



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL
ENVIRONMENT

ENV.D.2 - Marine Environment & Water Industry

Brussels, 10.06.2011
ENV.D2 (2011)
corrigendum1- 7/10/2011

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION "POSSIBLE WAY FORWARD FOR MARITIME SPATIAL
PLANNING AND INTEGRATED COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT IN THE EU"**

**ICZM COMPONENT - PROVISIONAL RESULTS OF THE WEB-BASED CONSULTATION
23/3 – 20/5 2011**

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. IDENTIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENT	3
3. INTEGRATED COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT	7
3.1. Familiarity with the principles of ICZM	7
3.2. The benefits of ICZM	8
3.3. Information	9
3.4. The integrated approach of ICZM	10
3.5. The objectives of ICZM and relevance for action on EU level.....	11
3.6. Measures, specific instruments and tools	14
3.7. Future EU action.....	16
ANNEX: Data questionnaire	

1. INTRODUCTION

Building upon a European Parliament and Council Recommendation on the implementation of Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) of 30 May 2002, (2002/413/EC) an Impact Assessment (IA) to evaluate further EU-policy options on ICZM was launched in 2010. Given the need for coherent spatial planning of coastal and maritime areas, the IA was done jointly with the assessment of possible future actions on Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP). To elicit relevant opinions from stakeholders and practitioners on the main challenges and opportunities for ICZM and MSP, an internet-based public consultation was launched.

The on-line consultation took place from 23 March to 20 May 2011. During the eight weeks, a total of 225 respondents replied to the questionnaire. In addition, by the closing date of the on-line consultation on 20 May, also 5 general statements or reactions were received, not using the questionnaire¹. These statements all emanated from respondents that also provided a response using the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was composed of 5 parts

1. Identification of the respondent (compulsory questions);
2. Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP);
3. Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM);
4. Linking MSP and ICZM;
5. EU publications and sharing information about MSP and ICZM.

This document provides the provisional evaluation of the ICZM-part of the on-line consultation, and covers parts 1 and 3 of the questionnaire.

The ICZM questions were mostly multiple choice ones. In some questions the participants were asked to rank given statements on a scale between 1 and 5, where 1 represented always the most negative (e.g. low importance) and 5 the most positive assessment (e.g. very important). 2 general open questions were included, in addition to the opportunity for respondents to provide suggestions under an item 'other' in closed questions. However the number of contributions received as 'other' was rather limited.

2. IDENTIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENT

The first section of the questionnaire consisted of compulsory questions; for the first questions only one answer per question could be given.



52 % of the respondents replied in their personal capacity, 48 % replied on behalf of an organisation.


Respondents from twenty countries out of the twenty-two coastal Member States participated in the online consultation. Although 20% of the replies originated from participants from the United Kingdom, the spread was generally very good (UK based respondents include several respondents from international organisations). In

¹ From CRPM, EUCC, EUDA, group of NGOs, Region Västra Götaland.


total respondents from twenty-eight different countries submitted replies (non-EU based respondents included participants from the United States, New Zealand, Turkey, Georgia, Norway, Brazil and Canada).

31% of the respondents represent or work for research institutions (universities or public or private research institutions). 29% of the respondents represent national or local governments. 17% responses came from NGO, civil society or environmental group or charity, 18% from industrial interest groups, enterprises (all sizes) and self-employed.





With regard to geographical areas the respondents are mostly interested in coastal waters (209 respondents), coastal land (140 respondents) and estuaries (112 respondents). The participants had the opportunity to choose more than one answer.




Most of the respondents are mainly involved into the following maritime activities or policies: Environment and nature conservation (68 respondents), spatial planning, regional development (54 respondents) and marine research (32 respondents). 'Other' (25 respondents) include respondents that state to be active in several activities/policies.

Nearly half of the respondents with an interest in environmental activities belong to the group "NGO, civil society, environmental group, charity" (26 respondents). With regard to spatial planning, it is mainly national governments (14 respondents) and universities (13 respondents) interested in this topic.

