



WORLD OCEAN COUNCIL

The International Business Alliance for Corporate Ocean Responsibility

NATIONAL BUSINESS FORUM
ON
MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING

Washington, D.C., USA

July 13-14, 2011

FORUM REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	2
SESSION 1 MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING (MSP): A COMMON UNDERSTANDING.....	4
1.1. Presentations	4
1.2. Discussion	4
SESSION 2 CASE STUDIES: MSP EXPERIENCE AND BUSINESS INVOLVEMENT.....	5
2.1 Presentations	5
2.2 Discussion	5
SESSION 3 THE U.S. MSP PROCESS, PLANS AND BUSINESS INVOLVEMENT.....	7
3.1 Presentations	7
3.2 Discussion	8
SESSION 4 A BUSINESS COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN ON MSP.....	10
4.1. Introduction.....	10
4.2. Discussion	11
4.2.1 Collaborate	12
4.2.2 Get proactively engaged	12
4.2.3 Provide constructive input	12
4.2.4 Get involved at the regional level	13
4.3 Conclusions and Next Steps	13
4.3.1 WOC could act as a broad-based clearinghouse for business on MSP	13
4.3.2 WOC could ensure ocean industry collaboration and coordination on CMSP	14
4.3.3 WOC could engage directly with the NOC and RPBs.....	14
Appendix 1: Forum Program.....	1-1
Appendix 2: List of Forum Participants.....	2-1
Appendix 3: Responses to General Audience Survey on MSP	3-1

INTRODUCTION

The World Ocean Council (WOC) National Business Forum on Marine Spatial Planning (MSP), 13-14 July, Washington, D.C. drew together more than 65 business leaders from a range of ocean industries, along with representatives of Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) NGOs and government agencies involved in MSP. The industries represented included oil and gas, shipping, fisheries, mining, offshore renewable energy, maritime law, marine tourism, marine technology, marine environmental services, and others.

The National Business Forum on MSP was organized by the WOC in partnership with Battelle Memorial Institute. The conference was also sponsored by the National Ocean Industries Association and Blank Rome.

The goals of the National Business Forum on MSP were to:

- Create a clear understanding of MSP in the ocean business community
- Define and examine the potential business impacts and benefits of MSP
- Ensure the business community is fully informed of the specific U.S. MSP process and plans
- Develop a WOC Action Plan for engaging CMSP and facilitating/coordinating business involvement in MSP as it develops in the U.S.

The Forum consisted of four sessions:

1. Marine Spatial Planning (MSP): A Common Understanding
2. Case Studies: MSP Experience And Business Involvement
3. The U.S. MSP Process, Plans And Business Involvement
4. A Business Community Strategy And Action Plan On MSP

Summaries of the presentations and discussions are presented below. The presentations are available at www.oceancouncil.org.

SESSION 1. MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING (MSP): A COMMON UNDERSTANDING

1.1. Presentations

- Introduction to MSP Concepts and Process
Leslie-Ann McGee, Director, Ocean and Coastal Solutions, Battelle Memorial Institute
- MSP Data, Information, Tools and Approaches
Jennifer Lukens, Acting Director, NOAA Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning Program
- Environment Community Interests and Expectations of MSP
Sandra Whitehouse, Senior Advisor, Ocean Conservancy

1.2. Discussion

The question and answer session after each presentation brought out a number of key themes, including:

Q: Who are considered as stakeholders in CMSP?

A: At the June 2011 NOC three-day workshop on CMSP some government official indicated those other than government officials were not stakeholders. The presenters stressed that all commercial and recreational interests are stakeholders.

Q: Who will be involved in the regional planning bodies (RPBs) to be set up, and will the Regional Fishery Management Councils (RFMCs) be included?

A: There are apparently some Federal Advisory Committee Act issues regarding RFMC's because they are non-governmental, non-profit entities, but they should be formally involved in some manner in the CMSP process.

Q: Is the National Ocean Policy (NOP) another unfunded mandate and another layer of bureaucracy being added?

A: The NOP framework acknowledges there is much relevant work that has already been done. The NOP is not starting from scratch and seeks to learn from and build on existing efforts, e.g. the Rhode Island Special Area Management Plan will be integrated into the regional planning body process.

Q: Will the policy be implemented before the science is established?

A: To some extent, there will never be enough information, and so planning must take place in any event. Nonetheless, there is a lot of science, data, and information that already exists to contribute to CMSP.

SESSION 2. CASE STUDIES: MSP EXPERIENCE AND BUSINESS INVOLVEMENT

2.1 Presentations

Panel: US MSP Experience Case Studies

- Northeast US

- MSP organizer/coordinator perspective
Leslie-Ann McGee, Director, Ocean and Coastal Solutions, Battelle Memorial Institute
- Industry/private sector perspective
Dave Preble, Rhode Island Member, New England Fishery Management Council

- West Coast US

- MSP organizer/coordinator perspective
Bob Bailey, Manager, Oregon Coastal Zone Management Program
- Industry/private sector perspective
Ken Connell, Coastal Oceanographer, Golder Associates

Panel: Other MSP Experience Case Studies

- Canada

- MSP organizer/coordinator perspective
Camille Mageau, Director, Oceans Policy and Planning, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
- Industry/private sector perspective
Jim McLsac, Coordinating Director, BC Commercial Fisheries Caucus

- European Union/United Kingdom

- MSP organizer/coordinator perspective
Haitze Siemers, Head of Unit, Maritime Policy for the North Sea, Baltic Sea and landlocked countries, DG MARE, European Commission
- MSP organizer/coordinator perspective
Peter Lawrence, Director, BigBlueStuff, in association with Golder Associates

Analysis of Proposed US MSP

Brent Greenfield, Executive Director, National Ocean Policy Coalition
Jack Belcher, Managing Director, National Ocean Policy Coalition

2.2 Discussion

The question and answer session after each presentation brought out a number of key themes, including:

Q: The drivers for much of the recent MSP interest and action seem to be related to renewable energy, while little is heard about the many existing industries. Is there a conflict, outside state waters, in need of a solution by federal policy?

