

Measuring Progress in the Implementation of Integrated Coastal Zone Management



**Guidance notes for completing
the Progress Indicator**

EU Working Group on Indicators and Data

Measuring Progress in the Implementation of Integrated Coastal Zone Management

Guidance Notes for Completing the Progress Indicator

A little background

An EU ICZM Expert Group was set up in 2003 to look at ways of helping Member States carry out the EU *Recommendation concerning the implementation of Integrated Coastal Zone Management* (2002). The Expert Group, which includes representatives from all 20 coastal Member States and from two Candidate Countries, established a Working Group on Indicators and Data (WG-ID) to advise it on how countries can assess whether they are moving further towards, or away from, a more sustainable future for their coasts.

After twelve months of looking at different possibilities, the WG-ID suggested that Member States and Candidate Countries should adopt two sets of indicators:

- An indicator to measure progress in implementing ICZM (the ‘progress indicator’).
- A core set of 27 indicators of sustainable development of the coastal zone (the ‘sustainability indicators’).

These two indicator sets are directed related. That is, the greater the penetration of ICZM into all levels of governance and activity in the coastal zone, the greater the likelihood that there will be a positive improvement in the state of the coast. And the more the coast is seen to improve, the greater will be a willingness to introduce further and more sophisticated aspects of ICZM. Thus the indicators should mutually reinforce one another to the long-term benefit of the coastal zone.

The progress indicator was road tested during 2004 by coastal practitioners in a number of countries and some revisions made to the original proposal. On the basis of those tests, the Expert Group recommended that all Member States and Candidate Countries should use the revised indicator to make a baseline assessment of how far ICZM is being implemented as part of the roll-out in 2006 of the national coastal strategies required by the EU ICZM Recommendation.

These Guidance Notes have been written to help Member States, Regional Authorities and Coastal Partnerships complete the assessment recommended by the EU ICZM Expert Group.

They include a brief introduction to the thinking behind the indicator, some notes which help explain the meaning of the ‘phases’ and ‘actions’, and guidance on how to fill in the indicator table.

Introduction to the progress indicator

Some studies in the past have tried to measure how far ICZM has been implemented in a particular country, region or regional sea by counting the number of ICZM initiatives or coastal actions. Other exercises have gone further *quantitatively* and attempted to measure the length of coast supposedly managed by an ICZM programme.

Both methods are useful in that they help identify who is doing what on the coast and are important building blocks in a stocktake of ICZM activity, but they do not say anything about the *quality* of any particular initiative.

The Working Group on Indicators and Data approached the problem by looking at a number of studies of coastal planning and management from the past two decades. These studies broadly agree that the ICZM process is both *stepped* and *cyclical*. This means that, first, implementation will be phased in over a number of years, and that, second, each turn of the management (or budgetary) wheel over those years will repeat the phases but each time in greater depth and complexity, *assuming that there has been a positive response in the state of the coast*. In other words, the incremental implementation of ICZM will occur only if the process is seen by decision-makers to lead to an improvement in the physical or economic condition of the coastal zone, or a greater ease in its effective planning and management. If there is little perception that the coast is moving towards a more sustainable future, or that the necessary changes in working practices demanded by the ICZM process is more trouble than they are worth, practitioners will struggle to move the ICZM agenda forward and each phase will be repeated but in a weakened state.

The research community generally agrees that there are four phases through which the ICZM process passes:

1. Planning and management are taking place in the coastal zone.
2. A framework exists for taking ICZM forward.
3. Most aspects of an ICZM approach are in place and functioning reasonably well.
4. An efficient, adaptive and integrative process is embedded at all levels of governance and is delivering greater sustainable use of the coast.

The WG-ID has adopted these phases and then sub-divided each of them into a number of actions. *It does not follow that all of the actions listed in the indicator table will be implemented in each phase*. Rather, it means that the actions are ones typically found in that particular stage of the development of an ICZM process.

Practical experience suggests that during the first time period or cycle, pioneering authorities or regions might reach into phase 3 of the ICZM process but leave a number of actions uncompleted in phases 1 and 2. During the second cycle, they might complete those actions without necessarily moving on to phase 4. Just as with the diffusion of any other concept or product, more coastal areas will join in as the process becomes understood more widely and ICZM is seen to be having an effect.