The results presented in this report provide the results of all respondents, without distinction between these groups. For some questions a slight difference in appreciation was noted in relative ranking of some possible objectives, measures or instruments for ICZM. Where appropriate, the text accompanying the graphs indicates such differences. However, in all cases the overall pattern of the total responses was confirmed for all groups of respondents.

While the total responses show a good spread across coastal Member States, the number of responses from individual countries is too low to affirm response patterns by Member State.





3. INTEGRATED COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT

While the questions in the section "Identification of the respondent" were compulsory, the ICZM-questions were optional ones. Out of 225 respondents, an average of 163 participants replied to the questions on ICZM (72%).

3.1. Familiarity with the principles of ICZM


Out of 190 respondents 110 (58%) are fully, 59 (31%) are somewhat familiar with the principles of ICZM. Out of 187 respondents 68 (37%) are regularly, 47 (25%) sometimes involved in the implementation of ICZM.



3.2. The benefits of ICZM

The questionnaire asked what benefits ICZM delivered, with a scale of appreciation 1 insignificant to 5 very significant. Given that the question was geared towards appreciation of benefits based on actual experience in implementation, this question shows a lower number of respondents than the other ICZM questions. The results show that respondents rate benefits overall in a positive way (upper range scores predominate). Respondents considered "Better understanding between stakeholders and authorities in the coastal zone" (109 respondents chose 4 or 5), "improved governance of the coastal zone" (107 respondents chose 4 or 5), "more efficient use of coastal resources" (105 respondents chose 4 or 5) and "more transparent planning and management of the coastal zone" to be the most important benefits deriving from ICZM implementation. These benefits are closely followed by "improvements to the coastal environment".


If you have been involved in ICZM, what do you consider to be the benefits that ICZM delivers?



3.3. Information

As for transparent planning and management of the coast the availability of sufficient information to authorities, stakeholders and concerned citizens is required, the participants were asked to rank to what extent they feel "well informed" about different topics.

131 participants feel well informed about "the state of the environment" in their country / region (62 fully agree, 69 agree), followed by 123 participants who feel well informed about "the risks that may affect the coast" in their country / region (64 fully agree, 59 agree). 121 participants somewhat disagree or disagree about a good level of information with regard to "development plans and actions undertaken in neighbouring coastal countries / regions" (55 somewhat disagree, 66 disagree).



3.4. The integrated approach of ICZM


To address the integrated approach of ICZM (e.g. integration of all sectors and uses of the coast, preservation of the coastal environment and cross-border integration) the participants were asked to state to which extent they thought given statements were valid in their country / region. The responses to the statements are an indication to which extent ICZM principles are thought to be implemented and achieved.

The results show that most of the participants disagreed or somewhat disagreed to the given statements. 112 respondents "somewhat disagreed" or "disagreed" on the statement "The long-term needs of coastal businesses and local communities are well taken into account in the planning and management of the coastal zones in my country/region" (68 somewhat disagree, 43 disagree), followed by "The impacts of new developments in the coastal zone are well analysed and a balance is sought between the needs of businesses, industry, coastal residents and the environment" (64 somewhat disagree, 44 agree).

The statement most of the respondents agreed on is "There are adequate procedures in my country/region to be involved and express my views and needs as regards coastal planning and management" (19 fully agree, 52 agree).

Most "disagree" responses are noted for the statements related to cross-border issues (66 disagree to "There are adequate procedures to be involved and express views as regards coastal planning and management in neighbouring countries/regions"; 69 disagree to "The planning and management of neighbouring countries/regions is/are well coordinated in my country/region and impacts across the administrative boundaries are adequately analysed and addressed").

To what extent do you agree that the following statements are valid for your country / region?



3.5. The objectives of ICZM and relevance for action on EU level

With a view to exploring options for possible future EU action on ICZM, respondents were asked to evaluate which in their opinion are the most important objectives to be addressed by ICZM (1=low importance, 5=very important).

