, integrated to the "Consellería" Environment, Water, Urban development and Housing of the Generalitat Valenciana. It must also be put into relief that a "water quality" service attached to the "Consellería" "Consellería" Environment, Water, Urban development and Housing, and addressing this very important and vital topic for the Region of Valencia, exists. On the same "Consellería" also depends the Directorate General of Climate change. Mapping and GIS are thematics supported by the "Instituto cartografico".

Catalonia states that the Spanish Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment has core competencies in the field of maritime policy with the areas of responsibility of management of water resources and protection of the marine environment. Some powers are being transferred to the Regions.

The Spanish Water Law ("Ley de Aguas") which entered into force in 1985 taught us that policy and regulation functions for water supply and sanitation are shared between various Ministries. For example, the Ministry of Environment is in charge of water resources management and the Ministry of Health of drinking water quality monitoring.

Basin agencies ("Confederaciones de Cuencas Hidrográficas": 15 basin agencies in Spain for rivers that flow through more than one autonomous community) are mainly in charge of planning, constructing and operating major water infrastructure; granting permits to use water, conceiving basin plans; setting water quality targets; inspecting water facilities and initiating hydrological studies. Basin Agencies are headed by a President who is nominated by the Cabinet

at the proposal of the Minister of Environment. Each agency ensures wide participation by various stakeholders in its decision-making process. There is a specificity in Spain: if a river totally flows within the territory of an autonomous community, the water administration of this autonomous community, instead of one of the basin agencies, is in charge of managing its water resources. This is the case for instance in Catalonia. In a nutshell, while basin agencies do not provide water and sanitation services, they play an important role in designing the framework for the provision of such services.

In terms of available maritime tools, FEPORIS partner informs us that the Directorate General of Planning and Landscape of the Generalitat Valenciana can count on a land management oriented- GIS<sup>5</sup> which also includes coastline management. This tool is run jointly with the Ministry of Environment of the Spanish Government that perceives in this system of exchange of information and data between the autonomous communities and the central government a fundamental basis:

It has to be mentioned that the “IdeaCV project”, “Infraestructura de Datos Espaciales de la Comunidad Valenciana” (Infrastructure for the Spatial Data of the Comunidad Valenciana), basically an IT system providing a set of resources (catalogues, servers, programs, data, applications, websites, etc.) helps Valencian town councils in their daily territorial and geographical data management via satellite images, maps, orthophotos etc. And these resources obey a series of conditions, rules, specifications and protocols.

Catalonia Region also possesses a GIS called “Idecostas<sup>6</sup>” for their own regional territory.

At strategic level, the Generalitat Valenciana informs us that there is only one regional official document specifically devoted to IMP. It was published in 2006 in collaboration with FEPORIS (“Contribution of the Generalitat Valenciana to the EU’s Maritime Policy Green Paper”). In it, the Valencian regional government expresses its point of view in relation to the interests of the Region regarding the issues covered in the Green Paper.

In Catalonia, there is not an official regional maritime policy identified as such. However the Department of Territory and Sustainability of the Government of Catalonia elaborated the “Pla director urbanístic del sistema costaner” (PDUSC: “Urban Framework Plan for the Coastline system”). There is not a specific office dealing for example exclusively with ICZM or a peculiar one making the synthesis by integrating the management of maritime affairs. However, we can stress collaborative action among different governmental structures with regards to coastal affairs.

In terms of public information (development of specific publications, existence of consultation structures), in Spain, especially in the Region of Valencia, there is no consultation structure with maritime activities’ representative whereas concerning the existence of regular consultation events or publications for professionals and/or the public, the u@MareNostrum project<sup>7</sup> website presents information on the IMP in the Mediterranean to the general public:

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.mapa.es/es/sig/sig1.htm>

[http://www.gvsig.org/web/home/portal-gvsig-fr/view?set\\_language=fr](http://www.gvsig.org/web/home/portal-gvsig-fr/view?set_language=fr)

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.geoportal-idec.cat/geoportal/cat/>

<sup>7</sup> [http://marenostrum.gva.es/index.php?option=com\\_processes&task=listDocuments&id=6&s=1&Itemid=2&lang=es](http://marenostrum.gva.es/index.php?option=com_processes&task=listDocuments&id=6&s=1&Itemid=2&lang=es)

In Catalonia, nevertheless, there are frequent consultations in the context of policy-making, law elaboration and planning, for example in the case of the elaboration of the PDUSC. There are also regular consultations in the framework of environmental assessment processes regarding activities, projects and plans dealing with coastline and maritime affairs.

It is worth mentioning that the Consortium Colls i Miralpeix organised an “International Workshop for ICZM in the Mediterranean” in 2009.

About relationships with the research sector, that can be specified as a participation in European projects, international agreements, Spanish Regions maintain close relationships with the research sector (with public and private bodies). More precisely, the Valencian Region collaborates with universities, such as the “Universidad Politécnica de Valencia” (UPV) or the Universidad de Valencia (UV). On various topics including: ICZM through different actors that reflects the wide range of structures interested in this issue like the UPV’s, “Instituto de Investigación para la Gestión Integrada de Zonas Costeras” (IGIC, Research Institute for Integrated Coastal Zone Management); the UPV’s “Laboratorio de Puertos y Costas” (Port and Coastal Laboratory) ; the UPV’s “Grupo de Investigación de Procedimientos de Construcción, Optimización y Análisis de Estructuras” (the Procedures for the Construction, Optimization and Analysis of Structures Research Group) ; the “Instituto Interuniversitario de Desarrollo Local” (The Inter-University Institute for Local Development), etc. About WFD, the links set up are with the UPV’s “Instituto Tecnológico del Agua” (ITA, the Water Technology Institute). On fishing issues, via the UPV’s “Grupo de Investigación en Acuicultura y Medio Ambiente” (ACUMA, Aquaculture and Environment Research Group) and on data management, with the UPV’s “Grupo de Informática Gráfica” (Graphical Information Group). It has to be underlined that marine pollution thematic is supported by FEPORTS, our Valencian partner within MAREMED project.

In Catalonia, in the context of the elaboration of the Research and Innovation Plan of the Department of Territory and Sustainability (DTS), an expert group gathering and integrating researchers specialized in environment from universities and research institutes (including those working on maritime themes), professionals dedicated to improving the discipline of innovation and business representatives was put in place. The idea is to share their needs, vision, and expectations. The Research and Innovation Plan provides formal exchange in the form of classic meetings with the expert group evoked above. The DTS also develops and promotes framework agreements with different research institutes and academic universities. And these agreements play an important role in contributing to the financing of the research activities of the institutions involved.

As budget for maritime affairs is concerned, for the Valencian Region, no particular budget linked to maritime affairs can be distinguished. Actually, the different departments (“consellerías”) which detain responsibility over maritime affairs (maritime transport, ports, fishing, coastline management) present specific budgets due to their activities and determining the budget share which is specific to maritime and marine issues within each of these activities is far from easy.

The same remark was highlighted by and prevails for Catalonia. Identifying specific budgets would indeed bring some complexity.

Regarding the transnational aspect of maritime affairs governance, that can be specified as a participation in European projects, international agreements, FEPORTS represents the Generalitat Valenciana in the CPMR maritime policy group and the Valencian government is a member of its geographical IMC. It is not involved in interregional or inter-state agreements with regard to the governance of maritime issues. FEPORTS also reports that the nearest thing to a mention of maritime affairs with regard to international policy is the promotion within the Mediterranean of Short Sea Shipping between ports of different Regions. The Comunidad Valenciana does not share a direct frontier with any region of another country. That is why the sole maritime links are those coming from the shipping movements of goods by sea.

An important decision is the signature in 2005 and 2007 by the Valencian government of two agreements with the Spanish Ministry of the Environment regarding the joint and integrated management of the Valencian coastline (ICZM process) within the framework of the legislation on the coasts, town and country planning and the protection of the environment. Information and data exchange structures also exist with the Department of Infrastructures and Transport.

Information exchange with the EU implies inevitably and logically the State level which acts as an intermediary between the Spanish Regions and the European Institutions. But contrary to what is observed for France for example (existence of a National Permanent Representation to the EU, the RPFUE, and the existence of a centralized General Secretariat dedicated to European affairs, the SGAE, which depends on the French National Government), a division of the Generalitat Valenciana's Consellería de Justicia y Administraciones Públicas (the Department of Justice and Public Administration) is the Secretaría Autonómica de Relaciones con el Estado y con la Unión Europea (the Regional Secretariat for Relations with the State and the EU). This coordinates and relays directly the Valencian government's interests with the EU, interregional and international organizations, national administrative structures and other regional governments within Spain.

In addition, the Comunitat Valenciana doesn't have common tools or formal relations with MAP or one of its RAC under the patronage of the UfM. Regarding the transfer or co-management of maritime policies' themes with other levels of local government, NGOs and professionals, the Comunidad Valenciana has to cope with a lack of institutional agreements which private companies and town councils have signed up to, making initiatives for coastline planning, maritime management and the integration of different sector policies difficult to achieve and vulnerable to economic and political factors.

Catalonia, associated partner of MAREMED project, is involved in thematic networks linked to maritime themes (CPMR, and obviously the EU MAP, in so far as the city of Barcelona is the headquarters of the UfM and the head office of the Regional Activity Center for Cleaner Production, the CP/RAC, actually situated at the Catalan Waste Agency). The Region is not involved in interregional agreements. However, the Government of Catalonia is a member of the Med PAN (Network of marine protected areas managers of the Mediterranean). Like the other Spanish Regions, formal relations with the State level exist but no technical tools are shared with the national scale. Nonetheless, agreements are sometimes made to work out reports, internal data base sharing, etc.

As far as relationships with the EU are concerned, each Department has its own way of shaping and organizing them in liaison with the Presidency Department which is responsible for Foreign Affairs.



A number of different procedures pave the way of interaction with other levels of local government, professionals and NGOs. They vary depending on the context, whether it comes to the elaboration of legislative acts (policies and laws), plans and programmes, authorization of economic activities, etc. For example, environmental assessments of activities, projects and plans are accompanied by consultations with other levels of governance. To set an example, the Catalan association “Land Stewardship Network” has created a working group on Marine Stewardship which presented solutions in order to promote the marine stewardship activity in Catalonia with the regional departments committed in maritime issues.

About the existence of a special mention for maritime affairs within the Catalan international policy, specific objectives are followed which indirectly concern maritime issues: the support to the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, the consolidation of the Pyrenees-Mediterranean Euroregion project, and the participation in the European regional networks like the IMC-CPMR and the Association of European Border Regions (AEBR).

- **Principles of governance of maritime policies in France**

In terms of **global governance**, each administrative Region (22) in **France** is represented by a Regional Council. In a country where 36,000 communes exist and where politicians and major stakeholders (like mayors of big cities) remain inevitable actors inside the political game, originally Regions were considered in a statistical way as they were administrative units for state planning. In 1956, the Regions we know today were created and the year 1982 registered an important evolution for regional prerogatives. Directly elected regional assemblies were indeed set up with the decentralization laws of 1982 (Lois Defferre). It has to be precised that most regional councilors detain other function, like councillor at “département” (province) scale or mayor (of big cities and smaller ones). Competences of regional assemblies in France revolve mainly around economic and regional development, environment, education (secondary schools), tourism and training. In terms of funding, it comes from regional taxes and state grants (notably the “Contrat de Plan Etat-Région”- CPER, a six-year contract signed with each Region that provides a financial partnership for planified projects).

If we make a comparison with Italy and Spain, we can logically assert that regional prerogatives are fewer developed in France, recognized as a centralizing state with Parisian-located Ministries. The existence of delocalized central power in “départements” and Regions (via the “préfectures” and the “Secrétariat Général à l’Action Régionale”- SGAR, which represents the state at the regional level, and by the way responsible for the management of EU structural funds<sup>8</sup> so far) and the fact that regional authorities were not historically established reflecting identity purposes (except for Corsica and Alsace) are two key arguments to understand the differences observed in terms of competences with the federal States Italy and Spain.

The “autonomy” of French Regions is thus limited. They count upon other levels of governance (départements, communes and obviously the central government) to put their policies into practice. This prevails also for maritime affairs.

---

<sup>8</sup> These prerogatives will however evolve from 2014 with the transfer of skills on the management of EU FS by the Regional Councils: It will be the ERDF OP Managing Authority. PACA Regional Council will manage 35% of the ESF and the EARDF regional component, the EMFF and will still participate in the inter Rhone-Alpine Massif OP.

The design of the French institutional distribution of competences is complex. We observe a division of responsibilities in the coastal zone between multiple authorities: the EU, the State, decentralized authorities (Regions, provinces and communes (or associations of municipalities)). This division of responsibilities is different depending on whether the area is marine or terrestrial. In the intertidal zone, the soil is covered occasionally or permanently by the sea which is the public property of the State: the maritime public domain.

In general, the French tradition of centralism gives the State almost all the responsibilities of the management and monitoring of the sea. In France, we observe indeed duplication between these three levels of authority. Some politicians consider the “département” to be quite archaic whereas the Region is modern. In addition, it is said that a move towards bigger Regions (as in Germany) would bring more uniformity to regional government in France. But some criticisms are also made about a decentralized system where State representatives and bureaucracy are omnipresent. Finally, it is difficult to reach an ideal equilibrium.