What the indicator tries to do is capture the degree to which ICZM is being implemented for a particular place and at a particular point in time.

Completing the progress indicator table

Working together

We know from tests carried out already that coastal practitioners differ in the way that they fill in the progress indicator table. Civil servants working in central government departments, for example, will not necessarily have much idea about what is going on locally. Similarly, local practitioners will have restricted knowledge about what is happening at regional or national levels. Even people working in the same organisation often differ from their colleagues in their assessment of whether a particular action is being fully implemented or not.

We therefore think it best to bring together coastal and marine practitioners from different administrations, organisations, agencies and interest groups to complete the table *jointly*. In this way, we should gain a more accurate picture of how far ICZM is being implemented at all three spatial levels – national, regional and local.

In fact, the act of completing the progress indicator is an important step in helping stakeholders to comprehend better exactly what ICZM is! The debate necessary to decide on an answer, even one as apparently simple as ‘yes’ or ‘no’, leads to an exchange of opinions about which organisations and agencies are doing what on the coast, and to what effect.

The Working Group on Indicators and Data recommends that all countries organise a workshop (or, preferably, a number of regional workshops) which bring together stakeholders from all administrative levels to complete the progress indicator table and provide a baseline for reporting under the EU ICZM Recommendation.

Experience has shown that the most effective way of organising a workshop is for someone to first give a general explanation of the purpose of the indicator and what the indicator table represents, and then for participants to split into small groups of about ten persons each. As far as possible, there should be practitioners from all administrative levels in each group. ***Although working in groups, the tables should still be completed on an individual basis.*** This is because it is probable that only one or two people at the workshop will be familiar with the same local area. Hence a completed indicator table could show a collective decision for the country and regional levels, but an individual decision for the locality.

Completing the indicator table

Here are the steps you should take to complete the indicator table:

1. Read this section through first and then read ***Phases and actions: some explanatory notes***, which accompany the table. The notes will help you understand what is meant by each phase and each action.
2. Print the indicator table in colour, if possible; this will help you distinguish between the phases.
3. The indicator table is divided into four phases and 31 actions. Alongside each action is a statement about whether or not that particular action is being carried out. You are asked to agree or disagree with the statement. If you think that the action has been implemented, or is being implemented, enter YES. If you think that the action has not been carried out, enter NO.

4. We want to assess how far ICZM has progressed at each level. Hence we want you to enter YES or NO for all three levels in 2005 - national, regional and local. (In some countries, there is no regional planning system – everything is done at the municipal level. In such cases, you would answer NO for regional and either YES, NO or DK for local).
5. We want to try and identify a trend through time; if you can, try and enter YES and NO for each level for the year 2000 also.
6. Continue until you have entered YES or NO for all 31 actions.

It is that simple! However, there are some rules that you must observe:

- Only enter YES if you are sure that the action described is actually taking place or has happened *in full*. If it has been implemented only partly, you must enter NO.
- If you are not sure whether an action is or is not being carried out, enter DK (Don't Know).
- Each YES or NO or DK that you enter must refer to the *same region* and the *same locality* for all 31 actions. Before filling in the indicator table, decide on your region and your local area. This is important because ICZM initiatives can vary remarkably from one municipality to another - even close neighbours can differ considerably in their approach to coastal planning and management. 'Regional' could be a standard region (Catalunya, Bretagne, Emilia-Romagna, for example) but it could also be somewhere around the size of a province (like a French department, a Swedish län and a Greek prefecture), or somewhere as big as the Wadden Sea, the Gulf of Finland or the Azores. 'Local' could be a municipality, a sedimentary cell or an estuary.
- Please write the names of your chosen region and local area at the top of the indicator table so that we know which places you are thinking about.
- Remember! There are no right or wrong answers. You can only enter YES or NO or DK according to what you know about your local area or your region.