154 respondents assessed the "promotion of sustainable coastal development in regional sea basins" to be most important (scores 4 or 5).

The next in rank attract very equal top range scores ("Ensuring a sustainable future for local coastal communities" (133 chose 4 or 5), "Protecting the coastal environmental and natural resources" (132 chose 4 or 5), "Ensuring a balance between coastal development and the need to protect the coastal environment and its


natural resources" (131 chose 4 or 5) and "Ensuring a balanced spatial development in the land and sea parts of the coastal zone (128 chose 4 or 5)).

"Ensuring a balance between coastal development and the need to protect the coastal environment and its natural resources" and "Protecting the coastal environmental and natural resources" attract the highest number of the top score 5.

While the overall appreciation of the 5 most important objectives among the ones proposed in the questionnaire is a general pattern, some variation in relative appreciation is observed among groups of respondents. Respondents mainly involved in Spatial planning/Regional development rate higher the objective "Improving the resilience of coastal zones to climate change", participants mainly involved in Marine research consider the objective "Enhancing the prevention of natural and technological risks in coastal zones" to be important.

For all groups, the objective "Stimulating economic growth in coastal areas" is rated relatively lower as an important objective.

Considering possible future EU action on ICZM, what are the most important objectives that ICZM should address?




In an **open question** the participants had the opportunity to express their views on the most challenging issues that the EU should acknowledge when considering

further actions to support ICZM implementation. 82 respondents replied to that question. Most of the answers addressed several challenges. One challenge addressed very often was the lack of a binding but flexible framework for the implementation of ICZM. The absence of cooperation and integration amongst different sectors and hierarchies, the need for land-sea interaction and the difficulty to find a balance between environmental protection and the economic development of coastal zones were also addressed. Respondents to that open question also asked for better participation and integration of stakeholders.

To evaluate the relevance for action on EU level, the participants had the opportunity to assess different justifications. The justifications were rated in general positively (responses "very relevant" and "relevant" predominate). In particular the justification "Coastal zones are of strategic importance to the EU economy and they constitute a common natural and cultural resource; a common EU framework for ICZM facilitates development opportunities and improves effectiveness of preservation measures" was rated most positively with 91 respondents considering it "very relevant".

To what extent do you agree are the following justifications relevant for action at EU level on ICZM?




3.6. Measures, specific instruments and tools

The EU Recommendation on integrated coastal zone management invites Member States to set up national strategies, indicating a broad range of possible measures for such national strategies. With a view to future EU action on ICZM, respondents were asked to indicate the importance (1=low importance, to 5 very important) to be given to certain measures, as well as some specific instruments as tools.

Participants assessed as measures most importance should be given to "institutional coordination between competent authorities" (136 chose 4 or 5), "coherent planning of land and sea parts of the coastal zone" (134 chose 4 or 5) and the "integration of interests (social, economic, environmental) in coastal planning and management" (132 chose 4 or 5).

The next measures in the ranking attract slightly less top range scores ("Cooperation in regional sea basins", "Cross-border coordination", "Integration of risk prevention" and "Public participation"). "Data gathering" has been evaluated as least important.

Respondents mainly involved in environment and nature conservation rank "Cross-border coordination between competent authorities" slightly higher.




In addition to the general measures, the questionnaire invited respondents to evaluate some **specific instruments and tools** with regard to their importance for the effective implementation of ICZM by Member States.

145 participants evaluated "Spatial planning, setting out a vision for coastal development and a strategic plan to orientate the use of coastal resources and space" with 4 or 5. 144 gave a 4 or 5 to "Information systems that facilitate the sharing and use of data and information between competent authorities, stakeholders and the public".

The appreciation of the next instruments/tools is relatively equal and ranges from 131 participants choosing 4 or 5 for "Indicators to guide the development of the coastal zone and the use of coastal resources", over 128 for "Zoning plans, including setback zones in the near shore area where no construction is allowed" to 126 "Coastal climate change strategies, providing an assessment of the impacts of climate change in the coastal zone and guiding adaptation measures". More detailed tools (sediment management plans, land policy instruments) attract relatively less top range scores (4,5).

