



## Comprehensive cross-border SEA and ICZM action plan aimed to reinforce the environmental integrity

### ARTWEI PROJECT COMPONENT 3

1. **Name of the cross-border Transitional Waters Area:** Öresund (The Sound).
2. **Themes for the comprehensive cross-border SEA and ICZM actions:**
  - Cross-border coastal and aquatic NATURA 2000 management and EU Water Frameworks Directive implementation
  - Cross-border spatial planning/ Strategic Environmental Assessment issues
  - Baltic Sea Action Plan implementation in the SBTW areas
  - Sustainable and cross-border integrated management of TW resources
  - Cross-border eutrophication (and/or water quality modeling)
  - Cross-border data and information exchange
  - Cross-border mussel farming as a tool for practical implementation of EU Water Framework Directive
  - Cross-border fisheries control
  - Other comprehensive cross-border SEA and ICZM action themes:.....
3. **List of stakeholder institutions ready to participate in the implementation of the comprehensive cross-border SEA and ICZM actions:**
  - Region Skane & County of Skane**
  - Region Sjælland**
  - Copenhagen City Council**
  - Malmö City Council**
  - Helsingborg City Council**
4. **Objective of the comprehensive cross-border SEA and ICZM actions:**

**To create one or several marine protected areas (Marine Reserves) in the Oresund**
5. **Comprehensive long-term cross-border SEA and ICZM actions:**
  - Coherent cross-border practical field actions
  - Creation of joint databases and/or maps
  - Joint cross-border fostering of sustainable utilization of TW ecosystem goods and services
  - Dedicated IT programming and modeling

- Spatial planning / Strategic Environmental Assessment procedures
- Institutional / organizational actions (establishing cross-border task groups etc.)
- Public awareness and capacity building actions (stakeholder training etc.)
- Scenario simulation exercises and / or games
- Other methods: A number of public awareness-building activities need to be implemented. Stakeholder involvement is essential particularly in the first phases. Therefore a number of campaigns targeting different groups will have to be started.

**6. Key result indicators:**

- Number of cross-border solutions that will be applied to tackle existing TW environmental integrity problems. If the responsible authorities agree – **2**:
  - Agreement between authorities in the two countries on Management Plan(s) for the Marine Protected Area(s)
  - Agreement on joint implementation of the Management Plan including surveillance and enforcement, and monitoring and research.
- Number of innovative tools that will be applied to tackle existing TW environmental integrity problems - **none**
- Number of coastal inhabitants in both countries sharing the area that will be positively affected by the action  
Approximately **4 million**
- Number of stakeholders with improved capacities as a result of the action
  - Local Government officials in both countries, approximately **20 in total**
- Number of stakeholder institutions in both countries that are going to be additionally involved into the implementation of the cross-border SEA and ICZM action plan.

**~5 in the two countries**

(Municipalities in Copenhagen, Helsingborg, Malmö, and the regions Skane and Sjælland)

**7. SWOT analysis of the proposed comprehensive cross-border SEA and ICZM action plan:**

<u>Strengths</u>	<u>Weaknesses</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A cross-border on environmental protection will be the first between the two countries.</li> <li>• A large portion of the population is likely to be in support of the designation of the area as a Marine Protected Area, which is likely to increase the political support for the Plan.</li> <li>• A joint marine protected area has been on the table for discussion between the countries (on the provincial/count/ &amp; municipal levels) for a number of years.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No previous such agreements have been signed between the countries. This may make some of the stakeholders uncertain.</li> <li>• A big conceptual gap among stakeholders - academic institutions, municipalities, regional authorities and private stakeholders on both sides of the Sound</li> <li>• Too little and too scattered information resources without a single information exchange platform</li> </ul>

<u>Opportunities</u>	<u>Threats</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A great opportunity to formalize a Marine Protected Area, which already has broad support in wide circles.</li> <li>• Most of the environmental (clean-up) actions that would be necessary in a Marine Protected Area, has already been taken (i.e. most land-based pollution have been dealt with, the fishery is under reasonable control)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main remaining issues deals with stress from shipping. Procedures for better management of issues such as garbage and sewage collection from ships need to be dealt with. In addition the issues of ballast water exchange and designated anchoring areas need to be resolved.</li> </ul>