For some years, European sea policies have introduced a new notion of management by "maritime region", and confirmed that an ecosystemic management approach is the most appropriate. These new precepts of renewed governance processes have also been followed in some MS, like France which decided for example to create a new forum, the “Conseil maritime de façade” (CMF), in order to dispose of a tool helping transpose the MSFD. These new management approaches require strengthened cooperation of the operational levels administering the territories and environments. In this legal context and complicated ecosystem approach, whose relevance has been more clearly highlighted by scientists, it would appear better to renovate public policies linked to the coast and the Sea.

Because Regions are almost everywhere in Europe, this does not mean that we are in a "Europe of the Regions". Indeed, those who would like to soften the State's presence in the Regions tend to be criticized by those who conceive that it is an attack on the State and on the nation as well. In some countries, Regions reflect the identity of their population (e.g. in Catalonia). This is not the case in France, with the exceptions of Alsace and Corsica where the identity concept is strong. The twenty other Regions were created by the State not to reflect traditional identities.

Despite these limits of competences, French Regions have become a substantial part of the French and European political systems. Nonetheless, the real influence of French Regions can only be measured bearing in mind the peculiar features of French top-down relationships. Is it worth saying that for Spain, where prerogatives for regional authorities are consequent, we speak about “government”? Therefore, it appears all the more important to study regional governance in France as a process that gathers a multiplicity of institutions.

Multi-level imbrication in general political governance in France is demonstrated in the way through European structural funding is put into place. Indeed, the EU SF are channeled and implemented through the state's regional offices. Regional operational programmes (OPs) are settled by a regional partnership which decides the different levels of co-financing of the actors on the ground (with generally a top-up financing coming from the départements regarding the national financing counterpart).

We have also to highlight the capacity of a Region to “interpret” the decentralization laws, namely taking initiatives aimed at targeted interventions in the framework of a sectoral public policy for which its competences are not extended (e.g. environment policy).

Could it be possible to imagine the same capacity of initiative concerning maritime policy? Could maritime affairs be an experimental sector in this regard?

The management of maritime affairs deserves a more dynamic point of view aimed at designing renewed forms of governance among actors, taking into consideration the EU policy-making processes and the fact that European institutions are pushing for a better integration of maritime policies in the MS, tendency initiated with the creation of the IMP and its necessary enforcement at a decentralized level.

In general, concerning **maritime policies** can be observed in **France**<sup>9</sup> quite pronounced fragmentation of governance on the Italian and Spanish models, beyond the fundamental differences stressed concerning their constitutionality. In terms of political representation, however, we can underline the existence of a political delegate especially in charge of maritime affairs (“Vice-Présidence à la Mer, au Littoral et à la Pêche”) in PACA, accompanied by its delegation, but not involved in maritime transports which is the duty of the “Vice-Présidence aux transports”, nor in maritime research and coastal tourism for example. The Vice-President is in charge of the coordination of all coastal and maritime actions in relation with the others regional representatives. One key-word to understand the repartition of competencies in France is “coordination” and cooperation with state offices like the “Direction interrégionale de la Mer” (DIRM), the “Direction Régionale de l'Environnement, de l'Aménagement et du Logement” (DREAL), the “Secrétariat Général de la Mer” (SG Mer) and the Conservatoire du Littoral for example. As mentioned above, French Regions have no legal competencies to manage coastal zones, except Corsica which has a special status. Overall maritime competencies are those aimed at helping fishing and aquaculture regional activities. But as it is also evoked in introduction, local governments have the possibility to imply themselves on policies on a voluntary basis and, for PACA, it is the case for coastal and maritime policies. A reform concerning French local authorities is being prepared and would perhaps modify the current governance framework in a direction more favorable to Regions.

But this specificity is not “relayed” on the ground. Indeed, concerning the technical organization of the regional management of maritime affairs, there is a maritime affairs office, the “Service Mer et Littoral” (SMER) with 10 regional agents which manages different parts of regional maritime policy and has competence to coordinate the whole actions with the others offices. It deals with fishing, aquaculture, harbours and nautical events, adaptation to climate change-erosion, fight against pollution at sea, marine data, ICZM, education to marine environment, WFD, historical heritage. Hierarchically, it depends on the “Direction du Développement des Territoires” (DDT). This let think that there is a strong link between spatial planning and maritime management in PACA Regional Council. For ICZM, the task is to coordinates answer of different offices. But other technical departments have an important action on coastal management like the transport, research, economy, and tourism offices, which imposes to maintain a good level of coordination among all regional agents.

PACA Region has a specialized budget for maritime affairs management (6 M€), but it does not reflect a realistic and accurate image of all funds mobilized because money coming from other departments of the Regional Council is also spent for maritime affairs. PACA has not set up yet earmarking actions in favor of maritime policies but it was judged interesting for the future

---

<sup>9</sup> The study only takes into account the PACA answers to the questionnaire. Corsica answers will be presented in another section of the report.

(even if difficult to make). The official budget may appear limited in comparison with the importance of sea activities in PACA, but it has to be put in perspective with the distribution of maritime affairs prerogatives in France.

In terms of maritime tools available, PACA Region is working closely with the “Centre Régional à l’Information Géographique” (CRIGE PACA) on GIS, one organization based in Aix-en-Provence partly funded by the Regional Council which is member of its steering committee (cf. supra). There is not a special GIS for coastal management but a GIS in which we can find different “coastal layers”. The

CRIGE is enriched by thematic working groups. The Region animates the working group dedicated to the “coastal and maritime” topic.

Every two years, a meeting, the “Rencontres Régionales de la Mer”, gathering all regional coastal stakeholders (near 600 people) and local representatives, is organized by the Regional Council in order to debate on the efficiency of regional policies or new policies that will be put in place. The next one will take place in November 2013.

Inside the Regional Council, two civil servants represent the “Conseil Consultatif Régional de la Mer” (CCRM) linked to the SMER. Created in 2005, it is a place of debate and proposals to establish an ongoing dialogue between the maritime sector, to facilitate the exchange of experience and the information flow, and to promote a prospective approach to the sea. It is a notable source of opinions and proposals for regional action in maritime affairs. The actors of the maritime industry are directly associated with the operation of this structure. More than 102 people are members, representing the diversity of these activities.

In strategic terms, it is important to notice the recent drafting and validation of the new regional maritime strategy valid for the PACA territory (“Stratégie Régionale de la Mer et du Littoral”-SRML). This important reference document was elaborated in an IMP objective and was the result of a 2 years consultation. The SMRL was approved by our political representatives in 2012 in plenary session. It is composed of two phases: a diagnosis one which screens a lot of maritime information and an operational one which describes issues and orientations based on the diagnosis. With this strategy, the Regional Council is equipped with a fundamental tool that guides actions and decisions for the future of regional maritime policies.

In terms of public information (elaboration of specific publications, existence of consultation bodies), beyond the existence of the CCRM previously presented, there is no other official consultative structures inside the Regional Council. Likewise, no specific publications are produced by the SMER. The Regional Internet site provides some basic information about maritime policies but there is no paper publication centered on sea activities that could be released internally in a given periodicity. Sometimes specific maritime information circulates through the official publication “Ma Région”, edited every month.

About relationships with the research sector, PACA is often working with Universities regarding specific aspects like the protection of Posidonia or adaptation to climate change. For fishing, the Regional Council cooperates with the French Public organization dedicated to marine resources, the IFREMER<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> <http://wwz.ifremer.fr/mediterranee>

Regarding the transnational aspect of maritime affairs governance, the PACA Regional Council does not have common tools or formal relations for the management or data exchange with the French State. And at local level, bottom up governance is done through the CRIGE PACA and the “Conseils Généraux” which represent the French provinces (“départements”). When ICZM is concerned, the Region participates to all consultation organizations of each project. Relationships with the EU are not formal in so far as SF are managed by the State in liaison with the French permanent representation to the EU. A regional office in Brussels, part of the International and European affairs Direction, furnishes targeted information about EU legislation and is involved in some monitoring work for all regional departments interested in EU policy making, including the SMER. With MAP or one of its RAC, no official relationships are built even if in MAREMED, the ICZM working group is the occasion to reflect and cooperate alongside with PAP/RAC about the implementation of the IZCM Protocol to the Barcelona Convention.

About projects, PACA is used to launching European ones via the Med programme for which the regional participation is very active. At this time, only MAREMED project is involving the SMER. At national level, the bathymetric Lidar project (LITTO3D) involves the Regional Council. In 2003, the French “Institut Géographique National” (IGN) and “Service Hydrographique et Océanographique de la Marine” (SHOM) have been asked by the Prime Minister to join efforts to produce together a modern and precise topographic and bathymetric model of the entire French coasts. The area extends from the 10 meters contour line inland to the distance of 10 kilometers seaward, or 6 nautical miles from the coastal baselines. This project was created to meet hundred or more requirements expressed by coastal managers concerned by the protection and exploitation of the littoral and by users of geo-referenced data. LITTO 3D should become the core of all future integrated coastal management projects.

On maritime themes, PACA is of course involved with the CPMR broad network and its respective working groups. At the CPMR level, the Regional Council coordinated a working group on data and cartography and a working group on maritime policies within the IMC-CPMR Commission. The Region is part of the “Alpes-Med” Euroregion<sup>11</sup> with Rhône-Alpes, Piedmont, Liguria, and Val d'Aosta. And this cooperation structure gathers more than 17 million of European citizens.

Finally, regarding inter-regional or inter-state agreements, we can notice the participation of the Region in the French delegation of RAMOGE agreement among Monaco, Italy and France (agreement which covers the area from the Rhône River to the Magra River (PACA and Liguria)). RAMOGE<sup>12</sup> fosters cooperation among public administrations in order to reduce human's activities ‘impacts on marine ecosystems.

Another agreement, the PELAGOS<sup>13</sup> one for the protection of Mediterranean marine mammals (covering a special marine protected area extending about 90.000 km<sup>2</sup> in the north-western Mediterranean Sea between Italy, France and the Island of Sardinia, encompassing Corsica and

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.euroregion-alpes-mediterranee.eu/>

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.ramoge.org/ramogeuk/accueil.php3>; <http://www.ramoge.org/ramogeuk/sanctuaire.php3>

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.sanctuaire-pelagos.org/accueil/>

the Tuscan Archipelago), in which the Region is indirectly part of, reveals the utmost importance of this topic for regional action.

### 1.1.2 General principles of governance of maritime policies in the 3 Islands forming the partnership

- **Principles of governance of maritime policies in Corsica**

In terms of **global governance** in **Corsica** Island, a French territory, the regionalization movement in the 1970s led to the creation of two departments in southern Corsica and northern Corsica in 1975. Now Corsica Region has a special status (Law of 13 May 1991 on the status of the territorial collectivity of Corsica conferring the local authority with special status) which takes account of its geography and history and provides the territory with extensive powers and a domestic Assembly. The law of 22 January 2002 gave Corsica new skills, but did not impact the previous status (now we speak about the “Territorial Collectivity of Corsica”, the “Collectivité Territoriale de Corse”).

Corsica has the same geographical isolation compared with Crete, located 180 km from the nearest mainland point.

Corsica stands out from other French Regions in terms of maritime governance with the OEC, the “Office de l’environnement de la Corse”, our partner within MAREMED. Created in May 1991, this specific public institution is in charge of promoting and coordinating regional policy in the environmental field. The Corsican Regional Authority extends its intervention through agencies and offices, a cross and essential dimension to its policies. Environmental concerns as coastline protection are crucial in Corsica. Some fields of action are assumed by the OEC, including fishing. As a local authority, even if it is enjoying a special status, partnerships are the same than those formed in the metropolitan area (for example with the relevant departments of the State or Regional Directorates like the DREAL for environmental issues). The OEC also contributes to the evaluation and analysis of public policies and projects, and thus their impact on the environment. With a workforce of some 103 officers and a primitive budget of around 20 M€, the OEC seeks to mobilize public or private actors, boosting local development and sustainable development.

In general, concerning governance of **maritime policies** in **Corsica** can be observed the same fragmentation than in Continental France. In terms of political representation, the Executive Advisor, President of the OEC, represents the Region for all environmental issues, including those related to maritime affairs. This situation differs from continental Regions where vice-Presidents are in general in charge of maritime affairs. Responsibilities are shared between the Assembly of “Collectivité Territoriale de Corse” and specific public institutions like the OEC.

Concerning the technical organization, different departments manage different policies linked to maritime affairs. To set an example, fishing issues are addressed by the “marine and terrestrial ecosystems” direction and the two departments “support to fishing and aquaculture activities” and “strategy and sciences of the sea”. ICZM is a cross-cutting matter which is not specifically supported by a unique service, due to its heterogeneous characteristics. To illustrate, regarding actions aimed at coastal protection and fight against erosion, the “prevention, pollution and risk management” direction is dealing with this issue. Data management, including marine data, is taken in charge by the “informatics system” department which is also responsible for the

territorial GIS and we have to underline that maritime transports is managed inside the Office dedicated to “transports” within the “Collectivité Territoriale de Corse” (internal service).

As budget for maritime affairs is concerned, we have some information regarding the funds available to address coastal management and protection. The pollution and risks prevention department has indeed a 450 000 € annual budget for this whereas 1.4 M€ are devoted to fisheries management inside the “marine ecosystems” department.

