

# Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) as an integrative factor in POLAND

## Morskie Planowanie Przestrzenne (MSP) jako czynnik integrujący w Polsce

Jakub Turski, Magdalena Matczak, Iwona Szałucka, Joanna Witkowska

Instytut Morski w Gdańsku, Polska

Article history: Received: 30.11.2018 Accepted: 01.12.2018 Published: 03.12.2018

**Abstract:** This paper reviews the Marine Spatial Planning process in Poland under the BONUS BALTSAPACE project, which systematise and integrate factors functioning in this process, in order to analyse the role of MSP in integration of various types of human activities in marine governance. The project aimed to systematise and integrate those factors through selected integration challenges, which were, 1) transboundary/cross border integration challenge, 2) policy/sectoral integration challenge, 3) stakeholder integration challenge, 4) knowledge integration challenge. The goal of this paper is to detect the main issues of the MSP process in Poland, in relation to those four integration challenges. The main conclusion is that MSP in Poland acts pretty well as a cross-scale integrator inside the country and also in the international set-up, however, cross-border integration is not required by Polish law and has been done at voluntary basis. Some deficits can be identified in relation to stakeholder and cross-sectoral integration but the biggest problem is knowledge integration despite huge effort of Polish Maritime Administration to collect all available knowledge. There is a need to work more intensively towards MSP relevant knowledge integration in the future in particular tacit knowledge of stakeholders. Another finding is that all those types of integration, even when achieved in Polish MSP will not prepare Poland towards joint transboundary planning effort at the BSR level. Here, there is a need of more research and continuation of transnational projects such as Baltic Lines or Baltic Rim.

**Keywords:** maritime spatial planning, integration challenges, MSP policy analysis, Baltic Sea and marine governance

**Streszczenie:** Celem tego artykułu jest ocenie procesu Morskiego Planowania Przestrzennego w Polsce z punktu widzenia projektu BONUS BALTSAPACE, systematyzującego i łączącego czynniki działające w procesie Morskiego Planowania Przestrzennego, polegające na analizie roli tego Morskiego Planowania Przestrzennego w integracji działalności ludzkiej z zarządzaniem morskim. W projekcie BONUS BALTSAPACE zostały określone wyzwania integracyjne: 1) wyzwania integracyjne transgraniczne, 2) wyzwania integracyjne polityki/sektorów, 3) wyzwania integracyjne interesariuszy, 4) wyzwania integracyjne wiedzy. W artykule przedstawiono główne problemy procesu Morskiego Planowania Przestrzennego w Polsce, w korelacji z przytoczonymi czterema wyzwaniami integracyjnymi. Morskie Planowanie Przestrzenne w Polsce działa relatywnie dobrze jako połączenie różnych szczebli kompetencji na poziomie kraju i na poziomie międzynarodowym. Dodatkowo, transgraniczna integracja nie jest narzucona przez prawo polskie, przez co jest działaniem dobrowolnym. W artykule zauważono trudności w przypadku integracji interesariuszy i międzysektorowym, ale za największy problem uznano integrację wiedzy. Przedstawiono konkluzję, że w przyszłości konieczne będą działania bardziej intensyfikujące integrację wiedzy w Morskim Planowaniu Przestrzennym, w szczególności wiedzy ukrytej posiadanej przez interesariuszy. Zauważono, że nawet gdyby Morskie Planowanie Przestrzenne pozwoliło na osiągnięcie wszystkich założeń integracyjnych w Polsce, nie przygotowuje to do wspólnego transgranicznego działania planistycznego na poziomie Regionu Morza Bałtyckiego. Tutaj konieczne są badania czy projekty transgraniczne takie jak: Baltic Lines czy Baltic RIM.