While for respondents mainly involved in marine research "Zoning plans" range only in fifth place, respondents mainly involved in environment and nature conservation and spatial planning rank it more important (second and third place). Respondents mainly involved in marine research consider "Indicators to guide the development of coastal zones" to be more important.



3.7. Future EU action

Currently, the European Parliament and Council Recommendation on ICZM (2002/413/EC) is the main instrument by which the EU promotes the implementation of ICZM. For the Mediterranean coastal zones an additional step was set in 2010 by the EU ratification of the ICZM Protocol to the Barcelona Convention (Council Decision 2010/631/EU).


With regard to future EU action on ICZM respondents were asked their degree of agreement to 3 statements, appreciating the form which future EU action could take.

42 participants express agreement to "the EU Recommendation on ICZM is a sufficient basis to achieve the objectives of ICZM in the EU" (9 fully agree, 33 agree; 26% of responses to the statement). This statement attracts relatively most disagreement. 102 participants somewhat disagreed or disagreed to the statement (52 somewhat disagree, 50 disagree).

117 participants express agreement to the statement "An EU binding legislative framework would provide a better basis for ICZM implementation in the long-term

and in cross-border contexts" (67 fully agree, 50 agree; 72% of responses to the statement).

112 participants express agreement with "the most effective way for the EU to support ICZM is through financial support to projects, research and studies" (52 fully agree, 60 agree; 68% of responses to the statement).



Breaking down the whole of respondents into the main different groups (covering c.94% of all respondents) the outcome shows some variation in relative results, while confirming the overall pattern of appreciation of the statements.

Respondents from universities and research institutes give more often a 'fully agree'/'agree' appreciation to the effectiveness of EU financial support to support ICZM. By contrast, respondents from industry groups and enterprises respond less often to fully agree or agree on this point, although over half still expresses agreement.

Respondents from NGO, civil society, environmental groups and charities give more often 'fully agree'/'agree' appreciation to the statement that "EU binding legislative framework that would provide a better basis for ICZM implementation the long-term and in cross-border contexts". By contrast, respondents from industry

groups and enterprises respond less often to fully agree or agree with the same statement, although over half still expresses agreement.

	Fully agree/Agree	Fully agree/Agree	Fully agree/Agree
	" The EU Recommendation on ICZM is a sufficient basis to achieve the objectives of ICZM in the EU"	"EU binding legislative framework that would provide a better basis for ICZM implementation in the long-term and in cross-border contexts"	"The most effective way for the EU to support ICZM is through financial support to projects, research and studies "
<i>All respondents</i>	26% (N=164)	72% (N=162)	68% (N=164)
Respondents from national or local government	31% (N=48)	70% (N=46)	68% (N=47)
Respondents university, public or private research	24% (N= 51)	75% (N=51)	82% (N=51)
Respondents NGO, civil society, environmental group, charity	26% (N=27)	85% (N=26)	63% (N=27)
Respondents from industrial interest groups/enterprises and self-employed	21% (n=28)	57% (N=28)	54% (N=28)

When grouping respondents according to activity or policy in which they are involved, also some variations in relative responses can be found: respondents predominantly involved in marine research more often fully agree or agree to the effectiveness of financial support to projects, research and studies. Respondents mainly involved in environment and nature protection and respondents mainly involved in marine research more often reply to fully agree or agree to "an EU binding legislative framework would provide a better basis for ICZM implementation", (89% and 84% respectively, compared to the overall result 72%). On this point, with 60% respondents mainly involved in spatial planning or regional development agree less on a binding legislative framework than the total.