In strategic terms, a spatial planning specificity concerns the Island. Indeed, Corsica is defining a management plan, called the PADDUC (“Plan d’aménagement et de développement durable de la Corse”), which is a document required by section 12 of the 22 January 2002 French Act on Corsica.

This is an important document that, in French Law, has the same value of:

- a planning scheme development territorial directive (“Directive Territoriale d’Aménagement- DTA”) which was renamed after the enforcement of the July 2010 Grenelle 2 Law the “Directive Territoriale d’Aménagement et de Développement Durables- DTADD”). A DTA is in France a strategic planning document which allows the State, in a given area, to design a particular framework for environmental and spatial planning issues. It is developed under the responsibility of the State in conjunction with local authorities and associations of local authorities. It is approved by decree by the State.
- a sea development scheme (“Schéma de Mise en Valeur de la Mer”- SMVM) which is a planning tool designed to improve the integration and development of the coastline in an overall sustainable planning approach.

The PADDUC, strategic framework document, is intended to replace the current Development Plan of Corsica.

It is prepared by the Territorial Assembly of Corsica after being adopted and submitted for consideration to the economic, social and cultural Council of Corsica (“le Conseil économique, social et culturel”- CESC) which is the Corsican consultative structure. It must be approved by the Corsican Assembly prior to a public inquiry.

A draft PADDUC was initiated by the Corsican Assembly in 2009, but it aroused strong controversy on the island. He was particularly criticized for sacrificing the coastal environment, without enough care about the environment and sustainable development. The project has met with strong opposition, and it was finally removed and rejected. The PADDUC was one of the issues of local elections in 2010 and was redrafted. It is now about to be adopted as the legislative project will be submitted to local representatives’ vote in October 2013, for an entering into force programmed in 2014.

It must: locate major infrastructure and equipment; set cultural and regional economic development objectives, including tourism, agriculture, social, and those relating to the preservation of the environment; define broad guidelines for spatial planning, transportation in a multimodal approach, recovery of energy resources, protection and development of the territory; complete the list of terrestrial and marine areas, sites and landscapes which characteristics are remarkable of the natural and cultural heritage of the coastal environments

to be preserved; finally determine spaces intended for seasonal activities within the "one hundred meters" coastal strip which may be authorized.

Interaction with local stakeholders, fishing and environmental professionals is strong within the Collectivité territoriale de Corse. Some work is being done in consultation with the Regional Committee on Marine Fisheries and Aquaculture (CRPEM), the Prud'homies, and conventionally with artisanal fishermen to collect marine data in particular. This presence in various steering committees involving local stakeholders is essential for the OEC.

In terms of maritime tools available, the Territorial Assembly of Corsica jointly with the OEC operates a geographic information platform<sup>14</sup>, acting as an observatory for the island.

Maps under the Regional Strategic Analysis are indeed being produced and it is relevant to assert the high utility of cartography in understanding coastal erosion phenomena, risks prevention, and economic activities distribution in a given territory.

In terms of public information, we may mention the Natura 2000 steering committee with various dialogues on various themes such as fishing, boating, etc.... The steering committee meets two or three times per year. It leads to the production of the DOCOB, the management plan of the area. It may also include the Action Plan for the Marine Environment (linked to the MFD implementation) and the Regional Strategic Analysis.

There is a conference organized by the Regional Directorate of the Environment, Planning and Housing about every two years, bringing together the different actors of maritime affairs from Corsica region among others.

About relationships with the research sector, it has to be said that links are teeming with IFREMER, STARESO, BRGM, and consultants. The Stella Mare (Sustainable TEchnologies for Littoral Aquaculture and MARine REsearch) platform<sup>15</sup> is another way of entering in interaction with the University world (in this case with the Pasquale Paoli University of Corte). The platform is focused on ecological engineering in coastal and marine area. It is part of a dynamics of projects' development to convert research into wealth. This unit was labeled by the CNRS in June 2011, and is attached to the Institute of Ecology and Environment (INEE). Stella Mare seeks the control and integrated management of marine and coastal resources of Corsica to allow a transfer of technological innovations to the maritime professionals in order to assist in the development and diversification of their production, but also in the management of their resources promoting responsible fisheries and sustainable aquaculture. The project is centered on the research, transfer and awareness and revolves around 14 research programs.

Good collaborations has allowed to produce a good database on the island that need to be more collected, developed, intercalibrated and summarized. To reach efficiently the Marine Strategy Directive targets for example, these local efforts must be helped and funded by national and European funds, taking into account the size of the work to be accomplished (length of the

---

<sup>14</sup> <http://carto.oec.fr/oec/authent.inc.php>

<sup>15</sup> <http://stellamare.univ-corse.fr/spip.php?rubrique1>



coastline). Indeed, research institutions are sized more on the island population (350 000 inhabitants) than the length of the coastline (1 000 km coastline which is comparable to length of the French mainland Mediterranean coastline but for several million inhabitants). Despite help of national institutions to produce environmental data, this creates real difficulties to get good adapted environmental diagnosis in the short delays imposed by the Marine Strategy Directive.

Regarding the transnational aspect of maritime affairs governance, Corsica Region is a member of the IMC-CPMR and the MedPAN South Project<sup>16</sup> which is a 4-year collaborative project aimed at improving the management effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in the south and east of the Mediterranean and supporting the creation of new ones.

Led by WWF Mediterranean, it partners with more than 20 national and international organizations to deliver an ambitious programme of support for the MPAs and relevant authorities.

Corsica Region actively takes part of the PELAGOS agreement like PACA Region, as the sanctuary is located in the Ligurian basin of the Mediterranean Sea. Corsica has also close links with the Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA) which was established by the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols in order to assist Mediterranean countries in implementing the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean. Tunisia has been hosting the Centre since its establishment in 1985.

In the same vein, international collaborations have been established very early, and the OEC has benefited to EU funding which represents, year after year, almost 30% of its resources, both in terms of investment and operations. The OEC has carried out some very large programs in a variety of areas, from collaboration on coastal management to fire prevention.

The OEC participates to a wide variety of projects implemented, first and foremost MAREMED and RESMAR, alongside with Tuscany. The OEC had also conducted the project which led to the creation of the Parc Marin International des Bouches de Bonifacio (PMIBB). The OEC was appointed sole manager of the French part of the international marine park. Its action is defined by the decrees establishing the natural reserves concerned, and by agreements binding the various institutional partners, the South Corsica province (“Département”), the Conservatoire du Littoral and the municipalities concerned.

The quest for coherence of all these actions from the development of appropriate methodologies to innovative partnerships, such as with the ADEME, the BRGM, the RMC Water Agency, and of course with the relevant departments of the State and local authorities, determines every moment the intervention of the OEC in all the fields where it has competences.

---

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.medpan.org/en/projet-medpan-sud>

- **Principles of governance of maritime policies in Crete**

In terms of **global governance**, **Crete** is part from Greece. Crete is the largest Greek island and the 5th largest in the Mediterranean Basin. It is located in the South of Aegean Sea covering a territory of 8.336 km<sup>2</sup>. Its population was in 2005 about 605 000 inhabitants. During summer, tourism makes this number much higher. Main infrastructures include 2 international airports and 1 national, as well as 5 big ports (the port in Heraklion is one of the 5 biggest in Greece). The island is mountainous (highest peak on 2.456 m). The climate is typical mediterranean: mild and humid, soft winters with considerable rains, particularly in the western part, and snow only on the mountains. Most rivers of Crete are small and seasonal (completely dry during summertime).

Only ten rivers have water all year round. Indicative names: Geropotamos, Anapodiaris, Kiliaris, Tiflos, Kolenis, Kourtaliotis.

The coastline of the island is estimated about 1.300 km (on maps only 41.07 %). Beaches are about 320 km in total. About 70% of them are in danger due to erosion. The main erosion reasons are: strong sea streams; no big rivers on the island; most rivers are small with reduced ability of sediments' transfer to the beaches; the abrupt bottom line of the beaches which doesn't favor the sediments' storage; small dams and mainly the maritime works in the coasts (tourist and fishing ports, marinas, near coast roads, etc.) disturb the sand's storage and distribution, creating or worsening erosion.

Greece has opted for a parliamentary system. Executive power is organized around a head of state and government. The head of state is the President of the Republic, elected by indirect universal suffrage for five years. The Prime Minister is the head of government: appointed by the President of the Republic, he is the leader of the majority party. The Prime Minister chooses his ministers and is officially appointed by the President.

The legislature is unicameral: the National Assembly (the "Vouli") has 300 members elected by direct universal suffrage for four years, with the exception of twelve members chosen by each state party to the percentage of votes obtained.

Devolved authorities reside mainly in the Regions. The region, administrative structure established in 1986, is not a legal person. It is primarily intended to plan and coordinate regional development. The secretary general of the region, selected by the Council of Ministers on a proposal by decree of the Minister of the Interior, is a government official. He chairs the Regional Council, an advisory body that brings together the Prefects, the Presidents of councils and representatives of associations of cities and towns. It is responsible for interdepartmental coordination and economic planning.

Greece now has 13 Regions: East Macedonia and Thrace, Central Macedonia, Western Macedonia, Epirus, Thessaly, Ionian Islands, Western Greece, Central Greece, Attica, the Peloponnese, the North Aegean, Southern Aegean, Mount Athos, and Crete (The Decentralized Administration of Crete is our partner within MAREMED).

The formation of the Greek state is historically related to the adoption of centralism. However, decentralization has never stopped to be seen as a political tendency which entered a new era

with the 2010 Kallikratis reform on line with the Greek Constitution. The place of local government in the administrative system was strongly reinforced.

Two justifications which explained the reorganization of decentralization in Greece is the economic development of the country and also the better use of resources from EU regional policy.

The new provisions of this law redefine the boundaries of local authorities and modify the election of local representatives. This reform aims to save taxpayers' money by limiting the number of local authorities, and, as a consequence, to rationalize management processes and reduce expenditures. Another primary goal is to merge smaller municipalities into larger.

The major advantage of Kallikratis Law lays upon the fact that local authorities became key players in local development.

In summary, the main aspects of the reform are:

- Two-thirds reduction of the number of municipalities and corporations
- The removal of the 57 "Prefectures"
- The creation of new Regions
- The creation of decentralized government
- Changes in methods of financing local authorities
- The evolution of the mandate of local elected representatives (4 to 5 years)
- The legal age for candidates for municipal and Regional Councils is lowered from 21 to 18 years with an expanding of their responsibilities.

More precisely, the former system of 13 Regional Administrations, 54 Prefectures and 1.033 Municipalities/communities is replaced by:

7 Decentralized Administrations (containing one or more Regions)

13 Regional Administrations (remain as Local Authorities)

Municipalities – the number is reduced to 325

The reform impacted the organization of Greek administration. Regions represent the secondary level of local government:

Greek Regions have almost the same geographical boundaries as the previous "Prefectures" completely removed. They now provide certain functions. Officials, Prefects and councilors are now elected for five years by universal suffrage. The 13 new Regions were formed by the merger of the 54 Prefectures, 3 super-Prefectures and sub-Prefectures. Each Region is divided into "prefectural units" that coincide with the former departments, each of which is headed by a vice-Prefect, member-elected on the list of the Prefect.

Regional politicians play a major role in the planning and implementation of the regional development program, they were given for the first time the responsibility to decide on the development of their territory, as well as the preparation and implementation of regional OPs, participation in the process of preparation and implementation of the National Strategic Plan for the current period (2007-2013).

Decentralized administrations like Crete form the tertiary level of local government. They consist of one, two or three Regions. They are led by a Secretary General appointed by the government, holding all the decision-making responsibilities. They have more or less the same responsibilities of the former Regions. For the first time, the decentralized public administration stops dealing with local business to focus on public affairs and tasks as required by the Constitution.

There are 7 decentralized administrations: Attica, Macedonia-Thrace, Western Macedonia, Epirus, Thessaly, Central Greece, Peloponnese, Western Greece, Ionian Islands, Aegean and Crete.

The island of Crete is positioned 160 Km from the Greek mainland and 320 Km from Athens/Piraeus, which is the main port/gate for importing/exporting most commercial products. The island is characterized by a geographical isolation.

In general, concerning governance of **maritime policies** in **Crete**, in terms of political representation, the Secretary General of the Region of Crete represents the island concerning maritime aspects. About technical organization, although maritime affairs and coastal management are crucial for the island, there has not been a political body or Directorate in the Regional Administration dedicated to this sector. ICZM and marine policies in general have no specific budget nor specific service on a national and regional level, thus their implementation lies on a multitude of different services. There is a lack of coordinating mechanisms for state involvement in coastal management, and some coordination and cooperation's missing links between the ministries and the independent public corporations involved. Responsibilities of coastal planning are spread among national, regional and local level, causing several problems of gaps and overlaps.

So far the Region of Crete and its different departments officially deal only with the control and licensing of maritime activities especially under the scope of environmental protection and local development.

But in accordance with the implementation of the IMP, and the fact that all maritime issues and challenges should be analyzed under this integrated perspective, close cooperation with Universities and other research Institutes was reinforced. This evolution should be considered as an attempt to renew processes of governance.

It is through spatial planning and environmental policy that coastal zone management in Greece is regulated. At national level, the structure responsible for spatial and environmental policy, both terrestrial and marine, is the Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change.