When you have completed the indicator table, it will look something like this:

Phase	Action	Description	National		Regional		Local	
			2000	2005	2000	2005	2000	2005
Planning and management are ...	1	Decisions about ...	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	2	Sectoral stakeholders ...	No	No	No	Yes	DK	Yes
	3	There are spatial ...	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	4	Aspects of the ...	Yes	Yes	DK	Yes	Yes	Yes
	5	Planning on the	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
A framework exists for ...	6	Existing instruments ...	DK	DK	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	7	Adequate funding ...	DK	No	DK	No	No	DK
	8	A stocktake ...	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
	9	There is a formal ...	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
	10	Ad hoc actions ...	DK	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
	11	A sustainable ...	Yes	Yes	DK	Yes	No	No
	12	Guidelines have been ...	No	Yes	DK	Yes	No	No
		etc., etc., etc.						

Next steps

The workshop organiser must collect all completed indicator tables and send them to the Working Group on Indicators and Data at the address below.

The WG-ID will compute the responses from each workshop or group assessment and keep a running account for each Member State or Candidate Country.

We will send the results of the group assessment to your workshop organiser (and to you if you enter your email address at the end of the Indicator Table).

Results will be presented to the EU IZCM Expert Group on an ongoing basis.

We welcome any comments that you may have about the progress indicator and the way that it is being used. In particular, we want to know about any problems you encountered in understanding the Actions and filling in the Indicator Table and any changes you would recommend (either to the description of the actions or to the explanatory and guidance notes).

EU Working Group on Indicators and Data, European Topic Centre for the Terrestrial Environment,
Autonomous University of Barcelona, Edifici C –Torre C5 4a Planta, 08193 Bellaterra, Spain

clive.gilbert@sailcoast.org; françoise.breton@uab.es

+44 7748 634907

+34 93 581 3549

Phases and actions: some explanatory notes

These notes will help you understand the precise meaning of each *phase* and each *action* in the Indicator Table. The notes describe what it is we are looking for with each action. Sometimes they do this by adding something to the *description* of the action, sometimes by commenting on the particular role of the action in the ICZM process.

You should read the notes before you begin to fill in the table and then refer to them as you consider each action.

Phase 1: Planning and management are taking place in the coastal zone

In this phase, the coastal zone is being treated in the same way as anywhere else in the municipality or region. Spatial planning and development control is taking place but the coast is not regarded as a special place requiring a different approach to its planning and management. However, existing instruments could be developed into the basis of an ICZM approach.

Action 1

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

Action 2

Stakeholders meet to discuss specifically coastal issues but there is no cross-sector engagement; sectoral interests speak only to themselves and not to each other.

Action 3

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

Action 4

Is any monitoring taking place? Gathering information about aspects of the coastal environment and economy often leads to the coast being identified as a special place requiring special treatment.

Action 5

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

Phase 2: A framework exists for taking ICZM forward

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

Action 6

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

Action 7

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

Action 8

A stocktake is an indispensable first step along the ICZM road to coastal management. Has one been completed that includes your chosen locality or region, perhaps as part of a Local Agenda 21 exercise? Most stocktakes in this phase restrict themselves to identifying those stakeholders who exercise some sort of legal responsibility in the coastal zone. We are not referring here to a more detailed and extensive state of the coast report – this comes in the next phase (cf. Action 14).

Action 9

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

Action 10

What we are looking for are actions which involve a reasonable degree of collaboration between sectoral interests such as coastal defence and nature conservation, or fishing and aggregates extraction.

Action 11

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

Action 12

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

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

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

Action 13

Here, sectoral interests, which usually have some sort of statutory or legal competence, are joined by non-statutory organisations and interests such as coastal communities, NGOs and pressure groups. The core of this action is that a process exists whereby *all* coastal and marine interests can become involved in discussing coastal issues, should they want to.

Action 14

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

Action 15

Management plans primarily related to one sector, such as coastal defence, recreation or nature conservation, are common. But having a single sector plan is not enough. Here we are looking for plans which are genuinely multi-sectoral and committed to an integrated approach.

Action 16

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

Action 17

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

Action 18

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

Action 19

Coastal management is cursed by ‘temporaryness’; an ICZM approach stresses permanence, not least in terms of someone at each administrative level with just one responsibility – the integrated management of the coastal zone!

Action 20

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

Action 21

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

Action 22

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

Action 23

In most Member States, statutory authorities consult a prescribed list of local and regional authorities, organisations and interest groups about development proposals (including their own planning schemes). Are coastal partnerships and other interest groups also *routinely* consulted?