Finally at the end of the ICZM part of the questionnaire, in an **open question** the respondents had the opportunity to specify what in their opinion the EU should do or propose concerning ICZM. 59 participants responded to that question. Nearly half of the respondents to this question suggested a legally binding instrument for the further implementation of ICZM. Participants not explicitly referring to a binding instrument often asked for a common general scheme or common rules for the implementation of ICZM. Analogue to the answers given to the first open question the respondents mention that the instrument would have to be flexible enough to be applicable in different coastal and governance contexts. Funding opportunities to support projects implementing ICZM and a coordinated or joint ICZM-MSP-approach were also suggested as answers to both open questions.

* * *

ANNEX: DATA QUESTIONNAIRE:

Parts I (Identification respondent) and III (ICZM related questions)

- Part I Identification of the respondent (compulsory questions)

Who are you? (Single choice reply)	
I am replying in my personal capacity	116
I am replying on behalf of an organisation	109

For whom do you work or who do you represent? (Single choice reply)	
national government	44
university	39
NGO, civil society, environmental group, charity	39
public research institution	20
local government	19
industrial interest group	14
international body (other than EU institution)	11
self-employed	10
private research institution	7
large enterprise (more than 250 employees)	6
small enterprise (between 10 and 50 employees)	5
EU project	4
micro enterprise (less than 10 employees)	4
medium enterprise (between 50 and 250 employees)	2
EU institution	1

Where are you based? (Single choice reply)	
Belgium	15
Bulgaria	6
Cyprus	3
Denmark	6
Estonia	3
Finland	14
France	13
Germany	13
Greece	4
Ireland	13
Italy	9
Latvia	9
Lithuania	1
Netherlands	8
Poland	7
Portugal	11
Romania	2
Spain	20
Sweden	9

United Kingdom	46
Other	13

In which area are you mostly interested (you may choose more than one alternative)?	
coastal waters	209
coastal land	140
estuaries	112
continental shelf	111
open ocean	86
islands	81

In which maritime activity or policy are you mainly involved? (Single choice reply)	
Environment & nature conservation	68
Spatial planning, regional development	54
Marine research	32
Other	25
Maritime traffic & transport	8
Renewable energy	8
Coastal defence engineering	5
Maritime or cultural heritage	4
Mineral extraction & dredging	4
Commercial fishing	4
Tourism, recreation (including boating and cruise tourism)	4
Aquaculture	3
Recreational fishing	2
Military	2
Non-renewable energy	1
Marine surveillance	1

- **Part III ICZM questions (optional questions)**

Are you familiar with the principles of integrated coastal zone management?	
Yes, fully	110
Yes, somewhat	59
Not really	15
Not at all	6
N/A	-
Have you been involved in the implementation of integrated coastal zone management?	
Yes, regularly	68
Yes, sometimes	47
Not very often	34
Not at all	38
N/A	-

If you have been involved in ICZM, what do you consider to be the benefits that integrated coastal zone management delivers? From 1=insignificant to 5=very significant	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Better understanding between stakeholders and authorities in the coastal zone (N=145)	7	11	13	46	63	5
Improved governance of the coastal zone (N=140)	12	6	10	44	63	5
More efficient use of coastal space and resources, reduction of conflicting claims on space and/or resources (N=139)	13	5	12	34	71	4
More transparent planning and management of the coastal zone (N=144)	11	7	18	36	67	5
Improvements to the coastal environment (N=141)	9	9	21	30	69	3
Increased resilience to coastal risks and impacts of climate change, better coastal defence solutions (N=139)	11	9	29	32	54	4
More opportunities for sustainable economic growth (N=137)	13	10	28	42	42	2
Improved quality of life for coastal communities (N=140)	7	10	36	33	50	4
Other (N=26)	3	0	0	0	14	9