A: In New England, there is a problem outside of state waters especially regarding fisheries conflicts with energy development in federal waters. In Washington State, renewable energy use was not considered before 2006, whereas other existing and established industry has a process in place to address their use of ocean space and resources.

Q: What are the top three conflicts that have been addressed in the Oregon State planning?

A: It is hoped that areas of opportunity for the hydrokinetic energy industry will be identified and that areas of ecological importance will be determined to settle the debate between environmentalists and fishing community and aquaculture. The undersea cable industry will benefit because they will have mapped out in detail where fishing grounds are and what the sea floor features are, bringing more certainty to the sector.

Q: What criteria were used for selecting regions for MSP in Canada, and why was MSP only implemented in a few regions rather than all areas?

A: In Canada, areas were chosen on a priority basis, based on ecological criteria and administrative realities, adding that the existence of conflicts, e.g. oil and gas development and fisheries impacts in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Beaufort Sea. The potential for economic development also played a role in choosing specific regions, e.g. shipping interests are a major economic driver for the West Coast region.

Q: Is engaging the private sector better done at the level of individual companies or trade associations?

A: Engagement is often better through a group. In Canada the Commercial Fisheries Caucus and Association of Petroleum Producers give information and advice to their representatives to advocate on their behalf. However, in the EU they have found that sometimes information can be so detailed and technical that company level representation is needed.

Q: How is adaptive management incorporated into existing plans and how to ensure that new information is used to make decisions?

A: Adaptive management is a goal in the Canadian CMSP and they are to report back on a periodic basis. In the UK, a phased approach to planning has allowed for adaptive management.

SESSION 3. THE U.S. MSP PROCESS, PLANS AND BUSINESS INVOLVEMENT

3.1 Presentations

Government Plans for CMSP

Sally Yozell, Policy Director, NOAA, Department of Commerce

To paraphrase, Ms Yozell highlighted that healthy oceans are important to the economy and for job creation and that the ocean management situation in the U.S. is complex, with over 140 statutes and 20 agencies addressing ocean issues, making it a challenge to integrate efforts and information.

More specifically about CMSP, it was highlighted that CMSP:

- Is similar to the planning that has taken place on land and it is early in the process.
- Should provide more predictability, better organizes the use and management of ocean areas and provides data to improve ecosystem health.
- Is regionally-focused and that the NOC is working to bring local interests and RMFCs into the regional planning bodies RPBs.
- Regional workshops will be held after RPBs are established.
- Policy needs to be developed regionally by those most knowledgeable at local level to address concerns about rules that vary by region.
- Will help enable better understanding of where we want to go with ocean use, reduce conflicts, bring more certainty, and create a more coordinated approach by the various federal agencies.
- Will include measures of success such as: RPBs, regional marine plans, accessible data for decision-making, improved coordination among government agencies, regulatory efficiencies, and improved environmental conditions.

Economic and Business Benefits and Impacts of CMSP

Kristen Sarri, Deputy Director, Policy and Strategic Planning, Department of Commerce

To paraphrase, Ms. Sarri emphasized that without CMSP, ocean industries will continue to experience uncertain return on industry investments, limited data availability, fragmented regulatory review process, litigation risk from opposing interests, and unforeseen events that stop development or operations. As an alternative, CMSP provides a tool for business that supports economic growth, opportunity, and investment that can increase predictability and reduce conflict, bring access to integrated data, increase coordination and efficiency, reduce litigation risks from opposing interests, and reveal conflicts up front with opportunity for early resolution.

While CMSP outputs will only be as good as the process and stakeholders involved allow it to be, there will be costs for government and various users. Difficult decisions will have to be made and tradeoffs between existing and future uses. To help ensure success, CMSP must focus on adaptive management, use best available science, and be transparent in developing and monitoring the plans.

Science and CMSP

Alan Thornhill, Science Advisor to the Director, BOEMRE, Department of Interior

To paraphrase, Mr. Thornhill outlined that CMSP brings together sustainability, ecosystem-based approach, science-driven decisions, and adaptive management. The process moves beyond the current situation of ad hoc decision-making that does not lead to predictability and coherent decision-making for use of the increasing crowded and stressed marine environment. CMSP will provide greater regulatory certainty and foster sustainable development of ocean energy and mineral resources over the long term and will enhance ocean and coastal resource stewardship.

CMSP is comprehensive and integrated and does not prescribe specific management outcomes. Decisions under CMSP must be resource-focused, stakeholder driven, informed by local, environmental, and traditional knowledge, and at the scale of human understanding and experience. Although the National Ocean Policy is necessary to create the framework, it alone is not sufficient and stakeholders must be involved if CMSP is to succeed. Adaptive management is a key to CMSP, as decisions have to be made and cannot wait until all the information is available. To help with this, CMSP information management tools are being developed, for which industry and NGO can assist. The NOC is working to design and set up National Information Management System, although some data may not be compliant with the Information Quality Act, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Department of Interior Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) are establishing the Multipurpose Marine Cadastre.