Unfortunately, budget components associated with maritime policies fields were not informed.

Other National authorities which influence directly or indirectly the formulation of coastal policy are the Ministry of Maritime Affairs Islands and Fisheries, the Ministry of Agricultural Development, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of National Defense.

The legislative framework for ICZM is not unified, as in other European countries concerned by MAREMED. Elements of it can be found in general spatial or sectoral policies regarding urban development, tourism, industry, or agriculture. Also in the general context and limitations provided by the Law on the foreshore and the waterfront, the Land Development Law (the Zoning Law) and the Environmental Framework Law.

In terms of maritime tools available, the Region of Crete does not have a complete GIS for coastal management. Cooperation links with the university world offer possibilities for the Region to

overcome this lack (e.g. Technical University of Crete, the Foundation of Research and Technology and the Hellenic Centre for Marine Research).

As far as public information is concerned, the above mentioned bodies also provide publications and the organization of information events linked to maritime sector. With this regard, it should be mentioned that each year some local events are organized in Crete either by local authorities, associations and unions, or even in the framework of national events (e.g. the Navy Week). Most of these events can count on an organizational support from the Region of Crete.

In strategic terms, the recent reform in Greece impacting the Cretan territory offers a great opportunity for new guidelines to be drawn and whole new policies to be developed and implemented by new special Departments of Administration. This could represent an added value concerning maritime activities for the island.

Renewed governance could help address what was underlined as hindrances regarding marine policies. To illustrate, Crete is characterized by unique ecosystems which are a notorious advantage for the island as a tourism destination but they also limit all activities that can be developed in those areas. The unique ecosystems make all Marine Policy procedures more complicated: more areas to be characterized, more information to be gathered, more monitoring to be done, more targets to be achieved. The protected areas are less populated, they produce less income and on the other hand demand resources for their monitoring and protection. The municipalities by their own are not able to finance the necessary measures for the monitoring and protection of protected areas. Another characteristic about governance of maritime affairs in Crete which should be improved lies in the lack of modern and sufficient infrastructure for fishing and the renewal of the fishing fleet.

Crete is also, as an island, logically at the heart of international waters. This geographical location led to some specificities when it comes to implement EU laws like the Marine Strategy Directive for instance, in so far as Cretan local authorities detain responsibility for the protection of marine areas within the island territory, but in practice can only manage the activities on land and some activities close to the coastline (aquaculture and fishing activities, ports etc.). Off-shore activities, like maritime transport and fishing are not controlled by local authorities. That is why the protection of the Cretan marine environment is impacted by international agreements which are fundamental for the island.

About relationships with the research sector, we can underline that links are quite furnished with for example the Technical University of Crete, the Foundation of Research and Technology and the Hellenic Centre for Marine Research (Crete's branch) active in this sector and providing valuable consulting services to the Region of Crete.

Regarding the transnational aspect of maritime affairs governance, the Decentralized Administration of Crete demonstrates an important activity as far participation in relevant European projects and related initiatives are concerned. This experience within EU projects constitutes also another action towards a new approach on maritime affairs. These projects provide some budget in order to undertake some actions, like studies' elaboration, activities aimed at raising awareness, and sensitization of local authorities and stakeholders.

- **Principles of governance of maritime policies in Cyprus**

In terms of **global governance**, **Cyprus** is the third biggest island in the Mediterranean (after Sicily and Sardinia) with 772 km of shoreline. Cyprus is an independent Republic which entered

the EU in May 2004 and is part of the Eurozone since 2008 (but the island is not a member of Schengen). The sovereign country is characterized by a presidential system of government. The President assumes the executive power via a Council of Ministers. Whereas legislative power in Cyprus is performed by the House of Representatives, the island is divided into 6 administrative districts which implement governmental policies (Famagusta, Kyrenia, Nicosia, Limassol, Paphos, and Larnaca). In terms of governance, each district is governed by a District Commissioner, named by the Government, in charge of the coordination of all Ministries in its district and under the responsibility of the Ministry of Interior. The District Officer is the representative of the State (the districts are thus not local authorities). They correspond to the first level of local administrative units established by Eurostat. And they follow a logic of devolution.

At local level, urban areas are placed under the jurisdiction of Municipalities. Communities/cities (local authorities) are another administrative structure equivalent to municipalities. Cyprus counts 33 Cities. They are administered by a municipal council and an Administrative Committee. Their main fields of competences include public health, construction and maintenance of roads, waste management, trade and economic activities, as well as the promotion of the area. It has to be said that local authorities are subject to central government approval for all legislation passed.

The political and administrative organization of the Republic of Cyprus details, regarding the national level, that the President is elected for a five years mandate by direct universal suffrage while Parliament is unicameral and consists of the House of Representatives whose members are elected for 2/3 of the Greek Cypriot community and 1/3 by the Turkish Cypriot community. The office of President is reserved for Cyprus Greek whereas the office of Vice-President returns to a Turkish Cypriot individual.

Within MAREMED, the State of Cyprus is represented by ANETEL, the Larnaca District Development Agency (ANETEL), a non-profit organization established in 2003 in the models of development structures and EU Agencies. The status of the Agency is a Public Equivalent Body. Its actions are especially targeted in the District of Larnaca. ANETEL represents all the 6 Municipalities of the District, almost all the 45 free Communities of the district of Larnaca, the local Commercial Industrial Chamber of Larnaca, the Women Association of Rural Larnaca, some Cooperative Organizations of the District, the Union of Communities of Larnaca (in which members are all the Community Boards of the District of Larnaca), Municipalities and Communities of the free District of Famagusta.

The establishment of a flexible mechanism like the Agency was desirable and recommended at the beginning of the 2000s. The active participation of the local self-governmental organizations of the District of Larnaca to the developments of the EU would be reinforced, especially thus through their participation to EU funded programmes and projects.

The ANETEL EU Programmes Department is responsible for the direct networking and communication of the Agency with the EU Institutions and EC DGs. Furthermore, it is responsible for the networking of the Agency with other Regional Authorities and organizations. The Department has also a permanent representative in Brussels who lobbies, monitors, and conveys useful information. The Agency is thus able to follow the developments in the framework of the EU decision-making processes. The EU Programmes Department is responsible for the involvement in Calls for proposals associated with EU funded programmes.

The final objective is the approval of project proposals submitted as lead partners or as simple partners.

In general, concerning governance of **maritime policies** in the Republic of **Cyprus** can be observed, in terms of political representation, the political delegate which is dedicated to the areas involving Maritime Policy is the Minister of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment.

About technical organization, for all maritime areas, the responsible is the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment with different departments of the Ministry. There is then a correspondence between political representation of maritime affairs and technical organization of maritime affairs. Concerning water policy, the competent structure is the Water Development Department, and for fishing activities, it is the Department of Fisheries and Marine Research. The Environmental Department heads ICZM and Adaptation to climate change policies. When the constructions for the improvement of the coastal areas are concerned, the organism responsible is the Public Works Department. However no department manages the marine data thematic. Indeed, Cyprus has not yet developed a Coastal Maritime Data (CMD) policy.

The Departments of the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment which are involved in maritime affairs cooperate each other with common tools and data exchange for research purposes and for new constructions for the improvement of maritime areas.

In Cyprus, except from the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment which is the main responsible Ministry for the protection of the coastal areas, the Ministry of Communications and Works is also responsible for the hard infrastructure aimed at marine protection.

On budget, the only policy area that has specific budget is the fishing one. The 2007-2013 Operational Programme for the Fisheries programmed 39.5 M€ (fishing and aquaculture activities, processing and marketing of fishery and aquaculture products, as well as measures concerning fishing infrastructure works). Additionally the OP deals with the sustainable development of fisheries areas and protection of the marine environment too.

For the rest, the budget depends on the needs that they may have every year.

In terms of maritime tools available, the only database Cyprus operates is the Legislation information inside the website of the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment.

As far as public information and strategy are concerned, no regular consultation nor maritime main event are scheduled but once a year each Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment publishes an annual report.

About relationships with the research sector, Cyprus officials are used to entering in interaction with researchers. The CAMP (Coastal Area Management Programme) of Cyprus for the Coastal Zone Management Protection is a cooperation structure between private researchers and the Environmental Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment. On water issues, they are cooperating with the MEDRC (Middle East Desalination Research Center), an organism of Excellence in Desalination and Water Reuse Technology.

Regarding the transnational aspect of maritime affairs governance, Cyprus is participating in transnational, trans-regional or European networks of cooperation, providing information from and about the EU to the ANETEL's staff (and to Cyprus in general). The District of Larnaca is not

an IMC-CPMR member but exchange of experiences and best practices with other organizations are common tasks for ANETEL. It is also worth to repeat that throughout the years ANETEL has implemented many European Projects.

Concerning ICZM, in the framework of the additional Protocol to the Barcelona Convention, CAMP<sup>17</sup> Cyprus adopts three overriding principles: It is a country-driven project designed to respond to national and local priorities perceived and defined according to the experiences, realities, and policy issues of Cyprus. It is also based on an integrated approach to coastal environment in order to address the diverse pressures and constraints that affect the coastal zone. Finally it focuses on the socio-economic aspects of coastal management given the importance of coastal development to the national and local economy.

Concerning water policies<sup>18</sup>, ANETEL is also in contact with the Mediterranean Hydrological Cycle Observing System (Med-Hycos) which is an information system based on a World Wide Web to Database connectivity dealing with managing and numerical/graphical processing of Hydro-meteorological data. The GEMS (Global Environment Monitoring System-Water United Nations Program) which provides scientific data and information on the state and trends of global inland water quality is also a structure with whom ANETEL is connected. The GEMS is dedicated to providing environmental water quality data and information of the highest integrity, accessibility and interoperability. These data are used in water assessments and capacity building initiatives around the world.

Two other main institutions can be highlighted to illustrate the transnational aspects of maritime affairs governance in Cyprus. First the MedMPA<sup>19</sup>: the project's general objective, under the Barcelona Convention, is to strengthen the conservation and sustainable management of the elements that make up the Mediterranean marine and coastal biological diversity. The actions advocated have been designed to act as models and thus play a pilot, demonstrational part. They also aim at strengthening the concerned countries' national capacities, to guarantee the future of marine resources; particularly those, which are of particular interest or are being jeopardized.

To promote the choice, creation and management of MPAs and lead them to be included on the SPAMI List, RAC/SPA has developed and implemented this Project, with the financial backing of the European Commission, for seven countries in the southern and eastern Mediterranean (Algeria, Cyprus, Israel, Malta, Morocco, Syria and Tunisia).

---

<sup>17</sup> Taking into account the importance of the ICZM Protocol as a powerful tool for the sustainable development of coastal zones, CAMPs are seen as the ICZM Protocol implementation projects at the local level, i.e. as prototype interventions to assist countries to implement the Protocol.

<http://www.cyprus.gov.cy/moa/agriculture.nsf/All/04B9487405A22B96C2257149002957C9?OpenDocument>  
<http://www.ucm.org.cy/Depository/Document/518/Document.pdf>

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.moa.gov.cy/moa/wdd/Wdd.nsf/all/462E24C7DDBE1BB4C225772700260C03?opendocument>

<sup>19</sup> Assistance to countries for creating and managing Special Protected Areas (SPAs). To promote the choice, creation and management of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and lead them to be included on the SPAMI (Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance) List, RAC/SPA has developed and implemented this Project, with the financial backing of the EU, for 7 countries in the southern and eastern Mediterranean (Algeria, Cyprus, Israel, Malta, Morocco, Syria and Tunisia).

[http://www.rac-spa.org/sites/default/files/doc\\_spamis/liste-aspim\\_2012.pdf](http://www.rac-spa.org/sites/default/files/doc_spamis/liste-aspim_2012.pdf)



Cyprus also participates to the UNEP MedPOL Program. MedPOL (the marine pollution assessment and control component of MAP) is responsible for the follow up work related to the implementation of the LBS Protocol, the Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution from Land-Based Sources and Activities (1980, as amended in 1996), and of the dumping and hazardous wastes Protocols. MedPOL assists Mediterranean countries in the formulation and implementation of pollution monitoring programmes, including pollution control measures and the drafting of action plans aiming to eliminate pollution from land-based sources.

About Interregional or inter-state agreements, concerning water issues, we can stress INBO (International Network of Basin Organizations), and for fishing, ICCAT (International Commission for the conservation of Atlantic Tuna), and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), also called the Law of the Sea Convention or the Law of the Sea Treaty.

About Adaptation to Climate Change, Cyprus did not have any specific policy for the coastal areas. The legislation used in the Environmental Department within the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment is the Kyoto Protocol, international agreement linked to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

## 2. Recommendations for renewed governance in the Mediterranean

The main results of the survey on maritime affairs governance submitted to the 12 Regions partners located in 5 different countries are unanimous: in terms of governance, it was indeed found a great variety of governance methods, structures and tools regarding coastal areas management among countries. It (the governance process) can either be transferred to the Regions which themselves may delegate part of their competences to lower decision levels, or shared between the States and local governments.

Besides, when governance is decentralized to the Regions, there may be large differences between Regions within the same country on how to implement maritime policies and subsequently their operational management.

### **2.1 The European project MAREMED, a concrete example acting as a best practice of renewed governance of maritime affairs**

The main goal of **MAREMED project** is to reflect and propose concrete solutions on how to improve governance processes at the Mediterranean basin scale. MAREMED contributes to those reflections.