**Słowa kluczowe:** morskie planowanie przestrzenne, wyzwania integracyjne, analiza polityki MSP, Morze Bałtyckie i zarządzanie morskie

## INTRODUCTION

Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) constitutes an important governance mechanism programming and regulating usage of the marine space [1]. It is also an EU requirement that was codified in the EU MSP Directive [2]. MSP can be portrayed as a share of European norms, rules and approaches in planning efforts that are implemented nationally [29, p. 34]. According to EU Directive [2] MSP is understood as a process by which the relevant Member State's authorities analyze and organize human activities in marine areas to achieve ecological, economic and social objectives. This mechanism aims at ensuring sustainable and efficient usage of sea space under the human activities taking place in the sea, thanks to preparation of plans, visions, principles, rules of conduct or strategies that should reduce conflicts and increase cooperation. The dominant MSP paradigm has not yet been agreed on, not in the literature, at least; however, many scholars are inclined to agree that this paradigm lies within the realm of sustainable development [48, 50]. One alternative to this, for example, could be evolutionary resilience [52] or, in a slightly narrower sense, achieving a good environmental status [53]. One of the ultimate aims of MSP is to influence "the future distribution of activities in space." [12, p. 11] Some scholars place the rationality of this process (e.g., [12, p. 11]) in the context of public choice [7, p. 139] in order to alleviate the so-called market failures, while others focus on the power and dominance games of certain interests [49, 50]; see also the concept of "radical" MSP by Flannery and Ellis [51]. One of the key problems faced by MSP is that its role is unclear within the more complex set-up of sea governance mechanisms. For instance, MSP is not mentioned in the Law of the Sea – UNCLOS, which remains the key mechanism governing the use and also protection of the seas and oceans (a kind of Magna Carta for seas and oceans). Together, these issues threaten MSP with disintegration. It is also quite unclear how MSP plays out in various contexts and to what extent and how MSP challenges are context dependent.

Integration is a key MSP concept that is mentally and intuitively associated with MSP and endowed with expectations to secure coherency and holistic approach to the planned area. Various forms of integration have been existing in the MSP literature and key policy documents [57–63, 50, 29]. However, there are only a few concrete attempts defining the nature and essence of such integration [e.g., 59, 65]. Therefore, there is a need to develop a framework to analyze MSP processes, as well as to use this framework to explore and compare various MSP contexts in the different sea basins. There are only a few frameworks proposed in the literature to analyze integration challenges of spatial planning [e.g., 64–65]. In this paper the BONUS BALTS-SPACE framework has been applied since it was developed by MSP practitioners based on analyzing MSP experience of several Baltic Sea region countries. The strength of this approach is in its non-descriptive and policy oriented character.

Under the Analytical Framework of the BONUS BALTS-SPACE project [48], the need for "a more systematic and integrated

approach to the management of...marine areas" was proposed and analyzed. Ultimately, four integration challenges were identified as being worth more in-depth examination. These were chosen based on key assumptions identified at an early stage, when specifying the scope and content of the BONUS BALTS-SPACE project, with an aim to study the role(s) of MSP in the integration of various types of human activities in marine governance. The selected integration challenges include the following [48]:

"(1) transboundary/cross-border - how to garner cooperation among jurisdictions (e.g., cross-national and sub-national) borders to further coherent planning and use between maritime activities and good environment status across borders and in the open sea – particularly in transnational marine space;

(2) policy/sectoral – how to pre-emptively address sectoral use incompatibilities, but also achieve synergistic interaction between sectoral interests – where mutual benefit/interest is emphasized (and sought after) - rather than only where sectoral interests are pursued;

(3) stakeholder – how to develop processes to support engagement among a range of stakeholders and put measures in place to manage conflicting interests in a timely and deliberative manner to inform what are regarded as legitimate and high-quality policy/planning processes and outcomes.

(4) knowledge – how to interlink different forms of knowledge, to fill gaps, to support multi-disciplinarily and robust science-based approaches to underpin MSP decision-making in pursuit of sustainable marine governance." [49]

## METHODOLOGY AND AIM OF THE PAPER

The main aim is to reflect on the Polish MSP process in terms of possible deficits and problems related to the four above-described integration challenges. Although the main aim is to identify key problems related to integration in Polish MSP, the paper will also provide some preliminary recommendations for the future MSP process. However, authors do hope that its main role will be on encouraging more intensive discourse on integration within MSP both in Poland and at the Baltic Sea region level between professionals and researchers.

Poland has been chosen as a study area due to the fact that despite efforts of the Polish Maritime administration, the MSP process has recently provided clear signs of insufficient integration of several MSP dimensions. Although the MSP process was designed by Polish Maritime Administration to enhance inclusion participation and integration, one should acknowledge that recently (i.e., after elaboration of the first full draft of the plan) some important stakeholders expressed their dissatisfaction with the planning solutions, sectoral lobbies organized additional meetings for criticizing the draft plan's proposal and some conflicts can be regarded as still pending.