3.2 Discussion

The question and answer session after each presentation brought out a number of key themes, including:

Q: CMSP is proposed as a tool for decreasing conflict and litigation, but couldn't it become a tool for litigation, e.g. for arguing that administration is not enforcing it their satisfaction?

A: The Executive Order (EO) and the NOP are not a new regulatory regime and existing laws are not superseded by it. The EO directs federal agencies to take actions, but challenges based on the EO would be questionable. The planning regions will operate at their own pace and some regions may well be ahead of others. The BOEMRE predecessor has been undertaking a form of CMSP through 5-year plans.

Q: What is the federal makeup of RPBs?

A: There will be five or six federal members on each RPB, possibly with more non-federal representation in Alaska because it is the only state in that regional planning area.

Q: Who will determine whether industry goals are compatible with the government National Ocean Policy (NOP) goals?

A: The administration is supportive of investment and growth in the U.S and the EO can be a tool for economic growth in the context of local priorities. Stakeholders are to be vocal in how best to achieve ecosystem based management and other goals of the NOP.

Q: How to ensure that data used to support CMSP, through tools such as the Multipurpose Marine Cadastre, is good quality given that some data may not be Information Quality Act-compliant?

A: Data must meet certain federal standards to be part of the National Information Management System. However, incorporating data remains a challenge, and there are limited staff and resources to undertake Quality Assurance/Quality Control.

Q: How will CMSP be linked to Coastal Zone Management (CZM) programs, if at all, noting that Alaska just withdrew from the Coastal Zone Management Act's program.

A: CMSP can move forward as its own program, e.g. that Rhode Island developed its spatial planning program under CZMA. States are urged to join in CMSP, but they are not required to. The EO does require federal agencies to participate in CMSP within their jurisdictional areas.

Q: There may be conflicts between regulations and cumulative effects, e.g. regarding impacts on animals over 20-25 years. How will such questions be addressed that can't be answered quickly and could entail litigation issues?

A: Cumulative impact analysis in a species-by-species approach will be the same as it is applied in terrestrial settings. As there are no new regulations under the NOP, it will be a matter of trying to get smarter with existing regulations and understand how the laws work together. Business should engage with federal officials to raise specific issues such as this one.

Q: Why haven't RFMC's been involved and what is meant by "productivity" given that some form of CMSP has been done for decades and habitats and ecosystem-based management (EMB) is not clearly defined and linked to the NOP?

A: The CMSP process needs RFMC input and involvement. The Government is working to develop an advisory mechanism with which to engage RFMCs.

Q: What is the form or path for stakeholder engagement and how will information flow through the process? Will there be regional advisory committees?

A: As the Strategic Action Plans and RPBs are being developed public comment periods have been and will continue to occur. The administration has urged that regional advisory committees be established, but these are not a requirement. Other mechanisms for stakeholder engagement include regional workshops and the Governance Coordinating Committee.

Q: Is it possible to develop examples of how regional CMSP could be beneficial for improving the siting process and reducing costs?

A: An inventory and learning is being compiled of CMSP related experience elsewhere, e.g. Cape Wind, Stellwagen Bank, and additional input is welcome. It is important for the NOC to do a better job of talking about what they're trying to do and how CMSP will make ocean use and planning more rational.

Q: If regional planning bodies are not required to set up regional advisory committees, how will stakeholder involvement be assured, given that experience in Massachusetts, Oregon and elsewhere showed how important stakeholder engagement is and how much effort it requires?

A: Stakeholder engagement is very important and one way it can be addressed is by Federal Advisory Committees meeting with federal agencies, state agencies, and tribal representatives.

Q: It is has been proposed that instead of CMSP rolling out nationally, it would be useful to have pilot projects focused on a region or two. Will this be possible?

A: This has been discussed and the decision was made to move forward nationally at a pace appropriate for each region. NOAA may have some CMSP funding that will be used for only a few

grants, creating de facto pilot projects. Moving forward with CMSP in each region, it will be important for industry representatives to meet with government officials, who are interested to meet with industry and hear private sector concerns.

SESSION 4. A BUSINESS COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN ON MSP

4.1. Introduction

Session 4 was designed to provide the opportunity for the business community to discuss and develop the path forward in engaging in MSP in the U.S. The WOC Executive Director opened the session with an outline of what ocean business community involvement in CMSP would need to address. This broadly includes consideration of:

- What is needed, e.g. what do we want to achieve and what does success look like?
- How do we get there, e.g. what structures and processes are required and who plays what role?
- What capacity and resources are required?
- What is the timeline?

The potential for an ongoing process of multi-sectoral ocean industry groups was sketched, for both the national level and the regional level. The purpose of these national and/or regional ocean business councils could be to:

- Provide multi-industry forum.
- Engage key sectoral or multi-sectoral organizations in a common ocean business community agenda on MSP.
- Foster inter-industry communication and coordination.
- Coordinate collective ocean business community interaction with government agencies and with other stakeholders.
- Shape CMSP process and agenda.
- Define business benefits of CMSP.