The partnership constitutes a significant sample representative of the Mediterranean issues and in particular covers:

- 4 maritime sub-basins: the north-west, Adriatic, Aegean Sea and eastern basin,
- 3 large deltas: the French Rhone, the Italian Po and the Spanish Ebro,
- 3 islands: Corsica, Crete and Cyprus, characterized by different governance processes (Cf. first part of the report)
- Several long contiguous coastlines allowing for interregional work, joint cartographic tests and same geomorphologic characteristics. This ultimate point favors pertinent reflections about the setting of sea policies aiming at addressing mutual issues affecting those contiguous coastlines.

The partnership extended to the CPMR helps promote the valorization of the results by all the European maritime Regions. The results expected within MAREMED as the BC 2012, which outlines the setting of macro projects, are also in phase with the EU will to promote best maritime practices and related political initiatives giving impulsion to concrete achievements, in order to reinvent cooperation.

Maritime policy is one of the CPMR's priorities and the Regions have been actively involved for over 10 years within the context of the "Europe of the Sea" and then "Aquamarina" initiatives in close consultation with the EC. However, governance of maritime policies in the Mediterranean still suffers from a lack of dialogue between the various institutional levels and the role played by the Regions, operational players alongside the States for implementing several parts of international regulations. Clarity is somehow missing and improved synergy is required.

In 2006 the Mediterranean Regions created a "maritime policy" working group<sup>20</sup>, a network of technical services for the member Regions contributing to the promotion of an IMP in the Mediterranean, in particular on the following themes: marine pollution, ICZM, adaptation to climate change, fishery production, sea research, transport, maritime safety and governance.

This work highlighted the lack of dialogue between the Regions and the other institutional levels, identified the challenges and shared priorities of the Regions, proposed areas of joint action and pointed out the need to come up with a cooperation project (which will become MAREMED) to implement, operationally, the jointly identified priority initiatives. The need to carry out concerted action to manage the challenges and problems of the Mediterranean basin globally has, for 30 years, been behind strong international and European action to tackle them.

The context for MAREMED is therefore supported by a great deal of work and studies resulting in particular:

- Internationally, from the Barcelona agreement (Mediterranean Action Plan: MAP) from the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) and more recently the Barcelona process (Union for the Mediterranean- UfM).
- Europe-wide, from the consultation carried out by the EC for the drafting of the European maritime policy and initiatives undertaken since then as part of the Blue Book action plan, like the 2009 EC Communication to improve governance in the Mediterranean<sup>21</sup>.

Moreover, many regulatory and legal texts provide a framework for Mediterranean maritime policy and the work carried out within MAREMED has, in particular, the goal of proposing an operational view for the implementation of the various parts of this policy such as the recommendation for Integrated management of the coastal areas in association with the Mediterranean ICZM Protocol, the Water Framework and Marine Strategy Framework Directives (WFD and MSFD), the white paper on adaptation to climate change in coastal areas, the application of the INSPIRE Directive linked to the EMODNET portal (building an integrated view of coastal management will require the setting-up of shared cartographic tools and interoperable data, which is also a medium for integrated governance), ICZM and MSP, the next European Common Fisheries Policy (CFP), etc.

<sup>20</sup> <http://www.medregions.com/index.php?act=1.5.3.6>

<sup>21</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2009:0466:FIN:EN:PDF>

Each of these issues is the subject of sectoral studies at the Regional, State or European levels. However, often these studies cannot be compared nor incorporated at the various levels for the same sector, nor between each other to give birth to an integrated policy. This is one of the priorities set up for MAREMED, namely integrating technical tasks in a truly integrated maritime vision, somehow perform a test “grandeur nature” (cross-reference these results in order to obtain a synoptic vision of the strategies applied to the coastal area) with the scope of operating a concrete declination of the IMP via a common interregional work on maritime thematics. In other words, solid technical arguments emerging from MAREMED working groups will be used to back EU maritime policy.

As far as the technical and scientific evaluation of the issues linked to these policies is concerned, the partners, in association with their research centers, have carried out before the launching of

MAREMED studies and projects (ENPI or MED) that have been valorized within MAREMED. Actually, the project partners have for many years taken part in cross-border projects in MAREMED's field and have set up contact networks in the Mediterranean in the field of maritime policies. Bringing the issues together has demonstrated the interest in working in partnership and pooling/mutualizing data. This argument is very important to illustrate once again the utilitarian nature of the project in terms of new ideas about governance principles relevant to maritime affairs.

So MAREMED consists in making an operational analysis of the maritime policies implemented in the coastal areas of the partnership and proposing methods for improved integration and innovative management of these policies (especially regarding the 2014-2020 financial period to come). This exercise is quite new, and no work of this type has been undertaken so far in the Mediterranean.

To sum up, the general goals of the project are:

- Strengthening maritime policies and making them coherent in their economic, environmental, sustainable development and governance aspects by the partner Regions;
- Adding value to the results obtained from the other European maritime Regions using the CPMR's skills and network;
- Disseminating the results to the other local maritime and coastal stakeholders: infra-regional institutions, professionals, research bodies, etc.;
- Allowing the supra-regional institutions to benefit from regional experience: States, the EC and international bodies, in particular those of the Barcelona agreement;
- Setting down MAREMED within a more global dimension through the CPMR's action, both geographically, in the Mediterranean and the other European seabords and in terms of time, by creating an approach and project tools which can be used widely and after the end of the project, taking in mind that the maritime issues tackled go beyond the classical administrative boundaries.

The concomitance of the project's results, declined into the 6 thematics, should help the construction of an integrated view of the issue.

Given the natural link between public opinion and policy decision, and the impact of individual behavior on the quality of the environment, communication and scientific information must be made available to the public at large.

If a public policy of the Sea and the coast can be built with sharing a common vision, how to deal with the relationship between land and sea in the French institutional context (for instance)? Mapping appropriate governance linked to this new shift is, in effect, still in its infancy.

Important developments have however emerged:

- Widening the circle of players institutionally recognized.
- The gradual opening of the legal instruments and administrative tools in order to understand both the land and sea.
- The gradual introduction of the ICZM concept.

To renovate and make governance of maritime affairs more efficient, it appears essential to broaden the circle of recognized political public actors. As we evoked before, the French tradition isolates the management of the Sea from the rest of the territory.

It was not until 2006 that the National Council of Coastline (“Conseil National du Littoral”) chaired by the Prime Minister officially associates elected from Coastal Regions, maritime professionals and NGOs in the development and evaluation of policies and decisions affecting the coastal ecosystem. Again it should be stressed that the terrestrial dimension remains dominant. Nevertheless, for many years, different maritime actors were recognized as legitimate participants: for instance, the “Conservatoire du Littoral”, a State public facility established in 1975 to conduct a land policy, gathers representatives from the State, counties and coastal towns to choose the land to preserve and manage them. Basin committees linked to water agencies whose funding is based on the “polluter/payer” principle are also located in every major district.

It has to be recalled that Regions are key players in coastal areas where the policies conducted at various administrative levels have intermixed influences.

Steady cooperation between technical and administrative services represents indeed an innovative approach in the field of governance able to foster a cross-border dialogue for integrated maritime policies in the Mediterranean.

The ideas produced by MAREMED on these issues had also enabled the identification of the tools needed for managing the coastal areas. On this point, exchanges with scientists working in this field are of considerable importance. A detailed decryption of the answers to the questionnaires taught us that links are particularly expanded between Regions represented inside the MAREMED pool and the scientific world.

Political decision-makers must be assisted in their decisions by technical arguments which allow them to understand the local challenges within an integrated context and a coherent spatial scale, often extending beyond their administrative boundaries. In the same vein than concerning the linkages with the scientists, the creation of technical cross-border platforms, such as FACECOAST<sup>22</sup> (“Face the challenge of climate change in the Mediterranean coastal zones”), must enable the efficiency of these policies carried out by the territorial players to be increased and the notion of sustainable development to make progress. In addition to the large scale strategies

---

<sup>22</sup> [www.facecoast.eu](http://www.facecoast.eu)

and policies, it is important to take into account the players on the ground because the viability of the coastal economies and the attractiveness of the coastal territories depend on the ability of its managers to ensure balanced development.

An improved governance of maritime affairs is necessary for the creation and implementation of an IMP in the Mediterranean which may only be envisaged in the context of cross-border and interregional cooperation. Indeed, an important parameter is that through international collaboration, more elaborate technical solutions are achieved with less cost. The Mediterranean Regions are facing the same problems and are searching for the same solutions. A lot has to be gained from sharing this know-how.

Improving governance should in particular lie upon the development of skills and the strengthening of administrative capacity. Governance processes must be encouraged by the exchange of experience between Regions. The dissemination of results to all levels of governance, professionals and the general public, is also highly desirable in order to enhance the management of coastal and maritime areas for the benefit of all levels of actors. As it was previously mentioned, collaboration has been set up with the other 35 Member Regions of the CPMR Inter-Mediterranean Commission and information will be scattered to the other geographical commissions of the European network, bringing together over 160 Regions.

The wealth of the partnership and its involvement in European projects will allow, thanks to a gathering of contacts and cross-referenced exchanges, a wide range of users and potential project holders to be reached. That is why we can say that MAREMED project thinks as an “idea laboratory” in its methodology. The vocation of the project is to serve as a model for better maritime governance in the future, in accordance with the choices made by the EC for the next years, and for future projects. For example, the experience of MAREMED was surely indispensable for the COASTGAP<sup>23</sup> (“Coastal Governance and Adaptation Policies in the Mediterranean”) European initiative setup (seven partners of COASTGAP were also involved in MAREMED). Other future European initiatives will probably be launched in the future taking into account technical and political results of MAREMED project.

Partners revealed that MAREMED has the advantage of being a platform which puts together various departments in regional governments with respect to the objectives of sustainability, environmental protection, fulfillment of the European Directives linked to maritime issues, with of course the concerns of the Mediterranean Regions.

For instance, the governance of fisheries is a complex topic. As the OPs set too rigorous criteria, Regions cannot develop strategies which are well-ordered on local specificities. It may be more interesting to leave local development strategies in the hands of more flexible implementation tools. It is relevant to assert that one of the most critical challenges regarding European fisheries is the regionalization and simplification of administrative procedures.

The results of the pilot action coordinated by Marche Region have shown that Management Plans can be an effective tool for the development of sustainable fisheries policies, also by means of multiannual planning tools. The management of fisheries at the local level is crucial in the Mediterranean area, where traditions and small-scale fishing play a pivotal role in the sector. In

<sup>23</sup> [http://www.facecoast.eu/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=category&id=9&Itemid=125](http://www.facecoast.eu/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=9&Itemid=125)

addition, Management Plans allow fishermen to become more directly involved in the planning process with a bottom-up approach. And management consortia have proved to be a particularly suitable instrument.

To set another example on how governance principles are of paramount importance, a real and practical ICZM cannot be reached if governance issues are not first solved. Governance is thus at the core of MAREMED reflections.

The EU, via its **2009 EC Communication**, highlighted the importance of launching maritime projects using the SF available for territorial cooperation. The EC proposed thus to help the Mediterranean MS to exchange best practice in IMP. The EU seeks an improving governance of maritime affairs which should balance economic development with the protection of the environment, using as much as possible cross tools such as ICZM and MSP. With this regard, the recent proposal for a directive to merge into a single body law ICZM and MSP, published in March 2013, is positive.

## **2.2 What position to adopt regarding the recent ICZM/MSP European Directive proposal?**

Some scenarios were discussed to update the **EU legislation in terms of ICZM** (2002 Recommendation of the Council of the EU with a non-binding nature). However, there are several legislative regional instruments in which the EU is part of (in the framework of the Barcelona Convention, the EU has signed the ICZM Protocol to the Barcelona Convention for ICZM in the Mediterranean).

Following an impact assessment launched in 2011, DG MARE had to decide between three options:

- Develop general guidelines to promote the development and ownership of best practices;
- Promote the implementation of ICZM and MSP through voluntary measures by adopting a new Recommendation of the Council of the EU (in line with the 2002 current legislation);
- A more detailed set of binding obligations (Directive) or a set of binding obligations directly applicable in the MS (Regulation);
- Establish a legally binding framework through a set of general binding obligations (Framework Directive);
- Implement a combination of these options.

Finally, the impact assessment carried out by the EC study concluded to the relevance of the Framework Directive choice.

A common European framework would have added value if it preserves the existing ICZM and MSP already developed in MS, Regions and sub-sea Regions. In other words, it should not go against what has been previously undertaken by the management of these two themes by the EU.

Regarding the definition of the "coastal zone", it also seems imperative to adapt to local contexts by offering more flexible definitions of the coastal strip according to the problems addressed (erosion, coastal flooding, integrity of land, preservation of coastal and marine biodiversity...). For example, the terminology "coastal zone of influence" appears more appropriate.

The choice of a Framework Directive seems adequate because this instrument is more flexible than a Directive and a Regulation which is directly applicable in the MS in its entirety. Especially the search for consistency between European public policies in favor of the environment encourages to learn from other EU Framework Directives already adopted and implemented in the MS and similar in terms of architecture (such as the WFD). It is also suitable to reason as much as possible throughout the watershed notion in order to streamline governance processes between different actors in pertinent geographical areas sharing similar characteristics.