Tab. 1. Project research set up.

BARRIERS OR DRIVERS FOR INTEGRATION	SECTOR/POLICIES	INTEGRATION CHALLENGES		
		STAKEHOLDER	KNOWLEDGE	TRANSBOUNDARY/CROSS-BORDER/MULTI-SCALE
MSP law	Sectoral/policy integration of the MSP regulations,	Stakeholders integration in the MSP regulations,	Knowledge integration in the MSP regulations,	Integration of particular MSP regulations across national borders/different scales,
Sectoral set-up (what sectors are active in Polish sea areas)	Sectoral integration in public policy,	Sectoral integration among stakeholders,	MSP interdisciplinary integration of sectoral knowledge,	Integration of sectoral interests across national borders/ different scales,
Environmental considerations	Integration of environmental policies,	Integration of environmental issues with stakeholders values,	Integration of decision support tools in practical MSP processes handling environmental issues,	Integration of environmental issues across national borders/ different scales,
Existing knowledge on sea areas	Integration of sectoral/policy knowledge with existing knowledge,	Integration of stakeholders' knowledge with existing knowledge,	Integration of available knowledge with existing knowledge,	Integration of transboundary/cross-border/ multi-scale knowledge with existing knowledge,
Intensity of conflicts	Integration of MSP across policy and sectoral differences,	Integration of MSP among stakeholders,	Integration of MSP across knowledge differences,	Integration of MSP across national borders/ different scales,
ICM (Integrated Coastal Management)	Integration of MSP and terrestrial planning on the policy/sectoral level,	Integration of MSP and terrestrial planning on the stakeholder level,	Integration of MSP and terrestrial planning on the knowledge level,	Integration of MSP and terrestrial planning on the boarders/scales level.

Sources: authors' own elaboration

All these have given a rationale for more rigorous examination of the integration challenges in line with the key possible drivers that might enhance or discourage integration within MSP: i.e., MSP law, sectoral set-up and existing arrangements, environmental considerations, intensity of conflicts as well as existing body of knowledge on sea areas and existing integrated coastal zone management practices. Those barriers and enablers of MSP were selected in line with Polish stock taking experience that can be traced from the Study of Conditions of Spatial Development of Polish Sea Areas [46]. The research set-up is described in table 1 and should allow to fill in this table with concrete information.

This paper provides more in-depth analysis of integration challenges in relation to key MSP drivers and barriers. The data used is based on the experience of Polish maritime spatial planners and data gained via interviews in the BONUS BALTS-SPACE project. A similar, more detailed analysis was provided by the BONUS BALTS-SPACE project [54–56] for the western part of the Baltic Sea region.

This paper can be seen as a reflection of planners on integration dimension of the Polish MSP. The authors currently participate in the development of maritime plan in Poland and used BONUS BALTS-SPACE project results as an inspiration source. At the current stage of development of MSP in Poland, the BONUS BALTS-SPACE project can also serve as a source of reflection for ex-post assessment of what has been achieved so far. BONUS BALTS-SPACE offers a rigorous methodology for understanding integration challenges and comparative material on their functioning in several Baltic Sea Region countries. Therefore, it has been used as a starting point for such reflections on integration within the Polish MSP.

## MSP IN POLAND

Since 2003, Poland has had the relevant legislation necessary for conducting MSP and this legislation has been successfully enriched and amended [3]. The years 2008–2013 were devoted to acquiring necessary experience in a form of participation of Polish scientists and Polish Maritime Administration in various transnational projects such as PlanCoast, BaltSeaPlan, PartiSEApate and Submariner. The results were translated into various publications on MSP [4–21], Blue Growth, i.e., development of Marine Economy in Poland [22] and environmental issues relevant for MSP [23–26]. Polish scientist have even initiated an MSP discourse in the neighboring Russia [27]. This research effort has gained critical mass around 2015 and was continued in parallel to the MSP process supporting MSP with important scientific evidences [28–45].