Planning and managing the coast well implies that sufficient information is available to the authorities, stakeholders and concerned citizens.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?					
I am well informed about	Fully agree	Agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	No opinion
the risks that may affect the coast in my country/region, such as by the impacts of climate change (N=173)	64	59	38	11	1
the state of the coastal environment in my country/region (N=173)	62	69	30	11	1
the trends in population growth and economic activities in the coastal zone of my country/region (N=173)	42	61	50	17	3

the development plans in the coastal zone in my country/region, such as for new buildings or ports or energy infrastructure (N=173)	39	68	46	19	1
actions the authorities undertake in my country/region to support sustainable coastal development (N=173)	36	58	54	24	1
developments plans and actions in neighbouring coastal countries/regions (N=171)	18	24	55	66	8

The implementation of integrated coastal zone management implies that the planning and management of coastal zones is based on a long-term perspective covering all sectors and uses of the coast, preservation of the coastal environment, robust information and analysis, coordinated action by relevant authorities, including across borders, and due involvement of stakeholders.

To what extent do you agree that the following statements are valid for your country/region?	Fully agree	Agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	No opinion
The long-term needs of coastal businesses and local communities are well taken into account in the planning and management of the coastal zones in my country/region (N=169)	16	39	68	43	3
The impacts of new developments in the coastal zone are well analysed and a balance is sought between the needs of businesses, industry, coastal residents and the environment (N=170)	15	44	64	44	3
The development plans in the coastal zone in my country/region, such as for new buildings or ports or energy infrastructure are coordinated (N=162)	12	35	61	47	7
The coastal environment in my country/region is well protected and the preservation of the environment is safeguarded for the long-term (N=168)	19	48	56	42	3

The impacts of climate change on the coastal zone in my country/region are well analysed and the planning and management takes future climatic conditions and sea-level rise well into account (N=168)	18	46	54	47	3
There are adequate procedures in my country/region to be involved and express my views and needs as regards coastal planning and management (N=167)	19	52	56	36	4
There are adequate procedures to be involved and express views as regards coastal planning and management in neighbouring countries/regions (N=166)	6	22	50	66	22
The planning and management of neighbouring countries/regions is/are well coordinated in my country/region and impacts across the administrative boundaries are adequately analysed and addressed (N=162)	6	18	45	69	24

Considering possible future EU action on ICZM, what are the most important objectives that integrated coastal zone management should address? 1=low importance – 5 = very important	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Promoting sustainable coastal development in regional seas basins (N=165)	11	7	23	77	77	2
Ensuring a sustainable future for local coastal communities (N=169)	13	8	14	48	85	1
Protecting the coastal environmental and natural resources (N=168)	18	5	11	30	102	2

Ensuring a balance between coastal development and the need to protect the coastal environment and its natural resources (N=169)	16	7	12	28	103	1
Ensuring a balanced spatial development in the land and sea parts of the coastal zone (N=169)	16	5	19	49	79	1
Improving the resilience of coastal zones to climate changes (N=169)	16	8	18	51	73	3
Improving the governance of coastal zones (N=162)	15	8	16	39	81	3
Enhancing the prevention of natural and technological risks in coastal zones (N=165)	10	10	24	48	66	7
Stimulating sustainable economic growth in coastal areas (N=160)	9	22	32	40	56	1
Other (N=24)	1	0	1	2	17	3

Open Question: What is / are the most challenging issue(s) that the EU should acknowledge when considering further actions to support ICZM implementation?
82 respondents

The EU Recommendation on integrated coastal zone management sets a common framework for implementation in EU coastal Member States. However, coastal zones are very diverse and the coastal planning and management arrangements between national, regional and/or local authorities differ significantly from one Member State to the other.