The land-sea interface in ICZM should be fully taken into account. New EU initiatives should not lead to a separation in the management of maritime areas (related to MSP) and territorial (related to ICZM).

The Mediterranean Regions are against the separation of ICZM and MSP, inept in the Mediterranean (as it was stressed during the French national sea conference in Marseille in 2012 and in Arles in 2013). Indeed, these notions are inseparable and elected representatives in PACA and Med Regions members of the IMC-CPMR, from which some Regions partners within MAREMED, share this position.

It is therefore entirely appropriate to link ICZM (policy) and MSP (a tool of this policy) at the same level in the text because in the end, these two concepts, even if they meet the different requirements in terms of skills (situations of coastal management are different in Italy, Spain, and France, as it is stated in the first part of the report), appear consubstantial. The CPMR suggests the same argument in favor of a non separation of ICZM and MSP.

In addition, we can legitimately ask ourselves how the new Framework Directive will facilitate management by avoiding duplication in terms of governance. Indeed, ICZM deals with energy, nature conservation, wastewater treatment, air quality, mobility... It is imperative not to put up new structures of governance, which would complicate the management processes and could be counterproductive.

The organization of the coexistence of uses in coastal areas requires a comprehensive and integrated approach of management able to balance economic development ("blue growth"), welfare, and environmental protection, which are interdependent. This integrated view of the land to the sea is also advocated in the PACA regional strategy for the Sea.

The introduction of the concept of multi-level governance in the context of ICZM promoting regional participation in a truly decentralized approach should be supported. Regions are best placed to implement concrete measures in this regard, and now hold a central role on the ground in this area. The problems identified in the practical implementation, and which are related to the partitioning of administrative agencies, conflicts of use and the absence of any financial resources in support of ICZM should encourage the EC to enhance the role of Regions as coordinating an integrated vision and management of their territories, because of their competences. In this context, new European initiatives should ensure a strong and effective participation of the Regions.

About a possible erosion of regional expertise in terms of spatial planning, it must be remembered that French Regions has no direct powers in terms of ICZM, unlike other European Regions from other MS, as in Italy or in Spain.

Concerning the cooperation aspect, ICZM and MSP should include a strong "cooperation" (transnational, cross-border and interregional) component. As such, PACA Region shares the position of the CPMR which mentions that the fact to cooperate across borders to develop programs and strategies is a key part of the added value of the Framework Directive proposal.

Another argument to take into consideration, linked to PACA Region experience, is that the bay contracts ("contrats de baies") implemented (one of the French structures chosen for implementing ICZM policies), has been proven. However coastal management confronts with political time, which tends to have a negative impact on the effectiveness of actions. In other words, at the most decentralized level, management must take into account the pace of elections, delaying sometimes the definition and implementation of action plans. Especially at the administrative level, where many devices are related to ICZM (for France we can put into relief the SAGEs- "Schémas d'aménagement et de gestion des eaux", the PAPIs- "programmes d'actions de prévention contre les inondations", the maritime components of SCOTs- "Schémas de cohérence territoriale",...). Thus the impact of different calendars must be measured.

We need also to embrace all aspects of the Sea and find spaces for all activities at sea because these ones always "return at a given time to earth". Consideration for this observation is fundamental and should find a favorable echo in the drafting of amendments to the Framework Directive proposal.

Another source of satisfaction for Mediterranean Regions, following the lobbying activities initiated in this direction, notably vis-à-vis the DG MARE, is the integration of the Article 10 into the proposal, on the importance of marine and maritime data aiming at ICZM and MSP. These data represent indeed the basis for understanding all phenomena affecting coastal areas, including environmental ones. They prove to be indispensable upstream to implement all policies of the Sea.

The transposition stage of the future Framework Directive to come could ask the question of what economic impact the transposition would have on regional territories. Should we not study these economic and financial incidences, especially as Mediterranean Regions knows high coastal pressure with a strong coexistence of many activities?

At European level, it appears crucial and logical to clearly identify the budgets dedicated to this integrated view of coastal zone management in the context of future European OPs that will come into force in 2014 (2014-2020).

Another remark about governance and subsidiarity is that the time required to transpose the future Directive into national law is considered too short.

And, as an echo of what was highlighted before, the absence of a distinct European budget for this synergistic management is currently lacking.

The success of the Mediterranean strategy driven by the EC with its 2009 Communication should ensure more sustainable growth for the Region. The governance topic is therefore a subject regarded as fundamental for the future of the area, taking into consideration the peculiarities affecting the Med basin and the debate around the effective creation of an **EU macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean**.



## **2.3 Towards an EU macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean?**

It has to be said that the macro-regional strategy for the Baltic Sea (EUSBR), which was adopted in 2009, constitutes a new way of cooperating and a model for inspiring new macro-regional strategies to deploy in other pertinent geographical area. Of course every territorial area has its own specificities but the EUSBR is reputed a good practice relevant in a benchmarking perspective. The variety of actors involved in a macro-regional strategy is high. It can be regarded as a new form of regionalism even if it doesn't proceed from a specific identity.

The 3 No's rule (no new institutions, no new funding and no new legislation), argument on which most stakeholders agree, is in line with the European principle of subsidiarity in so far as the idea is to avoid institutional overcharge. But in the same time, letting the MS at the core of the functioning of a macro-regional strategy could collide with the role of regional stakeholders. This is one important problematic underlined by some stakeholders (for example French MEP François Alfonsi talks about "the trap of intergovernmental governance").

It is necessary to underscore the positive role of the EC, acting as a coordinator, in terms of macro-regional governance. Several macro-regional projects are at an advanced stage. That is why the EC should help to set out common criteria and measurable indicators for assessing their relevance.

An EU macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean could be divided into sub-regional strategies (oriental, central and occidental). Its implementation could complete and obviously reinforced cooperation initiatives already impulsed within the framework of the Barcelona Process and the UfM, plus those that originate from EU programmes (MED, ENPI). Given its specificity, a Mediterranean macro-Region should target appropriate sub-regional levels for cooperation on specific projects. The coordination of these three macro-regional strategies- western Mediterranean, Adriatic-Ionian, and eastern Mediterranean- would enable the implementation of an overall policy for the whole Mediterranean basin in synergy with the priorities of regional and international organizations.

A macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean should receive more consideration because of its utility, as the Mediterranean area is essential for the EU.

Clearly, successful macro-regional strategies must rely on multilevel governance processes, facilitating the participation of local and regional authorities, the scientific world and the civil society in political decision-making and in the implementation stage.

Even if no further funding is logically desirable, it is important to find financial opportunities within the existing regulation and in the next financial period (cohesion policy and SF), and to push for funding technical assistance actions aimed at preliminary evaluation and data collection.

Every macro-regional strategy needs to promote structural projects and, as far as possible, macro-projects, like the BC 2012 political initiative suggests. In any case, the multi-annual financial framework 2014-2020 should provide possibilities for this kind of funding. That is why regional OPs would have to be narrowly oriented to the priorities set for the EU macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean in order to ensure the best coherence between the objectives and

the means to reach them. A strong maritime dimension appears fundamental and could bring real added value to concrete projects.

This maritime component suitable for coastal Regions should not come at the expense of the Mediterranean island territories and their development needs, in line with the terminology of the Article 174 TFEU. Accessibility of these lands with the continent is very important. An increase in the threshold for *de minimis aid* could embody a fair solution with this regard. This would allow reducing the gap among European Regions, statement in phase with the objectives pursued by the EU for its cohesion policy. The insular dimension of the EU macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean is thus crucial. It was also highlighted by Crete that applying a bottom-up approach would foster synergies with the IMP. When it comes to decide on the EU budget for cohesion, research, development and regional cooperation (SF above all), macro-regional strategies should constitute the path to follow.

As it was briefly evoked, multi-level governance, particularly involving the regional level, can guarantee the European vocation of such strategies.

In consequence, each reflection on the feasibility of an EU macro-regional strategy in a relevant territory must be based on a bottom-up process, and must reflect real commitment of the individuals on the ground.

Besides, Neighboring Regions must be massively involved within macro-regional strategies with the intention of launching a lot of appropriate projects. This argument is particularly important for the Mediterranean area. Among the difficulties that could hinder the development of an EU macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean, it has been listed the fact that the Mediterranean is not an open sea, that relative political problems affect the South shore, and that all countries did not have the same characteristics, which complicates further the setting-up of a global macro-regional strategy.

It is not worth to repeat that the maritime dimension should have a leading role in the framework of future macro-regional strategies, especially in the Mediterranean. This lever should help ensure cohesion in the whole basin and contribute to the “blue growth” objective in the coastal Regions of the Med area. This can be done with identifying and fostering specific projects and new political initiatives linked to these recommendations.

## **2.4 The interregional initiative “Bologna Charter 2012”, a new governance tool which justifies the launching of a maritime macro-project for 2014-2020**

**The interregional initiative “Bologna Charter 2012”** (The Charter of European Regions for coastal defense and promotion of a European interregional Observatory for the Protection of the Mediterranean coasts- BC 2012) directly supported by the MAREMED partnership and indirectly promoted by other local authorities signatories of the text embodies this vision of defining a common strategy in the coastal Regions, the fundament for maritime cooperation between Mediterranean Regions regarding policies related to the adaptation of coastal territories to climate change (limiting the risk of coastal flooding, marine ingression and coastal erosion), ICZM and MSP, governance, data harmonization and interoperability, and sustainable use of resources. The BC 2012 expressly requires the creation of an emblematic and synergetic macro-project which can form the ideal pedestal for the declination of the IMP in the Mediterranean.

The BC 2012 is regarded as a key factor to the consistency and effectiveness of public spending and, in this case, of European SF. This is the meaning, among other, of the action at the political level developed in MAREMED. The Charter is thus a political agreement, based on a previous version (developed in the framework of the past European project COASTANCE in 2007<sup>24</sup>), between various Mediterranean coastal Administrations involved in different EU projects but open to the whole Med community, that outlines a Strategy and a macro-project articulated in a number of action lines (namely sub-projects) to be established in the 2014-2020 period at the Mediterranean scale. The concept is to avoid dispersion in a number of single separated projects, the “traditional way”, to have a group of projects integrated in a shared strategic framework with specific objectives and actions. This allowing a higher level of synergy between coastal Administrations, an optimization of actions and EU investments, more opportunities to obtain useful and transferable results, and coherence in mainstreaming processes.

The idea and the general structure of the macro-project, ripened through years of regional cooperation within different EU projects, responds to the need of public Administrations in charge of coastal management to efficiently face the coastal zones’ protection and the climate change adaptation within the ICZM implementation process.

The main lines of action envisaged to be translated into projects, for the 2014-2020 EU financial programming timeframe, consist in:

- the building of a network of local/regional coastal Observatories (that envisages also the issue of data harmonization and interoperability);
- the survey and monitoring of erosion phenomena and flood hazard/marine ingression along the Mediterranean coastal areas;
- the individuation, the characterization and the promotion of the sustainable use of coastal and submarine stocks of sediments, for beach nourishment purposes;
- cross-border integrated planning and management of coastal zones and maritime space, for sustainable growth;
- sustainable use of the coastal territory along with the implementation of the principles and provisions of the ICZM Protocol for the Mediterranean;
- the design of interventions and structural works, consistently with the integrated planning processes, within the adaptation policies affecting coastal territories.

In order to extend the adhesion to the Charter, different actions are envisaged both at political and operative level, in order to possibly activate different funding opportunities (EU funding programmes, EC direct support). One of the operational actions already concretized, for example, is the project-clustering initiative FACECOAST to which MAREMED adhered. The cluster, that counts today more than 10 projects adhering, has been launched within the Capitalization process started by the EU MED Programme, and its aim is to strengthen

---

<sup>24</sup> It originates from a first Charter signed in Bologna in February 2007 by nine local public coastal Mediterranean authorities (Emilia-Romagna, Liguria, Tuscany, Lazio, Eastern Macedonia-Thrace, and Languedoc-Roussillon Regions, French Département of Hérault, and Generalitat of Catalonia) in the framework of the regional operation BEACHMED-e (INTERREG IIIC) and with the support of the organization "Arco Latino". The terms of the amended Charter is inspired by the Final Declaration of the European project COASTANCE (MED programme), signed in March 2012 in Komotini (Greece) by the political representatives of the project partners (Emilia-Romagna, Lazio, East Macedonia-Thrace, and Crete Regions, French Département of Hérault, Generalitat of Andalusia, Croatian County of Dubrovnik, Department of Public Works of Cyprus).

cooperation links between Regions, coastal Administrations, local stakeholders, Universities and other Research institutions, with the goal to maximize results and favor potential synergies between projects on coastal issues in the next programming period.

The revision of the first "Bologna Charter" was made to take account of new developments in the maritime sector, among them the adoption and implementation of the IMP, and the release of new European Directives relating to the Sea. Considering this new European legislative context and the Mediterranean dimension is indeed a necessity at a time when the next financial programming is emerging. This also corresponds to the political will of the coastal Regions to work towards the establishment of a macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean, as depicted before.