Operational functions of national and/or regional ocean business councils could be to:

- Provide multi-industry forum.
- Engage key sectoral or multi-sectoral organizations in a common ocean business community agenda on MSP.
- Identify sectors/companies active in the region to the RPBs.
- Disseminate info on CMSP process, outputs, plans to business sectors/companies.
- Develop common ground among sectors active in the region.
- Facilitate industry data input to planning process.
- Coordinate business community interaction with the formal CMSP process in region, e.g. Suggest ocean business council representatives to Advisory Committees.
- Develop partnerships and involvement of key sectoral or multi-sectoral organizations.

National or regional ocean business councils would not supplant company or association efforts to provide input to CMSP process at national or regional level. Nor would they substitute for company or association written comments or direct interaction with government agencies. The multi-industry groups would not seek to be the only business process and input that the government should consider.

Given the plans to proceed with the CMSP process, establishing a structure and process for coordinated business input to the NOC should be undertaken as soon as possible. This would create the means for coordinated business input to Regional Planning Bodies (RPB). The regional ocean business councils should be established as soon as the RPB is constituted in each region.

4.2. Discussion

A number of common themes, issues and specific ideas emerged from the discussion among the business community representatives.

Business Community Concerns about MSP

A range of concerns about CMSP were raised during the discussion, including considerations that:

- CMSP will have a negative impact on economic activity.
- The government will make planning decisions in the absence of adequate scientific information.
- There is not clarity of mission for CMSP and the measures of success are not clear.
- The goals are too ambiguous and the time frame is too ambitious.
- It is difficult to determine specific amount of funds being spent on CMSP.
- It is not clear what structure the government intends to take, e.g. set up ongoing committees or have listening sessions.

More specifically in relation to legislation and regulations, there were concerns that:

- CMSP is not legislatively mandated and Congress is not familiar with the CMSP process and developments.
- CMSP developments will overlap with industry specific agencies and processes, e.g. BOEMRE process for offshore energy.
- There is insufficient understanding on how marine spatial plans will relate to existing regulations and how all the regulations will fit together under CMSP.
- The NOC will develop new regulations, despite statements to the contrary.
- Ocean industries are not adequately involved in CMSP.
- The government process on CMSP is moving very quickly and is difficult to monitor for those not directly involved in the process.
- It is not clear who is a stakeholder.
- The administration wants to have input, but there is not a commitment to use or incorporate it.
- There is no clear plan for formally engaging industry in the RPBs.

The history of MSP-type efforts in the U.S. and the government interaction with industry also create concerns:

- Some federal agencies have been confrontational in initial ocean planning efforts.
- There is a selective engagement process by the government that is excluding industry.
- State level MSP efforts are not seeking industry input, especially fisheries.

Business Community Needs and Opportunities Regarding MSP

A series of common opportunities developed during the discussion regarding CMSP and the role of industry:

1. Collaborate
2. Get proactively engaged
3. Provide constructive input
4. Get involved at the regional level

4.2.1 *Collaborate*

- The common interest of all ocean industries is sustainable development of coastal and marine areas by responsible businesses.
- There is a need, opportunity and value for ocean industries to cooperate in a shared vision, forum and process on MSP.
- Recognize that different ocean industries are coming into the MSP discussion from experiences and different points of view.
- CMSP doesn't have to happen for such a body to be useful for sharing information and experience and understanding each other's marine use issues.
- There are common interests in ocean sustainable development among the various ocean industries, so ocean businesses should get to know each other even if they do not want to/need to engage in CMSP.
- There is value and utility in acting together and developing a united business front to engage in CMSP.
- A cross sectoral alliance would show collective leadership, have greater clout and be more listened to and influential in shaping the process and agenda.

4.2.2 *Get proactively engaged*

- Increased management of ocean areas and uses is approaching on one form or another, so focus not only on CMSP, but on the broader context of sustainable ocean economic development.
- It is better to be proactive than have a reactive approach, as the former brings barriers down and business will lose ground if it just passively tracks MSP issues and developments.
- Engaging in CMSP is about risk management.
- Business doesn't need to wait for formal comment periods to send a clear message that the opportunity for industry involvement in CMSP has not been sufficient.
- Companies need to decide when and how to develop staff resources to deal with MSP.
- The business community should rely on and leverage existing resources to help it engage in CMSP.

4.2.3 *Provide constructive input*

- Recognize the potential benefits of MSP to business.
- Help identify and optimize the business benefits and ensure they are realized.
- Make a clear statement about what industry wants to see, in part by making economic arguments.
- Ensure that CMSP addresses the role of continued job creation and economic development.
- Look for ways to bring industry data to CMSP, along with the industry understanding of quality control and data validity.
- Provide input on what MPS success looks like for the business community.

- Help ensure that CMSP has clear and realistic timelines, goals, measurable outcomes, metrics, monitoring and reporting.
- Help build trust through business community interaction with government and stakeholders.

4.2.4 *Get involved at the regional level*

- There is a need to coordinate regional level interest of the private sector in the CMSP process.
- This will require monitoring the regional developments, especially the formation of the RPBs.
- Regional level CMSP developments, and the RPBs in particular, must have industry input.
- The private sector should proactively ask that the RPBs plan for and provide a specific, formal mechanism for industry consultation and involvement.
- The business community should organize itself into regional ocean business councils and then allow each regional ocean business entity to decide about process for that area.
- There is value in developing a white paper for each region and the major business interests and economic drivers to help determine how to engage at the regional level.
- Industry interest will vary in each region and with limited resources, different groups should be most involved where they have the most interest, e.g. the oil and gas industry is very interested in the regional process in the Gulf of Mexico.