To what extent are the following justifications relevant for action at EU level on integrated coastal zone management?	Very relevant	Relevant	Not very relevant	Not relevant at all	I don't know
Coastal zones are of strategic importance to the EU economy and they constitute a common natural and cultural resource. A common EU framework for ICZM facilitates development opportunities and improves effectiveness of preservation measures. (N=163)	91	56	11	2	3
Coastal environmental processes are trans-boundary in nature and can be better managed in the context of a common EU framework for ICZM (N=166)	77	63	20	2	4

Coastal planning and management systems are very complex and are in some cases based on EU legislation e.g. nature conservation. A common EU framework for ICZM would provide more clarity and a better level-playing field for businesses and citizens who invest and work in coastal zones. (N=163)	73	60	21	2	7
Coastal planning decisions often have consequences for coasts in neighbouring countries. A common EU framework for ICZM facilitates the cross-border coordination of such planning. (N=162)	61	80	17	1	3
Coastal zones are vulnerable to the impacts of climate changes, which can be better addressed in the context of a common EU framework for ICZM. (N=159)	59	72	19	3	6
Other (N=26)	16	1	1	0	8

The EU Recommendation on integrated coastal zone management invites Member States to set up national strategies, indicating a broad range of possible measures for such national strategies. The implementation of integrated coastal zone management strategies in coastal Member States constitutes the major way to implement and deliver ICZM in the EU.

What importance should be given to the following measures as part of future EU action on integrated coastal zone management? From 1= low importance, to 5=very important	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Institutional coordination between competent authorities (national, regional, local) (N=162)	7	8	10	40	96	1
Coherent planning of land and sea parts of the coastal zone (N=164)	9	7	12	40	94	2
Integration of interests (social, economic, environmental) in integrated coastal zone planning and management (N=164)	8	6	18	36	96	0
Cooperation in regional sea basins (N=160)	4	8	21	62	63	2

Cross-border coordination between competent authorities (N=162)	6	7	23	57	66	3
Integration of risk prevention and climate change into the integrated coastal zone planning and management of coastal zones (=158)	6	9	20	50	72	1
Public participation in coastal zone planning and management (N=163)	7	10	29	48	69	0
Data gathering and information management to underpin coastal planning and management (N=129)	6	7	8	38	70	0
Other	1	0	1	1	13	3

Which of the following instruments and tools are important for effective implementation of integrated coastal zone management by Member States? From 1= low importance, to 5=very important	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Spatial planning, setting out a vision for coastal development and a strategic plan to orientate the use of coastal resources and space (N=168)	9	4	10	32	113	0
Information systems that facilitate the sharing and use of data and information between competent authorities, stakeholders and the public (N=168)	6	5	12	44	100	1
Indicators to guide the development of the coastal zone and the use of coastal resources (N=167)	9	4	22	54	77	1
Zoning plans, including set-back zones in the near shore area where no construction is allowed (N=168)	8	10	18	53	75	4
Coastal climate change strategies, providing an assessment of the impacts of climate change in the coastal zone and guiding adaptation measures (N=168)	6	9	27	63	63	0

Economic (including fiscal measures) to stimulate sustainable development options and innovative approaches to coastal management (N=163)	5	10	28	53	65	2
Sediment management plans, providing an assessment of sediments and sediment systems, delimiting coastal sediment cells and guiding coastal defence choices (N=165)	4	12	40	59	44	6
Land policy instruments (such as land purchase mechanisms, easements, transferable development rights) (N=153)	6	7	51	49	40	12
Other (N=23)	1	1	0	1	9	2

The main instrument by which the EU promotes implementation of Integrated Coastal Zone Management is currently the European Parliament and Council Recommendation on ICZM (2002/413/EC). For the Mediterranean coastal zones, an additional step has been set by the EU conclusion of the Protocol on Integrated Coastal Zone Management (Council Decision 2010/631/EU).

Considering future EU action on Integrated Coastal Zone Management, to what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Fully agree	Agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	No opinion
The EU Recommendation on ICZM is a sufficient basis to achieve the objectives of ICZM in the EU. (N=164)	9	33	52	50	20
An EU binding legislative framework would provide a better basis for ICZM implementation in the long-term and in cross-border contexts. (N=162)	67	50	18	15	12
The most effective way for the EU to support ICZM is through financial support to projects, research and studies. (N=164)	52	60	35	10	7

Open Question: What would you suggest that the EU should do or propose concerning ICZM i.e. how to go forward with ICZM within the EU? 59 respondents