Action 24

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

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

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

Action 25

Political support in earlier phases could have blown hot and cold. What we are looking for here is constant and effective political leadership at all administrative levels.

Action 26

This action reflects the need for agencies, authorities and interests to collaborate when necessary across administrative, local, regional and international boundaries, including marine ones (such as is intended when the Water Framework Directive is implemented).

Action 27

Goals have been set and progress towards achieving them is being monitored using a set of comparable indicators (such as those developed by the EU Working Group on Coastal and Marine Indicators and Data).

Action 28

‘Long term’ means a minimum of five years.

Action 29

This action is about ensuring that the huge amount of information on coastal and marine issues is made available to practitioners when they need it and in a form that they can readily use. It implies that end users have been part of the information gathering and disseminating process from the beginning.

Action 30

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

Action 31

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

An Indicator for Measuring Progress in the Implementation of ICZM

Country:

Region:

Local area:

Phase	Action	Description	National		Regional		Local	
			2000	2005	2000	2005	2000	2005
Planning and management are taking place in the coastal zone	1	Decisions about planning and managing the coast are governed by general legal instruments.						
	2	Sectoral stakeholders meet on an ad hoc basis to discuss specific coastal and marine issues.						
	3	There are spatial development plans which include the coastal zone but do not treat it as a distinct and separate entity.						
	4	Aspects of the coastal zone, including marine areas, are regularly monitored.						
	5	Planning on the coast includes the statutory protection of natural areas.						
A framework exists for taking ICZM forward	6	Existing instruments are being adapted and combined to deal with coastal planning and management issues.						
	7	Adequate funding is usually available for undertaking actions on the coast.						
	8	A stocktake of the coast (identifying who does what, where and how) has been carried out.						
	9	There is a formal mechanism whereby stakeholders meet regularly to discuss a range of coastal and marine issues.						
	10	Ad hoc actions on the coast are being carried out that include recognisable elements of ICZM.						

	11	A sustainable development strategy which includes specific references to coasts and seas is in place.							
	12	Guidelines have been produced by national, regional or local governments which advise planning authorities on appropriate uses of the coastal zone.							
Most aspects of an ICZM approach to planning and managing the coast are in place and functioning reasonably well	13	All relevant parties concerned in the ICZM decision-making process have been identified and are involved.							
	14	A report on the State of the Coast has been written with the intention of repeating the exercise every five or ten years.							
	15	There is a statutory integrated coastal zone management plan.							
	16	Strategic Environmental Assessments are used commonly to examine policies, strategies and plans for the coastal zone.							
	17	A non-statutory coastal zone management strategy has been drawn up and an action plan is being implemented.							
	18	There are open channels of communication between those responsible for the coast at all levels of government.							
	19	Each administrative level has at least one member of staff whose sole responsibility is ICZM.							
	20	Statutory development plans span the interface between land and sea.							
	21	Spatial planning of sea areas is required by law.							
	22	A number of properly staffed and properly funded partnerships of coastal and marine stakeholders have been set up.							
	23	Coastal and estuary partnerships are consulted routinely about proposals to do with the coastal zone.							

	24	Adequate mechanisms are in place to allow coastal communities to take a participative role in ICZM decisions.							
An efficient, adaptive and integrative process is embedded at all levels of governance and is delivering greater sustainable use of the coast	25	There is strong, constant and effective political support for the ICZM process.							
	26	There is routine (rather than occasional) cooperation across coastal and marine boundaries.							
	27	A comprehensive set of coastal and marine indicators is being used to assess progress towards a more sustainable situation.							
	28	A long-term financial commitment is in place for the implementation of ICZM.							
	29	End users have access to as much information of sufficient quality as they need to make timely, coherent and well-crafted decisions.							
	30	Mechanisms for reviewing and evaluating progress in implementing ICZM are embedded in governance.							
	31	Monitoring shows a demonstrable trend towards a more sustainable use of coastal and marine resources.							

If you are happy to do so, please add your name and email address (we will only contact you if we want to clarify the exact location and extent of your chosen locality).

Name:

Email address:

Thank you for your participation!