4.3 **Conclusions and Next Steps**

Moving Forward on Business Community Involvement in MSP

Forum participants felt there was value to collective, coordinated business community efforts in moving forward, and outlined a number of ways in which the WOC could foster and support this:

1. Act as a broad-based clearinghouse for business on MSP
2. Ensure ocean industry collaboration and coordination on CMSP
3. Engage the NOC and RPBs

4.3.1 *WOC could act as a broad-based clearinghouse for business on MSP*

By:

- Making information and data available on MSP progress and experience around the world.
- Monitoring and reporting on CMSP developments at the national and regional level.
- Developing a regular flow of information on MSP and the U.S. CMSP process to the business community through a WOC newsletter (or using information from other sources that are available).
- Conducting outreach to the media on the role of ocean industries in MSP.
- Establishing a listserv and private website for the secure submission and exchange of information, documents, and comments.
- Developing a white paper analysis of the various regulations that affect ocean industries in the federal EEZ and determine pressure points and recommendations for streamlining.
- Developing a white paper for each region and the major business interests and economic drivers to help determine how to engage at the regional level.

4.3.2 *WOC could ensure ocean industry collaboration and coordination on CMSP*

By:

- Organizing broad, cross-sectoral ocean industry forum for cooperation on CMSP.
- Expanding the constituency, i.e. engaging sectors that have not yet been actively involved in collaboration on CMSP.
- Facilitating and coordinating a shared process to develop a common vision, strategy and action plan on CMSP.
- Opportunity for stakeholders to talk is important and will probably find that we have different levels of interest in various regions; maybe different groups of stakeholders should take the lead where they have the greatest interest
- Need to broaden constituency

4.3.3 *WOC could engage directly with the NOC and RPBs*

By:

- Coordinating development of a letter from the ocean business community to the NOC as an output of the National Business Forum on MSP.
- Working to ensure the NOC includes sufficient business community involvement in the CMSP process.
- Coordinating private sector interaction with the NOC on CMSP.
- Establishing a mechanism for industry engagement with RPBs when they're created.
- Catalyzing the development of regional ocean business councils to engage with the RPBs.

Appendix 1: Forum Program

Wednesday, JULY 13TH

6:00pm - 8:00pm **REGISTRATION** Hotel Monaco, Foyer, Athens Room
6:00pm - 8:00pm **RECEPTION** Hotel Monaco, Athens Room

Thursday, JULY 14th

All Sessions – Hotel Monaco Paris Ballroom

8:00am - 12:00pm **REGISTRATION** Hotel Monaco, Paris Ballroom

8:30am - 8:35am

INTRODUCTION TO THE BUSINESS FORUM ON MSP

Paul Holthus, Executive Director, World Ocean Council

8:35am - 9:45am **SESSION 1**

MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING (MSP): A COMMON UNDERSTANDING

Moderator: Sandra Werner, ExxonMobil Upstream Research Company

1.1 Introduction to MSP Concepts and Process (35 min)

Leslie-Ann McGee, Director, Ocean and Coastal Solutions, Battelle Memorial Institute

1.2 MSP Data, Information, Tools and Approaches (15 min)

Jennifer Lukens, Acting Director, NOAA Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning Program

1.3 Environment Community Interests and Expectations of MSP (15 min)

Sandra Whitehouse, Senior Advisor, Ocean Conservancy

9:45am - 10:00am **MORNING BREAK**

10:00am - 12:00pm **SESSION 2**

CASE STUDIES: MSP EXPERIENCE AND BUSINESS INVOLVEMENT

Moderator: Michael Kearns, Director, External Affairs, National Ocean Industry Association (NOIA)

2.1 Panel: US MSP Experience Case Studies

- Northeast US

- **MSP organizer/coordinator perspective** (12 min)

Leslie-Ann McGee, Director, Ocean and Coastal Solutions, Battelle Memorial Institute

- **Industry/private sector perspective** (12 min)

Dave Preble, Rhode Island Member, New England Fishery Management Council

- West Coast

- **MSP organizer/coordinator perspective** (12 min)

Bob Bailey, Manager, Oregon Coastal Zone Management Program

- **Industry/private sector perspective** (12 min)

Ken Connell, Coastal Oceanographer, Golder Associates

2.2 Panel: Other MSP Experience Case Studies

- Canada

- **MSP organizer/coordinator perspective** (12 min)
Camille Mageau, Director, Oceans Policy and Planning, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
- **Industry/private sector perspective** (12 min)
Jim McLsac, Coordinating Director, BC Commercial Fisheries Caucus

- European Union/United Kingdom

- **MSP organizer/coordinator perspective** (12 min)
Haitze Siemers, Head of Unit, Maritime Policy for the North Sea, Baltic Sea and landlocked countries, DG MARE, European Commission
- **MSP organizer/coordinator perspective** (12 min)
Peter Lawrence, Director, BigBlueStuff, in association with Golder Associates

2.3 Analysis of Proposed US MSP (20 min)

Brent Greenfield, Executive Director, National Ocean Policy Coalition
Jack Belcher, Managing Director, National Ocean Policy Coalition