That is why, considering the obligation to adapt to climate change to cope with extreme weather events and the need to promote initiatives macro-projects in this direction; the merits of a synergy of forces and the federation of governance processes; the relevance of networking actions of all regional actors who share the same ambitions and the same issues; and the fact that coastal protection is a must and to achieve this, the exchange of experiences and mutual action are paramount, keeping in mind the interdependent nature of the Mediterranean area; the adhesion to BC 2012, as requested within MAREMED project, appears natural and well-founded.

Linked to the BC 2012, the COASTGAP project proposal "Coastal Governance and Adaptation Policies in the Mediterranean" (2012 Capitalization Call of MED Programme) was recently approved to design and prepare the macro project "BEACHMED-3" claimed by the Charter. In a nutshell, COASTGAP aims to capitalize best practices concerning adaptation and governance policies of the Mediterranean coastal zones with regard to climate change effects and other natural/anthropogenic threats.

Questioning about the future of maritime policy in the Mediterranean goes through the determination of what could be positive for **governance of maritime affairs regarding the next regional OPs**, at the light of the new Common Strategic Framework (CSF) and the future EU financial programming period.

In other words, what **impacts of the future European SF in the governance processes?** What **perspective for European territorial cooperation (ETC)** in the context of the future of MED and ENI programmes?

## **2.5 What impacts of the future Structural Funds in the governance processes? What perspective for European territorial cooperation (ETC) in the context of the future of MED and ENI programmes?**

Some exploring possibilities could be underscored. The key words are:

- Organize concrete synergies between SF funds that are part of the CSF, Funds for innovation and research (Horizon 2020, Cosme: Programme for the Competitiveness of enterprises and SMEs), of the EIB and of national and regional levels;

- Seek consistency across Regions in the drafting of their regional OPs on investments that will be performed in the future. This would allow to organize joint territorial projects among neighbor Regions for more efficiency in the coastal management;
- BC 2012 is to optimize and rationalize actions and EU funds' investments;
- Intercomplementarity between projects is essential. The clusterization of the projects like FACECOAST initiative is helpful;
- Concerning the new European Maritime Fisheries Fund (EMFF), fisheries and aquaculture sectors must remain a priority in the context of the new fund. The MAREMED partnership welcomes proposals made by the EC in order to ensure the funding of certain measures such as: support for innovation in different segments of the European fisheries sector; allocation of funds for renewal and adaptation of vessels devoted to fishing tourism; incentive measures aimed at strengthening partnerships between scientists and fishermen; continued funding for innovation, safety equipment, and with conditions, for port investments. The means dedicated to management should be allocated on a basis other than of a percentage of the overall envelope.

About Coastal and Maritime data, providing financing support through European programs and funds for the acquisition of common and inter-operable data, training local managers to data use for territorial management is requested.

About the "fight against oil pollution" thematic, take into consideration, in the framework of the next programming period, the needs of the terrestrial component of the fight against pollution in terms of preparation is considered very important for coastal Administrations. The relevance of allowing mutual assistance between Mediterranean territories by organizing simulation exercises on logical areas for the distribution of pollution in peculiar Mediterranean zones like the Adriatic, the North-western Mediterranean, the Aegean Sea, the Gibraltar Detroit, the area of Cyprus, Lebanon, Syria, Turkey, etc. is also to be stressed.

About the implementation of the WFD in the Mediterranean area, issues and challenges are also at financial level. It would be good if the WFD could include a specific financial planning section, so that the allocation of financial resources could be more easily done at the national and regional levels. In the same vein, competences are transferred from the EU to the national and regional scale, but the same thing is not done for funding. And partnerships (Regions-States) should be reinforced in order to confer solid financial resources to local authorities for effective management.

About ETC, it has to be said that it is indeed an essential tool.

The future European funds have to be levers for integrated maritime and marine Mediterranean policies. To succeed in this objective, it appears capital to clearly identify specific budget lines in the next future. Logically and subsequently, it is also necessary to provide future joint projects on coastal issues in the next cross-border and transnational cooperation programmes.

This being said, it appears therefore judicious to put into relief some key lessons and outputs about the current Med and ENPI Programmes (coming from the 2007-2013 experience) in order to convey messages for the future and improve them<sup>25</sup>:

---

<sup>25</sup> The following paragraph is extracted from the conclusions of the Managing Authorities of the MED and ENPI Programmes.

- Capitalization should be taken into account from the beginning;
- Strengthening animation devices is crucial;
- Avoid to increase the number of applications: target themes, types of actors, types of projects (studies, pilot projects, capitalization/transfer results );
- Evaluation criteria should take into account cross-cutting issues, in particular to characterize the strategic projects;
- Encourage actors to take into account cross-cutting issues;
- Improve the recruitment of evaluators and accompanying focus groups on strategic projects to ensure that the guidelines and criteria do not change depending on people;
- Strengthen the animation and selection capabilities (number of evaluators and project managers);
- Selection criteria should be more flexible, and not only focused on the final note, in order to guide programming and avoid that certain topics are not used;
- Strengthening technical assistance to promising projects (emerging, mounting, communication, dissemination, capitalization);
- Rely on experienced players (network, know-how) with perhaps the creation of a special status for them and integrate them into the technical assistance strategy;
- Develop tools (platform) to aid installation, monitoring and project management;
- The selection length is considered too long (eighteen months for ENPI for instance). This impacts negatively the implementation of action plans, the mobilization of partnerships (sometimes difficult to raise). Internal priorities may have also evolved considerably during this time;
- The duration of response is considered too short, particularly with regard to the accuracy of the action plan needed which is sometimes exaggerated. This degree of precision could be made more useful after the project selection;
- Too much time spent on the administrative and financial aspects compared to the content of activities (need for simplification);
- About the 1st Level Control: recruitment of experts difficult, delay in the appointment of the controller causes delays in starting the project (projects should be able to start despite the non completion of the confirmation of the first level controller for example);
- Need for harmonization of procedures and regulations between the two OPs (MED and ENPI);
- Selection criteria shared between the 2 OPs;
- Difficulty to integrate private actors, including SMEs who are part of civil society and are operational actors. Participation of civil society should be consecrated as a priority;
- Difficulty to integrate partners of the South shore (ENPI) who have low annual budgets under the thresholds imposed. The budget advance is being allocated with delay in general. This puts them in a difficult situation and affects the running of projects;
- Legal deadlines must be met;
- Rationalization of the number of applications submitted;
- Be careful not to systematically promote regional authorities as lead partners because even if they can count on financial and administrative capacities, they are often less agile than smaller structures and subject to political uncertainties (elections time);
- MED capitalization should include inter-capitalization program. Projects capitalization is relevant if it serves to broaden the objectives or territories and audiences;
- Difficulties associated with maintaining the same financial volume: how not to generate a greater number of projects while the programme must meet new needs and capitalize on successes?

- Remark on transparency about the origin of the funds given by regional authorities: some actors do not know if they are beneficiaries of ERDF funding via the MED OPs or via other support schemes coming from regional OPs (ERDF OPs).
- For ENPI, the definition by major issues rather than by objectives should be promoted. Environmental issues (in a “blue growth” perspective) are indeed a major source of job creation and economic development;
- Foster coordinated/joint MED and ENPI calls for proposals when possible;
- The new ENI Program should invest more resources and capacities to sustain the creation of a macro-regional strategy for the Med basin;
- Strong issue on the marine environment: targeting the implementation of the MFS;
- Environment should be cross-cutting (more substantial environmental criteria, eco-conditionality);
- To seek no delay in the launch of the OP to avoid decommitment at the end of the programming period (current risk of decommitment despite strong anticipation and over-programming);
- Develop joint animation and support devices between regional and cooperation OPs.

## **2.6 MAREMED political conclusions on governance**

It has to be recalled that political messages (in the form of **MAREMED political conclusions**) were drafted in the framework of the project. The IMC-CPMR adopted these strategic messages which place coastal Regions as pivotal partners of the new phase of the IMP. Parts of them regard the **governance thematic**. To sum up:

Over the last years, the IMP and EU maritime sectorial policies made significant steps forward, which are reflected in the Limassol declaration adopted in October 2012, the assessment of the IMP, and in EC proposals concerning the future of EU policies post 2014, which are currently under negotiation. The “blue growth” approach is now at heart of this dynamic and interacts with all EU maritime policies.

In this context, Mediterranean Regions stress that:

- All EU policies in relation to the Sea need to implement a balanced approach encompassing the economic, social and environmental dimensions under a blue growth perspective;
- Issues addressed in this policy position, such as ICZM, adaptation to climate change, marine data and pollution are part of key framework conditions that are a sine qua non condition of “blue growth”. These issues are today encompassed in the “blue growth” approach and must remain at center of it;
- An integrated approach way of management of coastal territories is mandatory for an efficient implementation of EU maritime policies. Coastal Regions are best-placed to play a key role in regard to this. In this new phase of the IMP, it is therefore also necessary to reaffirm, as a principle but also very explicatively in the regulatory and budgetary instruments associated EU policies, the involvement of regional authorities as major political partners in the development of the EU IMP and in maritime thematic policies. In this perspective, the analysis and relevance of the content of EU policies should be

assessed, before their adoption but also in the course of their implementation, at light of their consequences on territories, both in terms of socio-economic impact and in terms of governance. The implementation of EU policies shaped without sufficient clear and official taking into account of these aspects is often problematic, if not unsuccessful, since Regions are in the end often asked to take in charge the effective implementation of EU policies in most of the areas mentioned in this report;

- Obviously Regions and socio-economic stakeholders from their territories need to have strong budgetary resources within the next EU financial programming period to concretize objectives on the ground in link with maritime issues.
- This implies strong attention to the current negotiation process and to be able to organize concrete synergies between EU funds that are part of the CSF (encompassing the SF together with other EU funds), Funds of the Common Strategic framework for innovation and research (Horizon 2020, Cosme), of the EIB and of national and regional levels;
- In this perspective, it would be necessary for the earmarking of the SF to leave enough latitude to invest in framework conditions for “blue growth”;
- In parallel, a harmonized “coastal” terminology could help the coherence of investments made through future regional OPs across Regions. That would permit to organize joint territorial projects among Neighboring Regions for more efficiency in the coastal management;
- In parallel too, the maritime basins should be promoted as a suitable level of governance for the management of the IMP. The “basin” and “sub-basin” concepts (namely linked to a homogeneous geographical area like the Adriatic, the occidental part of the Mediterranean for instance) are a technical necessity to engage reflections on coastal and maritime issues. Again, Regions should be considered as full partners in the development of maritime basins strategies;
- Further develop and consider the feasibility of macro-regional approaches at the Mediterranean basin scale, such as the definition of a European macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean in which the maritime dimension could constitute a major axis;
- At this stage, structuring initiatives which are developed at the level of the Mediterranean basin can contribute to the future development of a European macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean. In this regard, the BC 2012 is particularly interesting as a strong and efficient way to promote joint political initiatives in the field of marine and coastal areas. As it was previously evoked, the BC 2012 both reflects and can stimulate structuring European projects across the Mediterranean like MAREMED, SHAPE, BEACHMED...and to network them in a process of clusterization (as the example of FACECOAST);
- Action should also be undertaken in order to ensure better synergies between EU MED and ENPI programs around projects dealing with specific maritime thematics (Cf. supra).

## Conclusion

As a conclusion, the purpose of the governance questionnaire, more general than the other ones targeted on a specific technical thematic, was to develop a comprehensive view of maritime policies in the different Regions partners of MAREMED project. The answers provided taught us that the implementation of maritime policies at internal level is shared between different



regional departments. Indeed, although most of the partners Regions have a political representative delegated to maritime affairs, there is often no technical service reserved to the policies of the Sea except for PACA region, which has a "sea and coastal" service. The others see the management of their maritime affairs scattered between different offices.

Therefore, the Regions are unable to determine what precise budget is reserved for the implementation of maritime policies since many services receive funding.

Regarding bottom-up maritime governance, the Regions would like to strengthen their relationships with their national States and the EU in this field. However, some are building solid linkages with other sub-state levels (for instance PACA organizes every two years the "Rencontres Régionales de la Mer" to bring together all local actors playing a notable and preeminent role in maritime policies).

Relations with the research sector are, in turn, rather well developed. In Italy and Spain, many Universities are collaborating closely with Regions on maritime issues such as adaptation to climate change, sustainable development of marine ecosystems, or coastal management. This is not the case in France where relationships with researchers remain more restrained.

Finally, concerning transnational maritime governance, regional partners are all at least members of the CPMR, but are quite active in other partnership projects, like the MAREMED project obviously which aspires to harmonize the different ways of "doing maritime". Other examples are SHAPE, COASTGAP, PEGASO<sup>26</sup>, RESMAR<sup>27</sup>, and PERSEUS<sup>28</sup>, just to name a few (of them).

This observation shows the need, if not to bring the management of maritime affairs in the hands of a single body, at least set up regular meetings between regional services concerned to coordinate their actions. Progress in the internal organization of the Regions seems necessary for better governance.

On the cooperation argument, whether within the same State or not, it must be further developed. First, as the Regions are not organized in the same way, they may encounter some communication problems in the realization of a European project. Indeed, officials do not necessarily find their counterparts abroad. That is why, during the making of MAREMED project (first stage), different services (fisheries, environment, climate change, land use) have been contacted to gather all stakeholders involved in maritime affairs potentially interested in joining the pool project. In consequence, the mapping was quite difficult to make. In addition, different Regions, sometimes within the same State, interpret EU legislation in different ways. The diagnostic phase allowed this situation and posed in new terms the necessity to improve the governance of maritime and marine policies.