12:00pm - 1:15pm **LUNCH** Hotel Monaco Paris Ballroom

1:15pm - 3:00pm **SESSION 3**

THE U.S. MSP PROCESS, PLANS AND BUSINESS INVOLVEMENT

Moderator: Leslie-Ann McGee, Director, Ocean and Coastal Solutions, Battelle Memorial Institute

3.1 Government Plans for CMSP (20 min)

Sally Yozell, Policy Director, NOAA, Department of Commerce

3.2 Economic and Business Benefits and Impacts of CMSP (15 min)

Kristen Sarri, Deputy Director, Policy and Strategic Planning, Department of Commerce

3.3 Science and CMSP (15 min)

Alan Thornhill, Science Advisor to the Director, BOEMRE, Department of Interior

3.4 Question and Answer Session with Government Representatives (55 min)

3:00pm - 3:15pm **AFTERNOON BREAK**

3:15pm - 5:15pm **SESSION 4 (Business community representatives only)**

A BUSINESS COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN ON MSP

Facilitator: Paul Holthus, Executive Director, World Ocean Council

Facilitated discussion with ocean business community representatives only

4.1 Proposing a Draft Strategy and Action Plan on MSP (30 min)

Presentation of an initial “straw man” strategy and action plan for industry involvement in MSP

- How can the business community best engage in MSP in a cross-sectoral, coordinated manner?
- How should the ocean business community engage in MSP at the national level?
- At the regional level?
- What should be addressed on a sectoral basis? On a multi-sectoral basis?
- What are the priorities for engaging in MSP?

4.2 Discussing the Draft Strategy and Action Plan on MSP (60 min)

Facilitated discussion of the initial “straw man” strategy and action plan for industry involvement in MSP

- What is the best process and structure to organize and implement industry involvement in MSP?
- What are the pros and cons of a sector-by-sector or cross-sectoral approach?
- What should be addressed at a national scale and what at the regional planning scale?

4.3 Implementing the Draft Strategy and Action Plan on MSP (30 min)

Facilitated discussion of the ways and means to undertake coordinated action on MSP

- What institutional arrangements would be most useful and effective?
- What resources and capacity are needed to implement the action plan?
- What timeline is needed and appropriate?

5:15pm - 5:30pm SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

Paul Holthus, Executive Director, World Ocean Council

Appendix 2: List of Forum Participants

First Name	Last Name	Job Title	Company
Bob	Bailey	Coastal Program Manager	Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development
Jonathan	Baker	Consultant	Battelle Memorial Institute
Jack	Belcher	EnergyNorthAmerica LLC	National Ocean Policy Coalition
Brittany	Benko	Senior Regulatory Affairs Director	BP
Megan	Bloomgren	Vice President	DCI Group
Joan	Bondareff	Of Counsel	Blank Rome LLP
Craig	Bone RADM (Ret.)	Vice President	American Bureau of Shipping
Louis	Brzuzy		Shell Oil Products
Kenneth	Connell	Coastal Oceanographer	Golder Associates Inc.
Paul	Cooper	Vice President	CARIS USA
Jason	Creech	Senior Hydrographer	David Evans and Associates, Inc.
James	Currie	Legislative Director	National Marine Manufacturers Association
Janet	Deisley	Manager, Environment, Health & Safety	Teck Resources Ltd
Gregory	DiDomenico	Executive Director	Garden State Seafood Association
Andrew	Dumbrille	Manager, National Oceans Governance	World Wildlife Fund
William	Ellison	CEO/Chief Scientist	Marine Acoustics, Inc.
Jeanne	Grasso	Partner	Blank Rome LLP
Brent	Greenfield	Executive Director	National Ocean Policy Coalition
Anna	Hofford	Associate	Pacific Energy Ventures
Paul	Holthus	Executive Director	World Ocean Council
Carlton	Hunt	Research Leader	Battelle Memorial Institute
Steve	Huvane	Captain	Heidmar
Tom	Ingram	Executive Director	Diving Equipment & Marketing Association (DEMA)
Gary	Isaksen	Marine Issues Manager	ExxonMobil
Michael	Kearns	Director, External Affairs	National Ocean Industries Association (NOIA)
Jessica Hamilton	Keys	Senior Policy Advisor Office of the Under Secretary	NOAA
Jason	Kovach	Captain	Quivira Pty Ltd
K. Russell	LaMotte	Principal	Beveridge & Diamond, P.C.
Peter	Lawrence	Founder	BigBlueStuff
Jennifer	Lukens	Acting Program Director	NOAA Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning Program