Partnership projects, which are able to exceed the state dimension, are richer and can bring together many actors. The idea is to "bypass" national contingency seeking alternative and renewed modes of governance in an EU-wide approach. In other words, this type of structuring project allows the Regions to be directly associated with the policies promoted by the EU. A sort

<sup>26</sup> <http://www.pegasoproject.eu/wiki/Portal:PEGASO>

<sup>27</sup> <http://www.res-mar.eu/fr/>

<sup>28</sup> <http://www.perseus-net.eu/site/content.php>

of win-win relationship as the EU, in turn, benefits from the regional expertise in terms of application of EU standards by local authorities, according to their specificities. Therefore, MAREMED could be regarded as a facilitator and a catalyst for all maritime stakeholders. The Regions can then share their difficulties and obstacles encountered in the implementation of EU maritime Law, with the interesting opportunity which consists in raising a wide range of Mediterranean specificities (ICZM, fisheries, implementation of the WFD in a Med context...).

The Mediterranean Sea is "shared" with many States which are not all members of the EU. But the environmental obligations legitimately imposed by the EU are sometimes harsh and often priced. This observation conducts to a certain "inequality" of competition between the North and the South shores. Northern Regions therefore wish that the same rules are applied to the entire Mediterranean basin. This hindrance does not arise for other European seas which are surrounded by countries all belonging to the EU. As a consequence, the setting of a macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean is more complex to achieve, in comparison with the Baltic area for example, which constitutes otherwise a model to inspire.

So, the hypothesis of establishing a macro-regional strategy in the Mediterranean must face various issues, from multi-level/multi-actor governance implying coordination between the instruments and financial resources to functional aspects and priorities in an integrated approach, without forgetting the external dimension (relations with the UfM, with operative programmes for territorial cooperation and strategic projects, and with Euroregions and European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation- EGTC).

The analysis of one or more macro-Regions in the Mediterranean must lay upon a pragmatic approach as shown in the Baltic case. However, it cannot ignore fundamental political issues related to the Mediterranean area. Such issues, though, should not constitute an obstacle to undertake this new macro-initiative that leads to a more profitable collaboration between the EC, central governments and local authorities, relying on social and economic realities. A macro-regional strategy aims to open a new area for cohesion policy in Europe and the EC is proposing that territorial cooperation policy should be enhanced in order to further support macro-regional policies.

The principal challenge for the implementation of a macro-regional strategy in the Mediterranean is about funding opportunities, in so far as the area covered is very large. And environmental concerns are at the core of the strategic objectives.

The European institutions have not yet adopted a permanent strategy that embraces the specific needs of the islands, and the full accessibility of Mediterranean insular Regions and their better integration within the European single market could best be ensured through the allocation of appropriate resources and the adoption of an integrated approach on this issue, acknowledging of course the structural disadvantage faced by populations living in these islands.

With this respect, OPs need to be matched to the corresponding priorities of the macro-regional strategies in order to ensure the best possible coordination of objectives and means. And macro-regional strategies should obviously promote structural maritime projects for the Western and Eastern parts of the Mediterranean, paying attention to the protection of the environment and the preservation of biodiversity. For that, the EC has to determine what specific instruments are required to evaluate and launch any new macro-regional initiatives, such as pilot projects. With the scope to contribute in the achievement of the EU Strategy objectives of smart and

sustainable economic growth, the “blue growth” initiative, and the objectives of the EU Neighborhood policy.

The idea of a macro-regional strategy for the Med basin is thus gaining ground. This new tool for European policy coordination seems to be adapted to the Mediterranean context, including the need to meet common challenges, to articulate neighborhood and regional policies, and to rethink the multi-level governance in the respect of the principle of subsidiarity. It may also be able to provide added value to the Mediterranean area by facilitating integration on specific topics, while improving forms of existing cross-border and transnational cooperation and offering a scene for local authorities to express themselves and to represent their interests at EU level.

A number of challenges and unknowns, however, remain to be clarified. The current reflections on macro-regional strategies do not have enough distance to make an assessment. If a macro Mediterranean Region would one day appear, profound adaptations of the Baltic model would be needed to develop a coherent strategy with other Mediterranean cooperation processes for an implementation in the best conditions. This strategy should facilitate the implementation of policies and projects in a flexible and adaptable way.

A macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean could arise if also backed up by solid political will. It is also in the sense that the BC was updated in 2012. The Charter, as previously described, advocates for the sustainable use of the coast in an integrated planning perspective and willingness to intervene structurally on the Mediterranean coast. This is consistent with policies already implemented at regional level in this area and Mediterranean Regions, thanks to the BC 2012, will apprehend more efficiently today's and tomorrow's challenges posed by the preservation of the coastline, its economy and its coastal and marine ecosystems.

BC 2012 emphasizes cooperation and be regarded as new governance tool helpful for local Mediterranean authorities. The text is still open for new adoptions and forecasts the launching of macro-projects in phase with the next 2014-2020 EU financial programming period.

Cohesion policy and the future EMFF offer multiple opportunities for the implementation of the EU IMP, particularly in the Regions partners of MAREMED, which have strong links with continental Europe and at the same time a historic projection in the Mediterranean. With the Treaty of Lisbon, which entered into force on 1 December 2009, it was expanded the scope of the Union's cohesion with the addition of the term “territorial cohesion”. This goes beyond the notion of economic and social cohesion. In policy terms, the objective is to achieve a more balanced development by reducing existing disparities, preventing territorial imbalances and by making it more coherent sectoral and regional policies. The competitiveness and prosperity depend increasingly on the ability of individuals and businesses to exploit in the best way all the land and maritime resources. In a globalized and interdependent world economy, competitiveness also depends on the ability to build links with other territories to ensure that common assets are used in a coordinated and sustainable way. Cooperation along with the flow of technology and ideas as well as goods, services and capital is becoming an increasingly vital aspect of territorial development and a determinant key of long-term sustainable growth of the whole EU. Solutions therefore require an integrated approach and cooperation between the various authorities and stakeholders.

A cooperation approach all the more important when it comes to the coastline integrity. Dialogue and partnership between the different levels of government, and between them and the organizations on the ground directly involved in the development process is thus essential. In this respect, territorial cooperation, encouraging the sharing of positive experiences (benchmarking of best practices), the integration of resources and tools, and the development and implementation of common policies also in maritime issues becomes a fundamental instrument.

Article 174 TFEU states: *"In order to promote its overall harmonious development, the Union shall develop and pursue its actions leading to the strengthening of its economic, social and territorial cohesion. In particular, the Union shall aim at reducing disparities between the levels of development of the various Regions and the backwardness of the least favored Regions. Among the Regions concerned, particular attention is paid to rural areas, areas affected by industrial transition, and Regions which suffer from severe and permanent natural or demographic handicaps such as the northernmost Regions with very low population density and island Regions, cross-border and mountain".* This statement prevails obviously for insular territories, well represented in the MAREMED partnership (Crete, Cyprus, Corsica).

Renewed governance of maritime affairs goes also through innovation. This issue sets a very high relationship between science and policy. And this is a main point to emphasize for the future. In this context, our decision makers have a critical need of scientists as they appear as mediators of uncertainty. The need for innovation is strengthened to facilitate adaptation to global change: the classical pathway of progress has always been to find new solutions, but it has now become a priority to underestimate the risks every day and seriously evaluate the disadvantages and impacts of choices to implement them. This need for innovation is particularly pregnant for two MAREMED working groups led respectively by Liguria and Lazio Regions: common data management and adaptation to climate change (with the application of erosion risk maps models).

The concretization of another project would be another example of new governance processes because its realization is based on the ability to put together local authorities and the State in a useful and innovative approach. Indeed, the bathymetric Lidar project (Litto3D), led by the Hydrographic Office of the Navy (SHOM) and the French National Geographic Institute (IGN), and co-financed by the ERDF and the Regions, aims to provide an accurate altibathymetric description of both sides of the coastline: from the 10 m altitude above the foreshore, to the 10 m isobath (or a distance of 10 km). In addition to the topographical description of the soil, Litto3D plans to provide an accurate hydrodynamic model. The interest of this project is to provide a frame of reference for all measurements and studies to monitor the environment, often become, over the years, the subject of over-exploitation, and, thereby, the seat of acute conflicts.

The EC's decision to acquire the tools of an IMP has been an important stimulus for the MS and Regions to continue the development of coastal areas and islands in its territory, joining together the various policies in the industry and aiming for synergy and cooperation between the multiple parties involved. The regional level is a privileged point of view for reading, identifying and integrating the paths of development in the context of the IMP.

The Regions are, in fact, lead actors of numerous partnerships and territorial cooperation initiatives dedicated to the development of coastal areas and islands. The maritime dimension is for MAREMED partners an element of cultural identity in the first place. This identity, which can be further enhanced, offers the prospect of integration with other Regions, from Europe and elsewhere. The Mediterranean basin, actually, is the reference point for the resolution of problems that arise in a transnational and interregional dimension. It is therefore more and more mandatory to abandon the strictly sectoral approach. Developing synergies between different policies to build a programmatic design that faces the common goal of sustainable development is now the main challenge of the maritime policy.

The Regions believe that the current tools seem inadequate. They consider that only the definition of new modes of governance inside the Mediterranean space, implying close cooperation between international, national, regional and local levels, will provide means of supplying appropriate responses to the major maritime issues in the Mediterranean area.

The regional level is an extraordinary point of view to understand, identify and integrate the ways of developing coastal and island territories. It is an optimal level to build up relevant action policies, which must include all the territorial realities within a unique, collective, and shared framework. At regional level, European policies have fostered a progressive process towards a new focus on territorial governance issues, based on the certainty that a global vision of development might help to find more suitable solutions to solve complex problems affecting essentially homogeneous parts of the territory, where local development is designed.

This position is shared by the EU. According to the EC, *“MS are encouraged to develop their own integrated maritime policies closely with their national and regional maritime stakeholders. Because of the multiple interactions between different policies related to maritime affairs, any action developed by governmental structures requires effective coordination. To achieve this, it is appropriate that MS improve and facilitate cooperation at all levels of maritime governance, including the European one.*

*MS shall provide for the creation of internal coordinating structures in their administrative systems (Ministries, Parliaments, etc...). Such a structure would provide a governance framework to facilitate decision-making at national level. A Responsible for the coordination of maritime affairs could be appointed. Its role would include structured dialogue between sectoral interests.*

*Coastal Regions and other local decision-makers should be able to play a role in the development of integrated maritime policies, given their experience in ICZM.*

*All maritime stakeholders (economic partners from industry and services, social partners, NGOs, Universities and Research centers), should participate in the definition of the IMP. Participation at national, regional or local level is recommended. MS should allow the participation of stakeholders in the governance of maritime affairs while ensuring the transparency of the decision process.*

*It is essential to develop cross-border coordination at the regional sea basins' scale to ensure the dissemination of good practices and enhanced cooperation between MS in areas such as the protection of the marine environment, safety, security and surveillance cooperation, as well as marine and maritime research. In this context, the EC is developing regional strategies and is preparing macro-ones for the Baltic (already approved) and the Mediterranean Seas.*

*The EC invites MS to share information about their actions in maritime governance and encourages the sharing of best practices”.*

We must thus push for a dynamic evolution of the decentralized levels, and go towards the strengthening of the Regions regarding marine and coastal issues. And MAREMED is clearly a tool to interact with the services of the EC in the context of the implementation of new legislative frameworks, including the next 2014-2020 programming period. The participation of the CPMR in this project also offers us this opportunity to insert ourselves into the European agenda to express our needs and Mediterranean concerns.

For the governance of maritime policies, most EU MS, and particularly those of MAREMED, have decentralized the application of these policies to the Regions or Regions have implemented proactive policies which became the support of integrated actions on the coast. This need for dialogue between States and Regions was reiterated by the EU, as the EC pointed out in its 2009 communication (Cf. supra). The EU wishes to develop maritime policies that transcend administrative boundaries. To achieve consistent integration and to promote joint work between Regions of the same country or between Regions pertaining to a similar geographical area, it is relevant that Mediterranean Regions federate in a common strategic vision (the construction of the future regional OPs offers an opportunity to catch). Renewed governance of maritime affairs also deals with renewed financial governance.

It is both imperative to implement European legislation and in parallel meet the Mediterranean agreements. With this regard, ICZM is a prominent example. Now we have a Mediterranean Protocol of the Barcelona Convention covering this thematic, signed by the EU, which integrates the concept of terrestrial and marine management and dedicates the principle of systematic consultation with local stakeholders. Marine data is also important to improve maritime governance as they represent the fundament for understanding phenomena whose comprehension is vital for decision-making. MAREMED showed the wealth of GIS operated by the Regions partners but also the need to ensure their interoperability.

Finally, MAREMED could be regarded as a testimonial act of integrated maritime political governance. Utterly linked to the EU IMP and striven to give some suggestions to the European Institutions on this topic, we can say that the project succeeded in developing on the ground the existing thematical, geographical and temporal integration of maritime policies desired by the EC when it published the Blue Book. However technical integration is still pending but the project tried to help address this last challenge as, technically, the 6 MAREMED thematics were developed simultaneously.