First Name	Last Name	Job Title	Company
Camille	Mageau	Director	Oceans Policy and Planning, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Meredith	Martino	Director, Environmental Policy & Advocacy Outreach	American Association of Port Authorities
David	McCarron	Principal Consultant	IA Team
Leslie-Ann	McGee	Director, Ocean and Coastal Solutions	Battelle Memorial Institute
Jim	McIsaac	Coordinating Director	BC Commercial Fisheries Caucus
Bernhard	Metzger	Vice President Oil & Gas	Battelle Memorial Institute
Rick	Mire	Environmental Issues Manager	ExxonMobil
Jeff	Morgheim	Director	BP
William	Murtha	Policy Associate	The Nature Conservancy
Kameran	Onley	Director, US Marine Policy	The Nature Conservancy
Jeanne	Pagnan	Vice President	Twin Dolphins
Drue	Pearce	Senior Policy Advisor	Crowell & Moring LLP
Christopher	Pestak	Sr. Market Manager	Battelle Memorial Institute
Don	Pickering	President/CEO	OpenOcean Corp.
Trevor	Pickett	Manager	Quivira Pty Ltd
Dave	Preble	Rhode Island Member	New England Fishery Management Council
Leona	Roach	MSP Forum Coordinator	Marine Consulting Services
Walt	Rosenbusch	VP- Projects & Issues	International Assoc. of Geophysical Contractors
Tim	Ryan	Sr. Executive VP	Apex Wind Energy
Martin	Salva	Advisor	Battelle Memorial Institute
Kristen	Sarri	Deputy Director	Policy and Strategic Planning, Dept of Commerce
William	Senke	Underseas Systems Business Development	Lockheed Martin
Haitze	Siemers	Maritime Policy Baltic and North Sea	DG MARE, European Commission
Shannon James	Smith	Executive Vice President	OpenOcean Corporation
Don	Smith	Director, Transportation	Teck Resources Ltd
Karen	St. John	Senior Dr Regulatory Affairs	BP
Bruce	St. Pierre	Environmental Supervisor	ConocoPhillips
Bill	Streever	Environmental Studies Lead	BP Exploration (Alaska), Inc.
Bruce	Tackett	Managing Director	Resource Access International LLC
Melissa	Taylor		Quivira Pty Ltd

First Name	Last Name	Job Title	Company
Alan	Thornhill	Science Advisor to the Director	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Dept of Interior
William	Toman	Program Manager	SAIC
Sam	Walker	Marine Advisor	BP
Sandra	Werner	Research Scientist	ExxonMobil Upstream Research Company
Sandra	Whitehouse	Senior Policy Advisor	Ocean Conservancy
John	Young	Operations & Technical Services	Resource Access International LLC
Sally	Yozell	Director of Policy-Special Advisor to the Under Secretary	NOAA

Appendix 3: Responses to General Audience Survey on MSP

General Audience Survey Results - Statistics		
Survey Name: General Audience WOC Marine Spatial Planning Survey		
1. Number of Respondents: 49		
2. Do you REPRESENT a(n):		
	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Company or Other Entity engaged in commercial activities in the ocean	29	59.1%
Ocean Industry Association	6	12.2%
Other part of the ocean business community	14	28.5%
No Responses	0	0.0%
Total	49	100%
Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maritime and commercial fishing publications • Non-profit organizations • Scientific and Engineering Consultants • Media and information service • Research and developments organizations • Regulatory and policy • Oil and Gas • Associations • Fisherman • Aquaculture 		
3. What ocean industry SECTOR best describes the entity you represent? Select all that apply.		
	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Oil and gas	12	24.4%
Shipping	14	28.5%
Fisheries	18	36.7%
Aquaculture	6	12.2%
Cruise Line Tourism	2	4.0%
Coastal or Marine Tourism	7	14.2%
Offshore Renewable Energy	9	18.3%
Dredging or Construction	6	12.2%
Marine Technology or Science	17	34.6%
Maritime Law, Insurance or Finance	2	4.0%
Ports	5	10.2%
Other	11	22.4%
Total	49	100%

Other Responses:

- Environmental including ocean, coastal, and great lakes
- Manufacturing
- U.S. DOD
- Sustainable development

4. Rate your organization's familiarity with the CONCEPT of Marine Spatial Planning:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not Familiar
	28	16	5
	57%	33%	10%

5. Rate your organization's familiarity with the PROCESS of Marine Spatial Planning:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not Familiar
	19	21	8
	40%	44%	17%

6. Rate your organization's understanding of how Marine Spatial Planning can AFFECT your business activity – either positively OR negatively?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not Familiar
	26	16	6
	54%	33%	13%

7. Is or has your organization ENGAGED in a Marine Spatial Planning process at any level OUTSIDE of the U.S.?

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes	24	48.9%
No	25	51.0%
No Responses	0	0.0%
Total	49	100%

8. IF ENGAGED in Marine Spatial Planning OUTSIDE of the U.S., in what REGION are/were you involved? Please indicate all that apply.

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
a. Europe	7	25.9%
b. Asia	8	29.6%
c. North America (non-U.S.)	11	40.7%
d. Central America	1	3.7%
e. South America	3	11.1%
f. Western Pacific	5	18.5%
g. Africa	2	7.4%
h. Arctic/Antarctic	5	18.5%

Other	7	25.9%
Total	27	100%
Other Responses:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Australia • Canada • Asia • Indian Ocean • Central Pacific 		
9. IF ENGAGED in Marine Spatial Planning OUTSIDE of the U.S., what RESOURCES has your organization committed to that effort?		
	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Technology	5	18.5%
Personnel	24	88.8%
Assets	4	14.8%
Other	8	29.6%
Total	27	100%
Other Responses:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consulting • Financial • Knowledge and expertise • Planning • Community involvement 		
10. Is or has your organization ENGAGED in a Marine Spatial Planning WITHIN the U.S.?		
	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes	18	36.7%
No	29	59.1%
No Responses	2	4.0%
Total	49	100%
11. IF ENGAGED in Marine Spatial Planning WITHIN the U.S., which of the following RESOURCES has your organization committed to that effort?		
	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Technology	6	26.0%
Personnel	15	65.2%
Assets	1	4.3%
None of the Above	5	21.7%
Other	6	26.0%
Total	23	100%
Other Responses:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and expertise • CMSP policy • Personal interest and time 		
12. Rate your organization's INTEREST in engaging in Marine Spatial Planning WITHIN the U.S.?		

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Very Interested	Interested	Not Interested
	17	19	8
	39%	43%	18%

13. Rate your organization's PERCEPTION of how the U.S. Marine Spatial Planning Process will impact your organization's business, e.g. access, site planning, engineering, environmental compliance routines?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Positive Impact	Somewhat Positive Impact	Neutral Impact	Somewhat Negative Impact	Negative Impact
	11	7	15	8	5
	24%	15%	33%	17%	11%

14. Please rank in order of importance the following statements about what potential POSITIVE IMPACTS the U.S. Marine Spatial Planning process will have on your business activity?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Least Important							Most Important
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Encourage scientifically sound, economy driven offshore development regulatory decisions	3	2	3	1	1	4	5	12
	10%	6%	10%	3%	3%	13%	16%	39%
Facilitate offshore planning and ocean-industry business innovation	1	1	7	2	5	7	8	0
	3%	3%	23%	6%	16%	23%	26%	0%
Fast-track new offshore development opportunities through designated development zones	1	7	3	3	7	7	2	1
	3%	23%	10%	10%	23%	23%	6%	3%
Foster ocean-related industry growth and expansion	1	1	3	7	6	6	3	4
	3%	3%	10%	23%	19%	19%	10%	13%
Help assess potential market entry into marine renewables or offshore wind.	1	6	6	6	4	3	5	0
	3%	19%	19%	19%	13%	10%	16%	0%
Lead to promulgation of Marine Protected Areas	7	4	7	4	2	2	4	1
	23%	13%	23%	13%	6%	6%	13%	3%
Resolve conflict between environmentalists and offshore industry	4	5	2	5	4	2	3	6
	13%	16%	6%	16%	13%	6%	10%	19%
Other potential POSITIVE Impacts? Please describe in comments below	13	5	0	3	2	0	1	7
	42%	16%	0%	10%	6%	0%	3%	23%

Comments:

- Assistance with implementation of laws and regulations
- Stakeholder involvement for industries not well represented
- Improved coastal ecosystems
- Improved ecotourism
- Increase of public awareness
- Level the playing field for on-shore and off-shore energy providers
- Domestic offshore oil exploration with attention to environmental safety
- Improvement to search and rescue
- Meeting environmental requirements and create good stewardship of the ocean
- CMSP is viewed as not creating a positive impact to many businesses

15. Please rank in order of importance the following statements about what potential NEGATIVE IMPACTS the U.S. Marine Spatial Planning process will have on your business activity?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Least Important					Most Important
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Add regulatory and program costs and to ocean industries and stakeholders	3 11%	5 18%	4 14%	7 25%	2 7%	7 25%
Cause offshore development planning and permitting delays	3 11%	2 7%	7 25%	2 7%	8 29%	6 21%
Generate conflict between environmentalists and offshore industry	3 11%	7 25%	1 4%	12 43%	2 7%	3 11%
Hinder or impede offshore development in State or Federal waters	1 4%	6 21%	9 32%	3 11%	6 21%	3 11%
Resolve conflict between environmentalists and offshore industry	5 18%	6 21%	5 18%	3 11%	7 25%	2 7%
Other Potential NEGATIVE Impacts? Please describe in comments below	13 46%	2 7%	2 7%	1 4%	3 11%	7 25%

Comments:

- Danger in establishment of non-extractive industry
- Limit to ocean use
- Negative impact to business
- Negative impact to fisherman both industrial and recreational
- Potential conflict between industry and NGOs
- Favorability to those with regulatory power
- Hindrance to investments in offshore renewable energy
- International players

- Negative impact to ecosystems due to industrial expansion

16. Does the EXECUTIVE LEVEL of your organization currently possess sufficient information and knowledge to make informed decisions about if and how to engage in the U.S. Marine Spatial Planning process?

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes	15	30.6%
No	28	57.1%
No Responses	6	12.2%
Total	49	100%

17. As the World Ocean Council prepares the National Business Forum on Marine Spatial Planning (July 13-14, 2011 in Washington D.C.), what specific topics, outcomes or agenda items would ensure the Forum is relevant, timely and engaging?

Response Summary:

- Strategic planning
- Working across international boundaries
- Roles of stakeholders, industry, business, environmental advocates, regional planners,
- Involvement among all groups
- Planned studies
- Marine Protected Areas
- Potential impacts
- Data sharing
- Decision making
- Communication
- Ocean protection and preservation
- Shipping and ocean use
- Setting long-term goals
- Oil exploration

18. The World Ocean Council has invited key government representatives to address the National Business Forum on Marine Spatial Planning in order to ensure a high-level description of the developing policy and implementation of Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) in the U.S. Please offer your thoughts on suitable industry associations, or representatives from industry associations that could present perspectives on MSP from the point of view of ocean industry.

Response Summary:

- Off shore wind farms
- Hydropower and energy
- Shipping industry
- Tourism
- Marine industry
- Fisheries
- Divers
- American Petroleum Institute
- Oil and Gas
- National Ocean Policy Coalition

19. What ADDITIONAL aspects of Marine Spatial Planning should this survey have addressed to be most useful to the ocean business community?

Response Summary:

- Governance
- Financing
- Planning
- CMSP Organization
- World interest
- Players
- Marine Industry
- Timing
- Socio-economic
- Conservation