Key strategic documents governing the use of the Polish space – the National Spatial Development Concept [9], and the Marine Policy of Poland till 2020 have guided the MSP process in Poland. Polish MSP will constitute a legal binding document. Operational responsibility for MSP is clearly assigned to the directors of the three Maritime Offices. They are responsible for planning uses in assigned sea areas and for giving construction permits for artificial structures. They are also responsible for navigation and coastal defense. Other Ministries are responsible for mining, fishery and nature protection but MSP gives a platform for coordination. Directors of the Maritime Offices are subordinated to the Ministry of Maritime Economy and Inland Navigation, but this does not mean a bias for development at the expense of, e.g., nature conservation.

The directors of Maritime Offices work together in a co-opera-

tive network coordinated by the Director of the Gdynia Office. The legislation includes certain drawbacks that make MSP difficult but they should not stop the process. The main Act has been revised already, and the changes include, i.e., establishment of the contiguous zone and baseline demarcation. Still the monitoring and assessment procedures of MSP are missing.

As reflected by Cieslak et.al [47], the MSP process in Poland was divided in two phases. The first one of 2013-2016 was devoted to the collection of planning evidences and resulted in a very detailed study on the use of Polish sea space and possible future changes in this regard [46]. The preparation of the actual regulatory plan, however, was started only in 2016. It was tendered by the maritime Administration. The winning consortium was composed of the Maritime Institute in Gdańsk and the National Marine Fisheries Research Institute that was entrusted with a task to compile the regulatory maritime spatial plan (in the resolution 1:200 000) covering almost the entire Polish sea waters (with exclusion of internal waters of lagoons and sea ports). In the fall of 2018, the work is being continued with the second draft of the plan based on inputs received during interministerial and inter-administrational consultation process and public hearings that took place in summer 2018.

However, at the same time a weak side of the Polish MSP is the insufficient policy, which weakly manages general goals and objectives. There is no clearly spelled out and agreed process vision in the public choice regarding the use of sea space, neither priorities on types of sea use. This adversely affects sector, knowledge, and stakeholder integration. The existing Maritime Policy of Poland is general and provides only some hints allowing only rough prioritizing among sea uses. The top priority is given to shipping, ports, and navigation. According to Polish legislation, also environmental issues are prioritized. However, the importance of some other uses (e.g., off-shore renewable energy) is less clear in the existing policy, at least in relative terms. National interests, largely, are not pre-defined, but subject to context-specific consideration and evaluation. Thus, it seems that Poland is approaching step 4 in the MSP planning cycle but with some homework still to be done under step 2. For internal waters and perhaps also for some parts of the EEZ or territorial waters (areas with high intensity of conflicts) some detailed plans will also be prepared. Both types of plans will have slightly different levels of detail including the scale of map and different zoning patterns.

## POLISH EXPERIENCE IN USING THE MSP AS AN INTEGRATOR

So far, Poland has prepared three maritime pilot plans [16, 13, 17] and has recently made a very extensive stock-taking effort [46]. These pilot plans have provided a testing ground for knowledge, stakeholder, multi-scale, and sector integration. The aforesaid stock-taking was completed in 2015 and is furnished with more than 100 maps. It has worked as a knowledge integrator. Also, possible and potential sea-use conflicts have

been identified, as well as the planning context (key internal and external pieces of legislation, international agreements and conventions, policies and available know-how in terms of the international projects results). Many integration aspects are dependent on the working routines of the Maritime Administration since they are not prescribed in law. This concerns mainly knowledge and stakeholder integration and to some extent also multi-scale and transboundary integration. This is a “learning by doing” process. Important is the experience accumulated by the Maritime Administration within the aforesaid international MSP projects. Also, the planning of culture matters. Fortunately, spatial planning is a new subject for the Marine Administration, therefore it is somehow immune to the negative planning routines existing on land. Planning routines are different from that on land. Poland has, for example, different types of plans and different zoning patterns at sea compared to in land. The main reason is that MSP is adjusted to the specificity of the sea.

## POLISH LAW ON MSP AS AN INTEGRATOR

As far as integration is concerned, the Polish law on MSP does not provide a sufficient base for policy and sector integration and for integration of the knowledge base.

Sector and policy integration is achieved at the highest possible policy level through the country's long-term and mid-term strategy. However, sea issues in those documents are not the prominent ones. Better integration has been achieved in the National Spatial Development Concept as an overarching document guiding spatial development of the country and also covering sea space. But this document deals mainly with the principles for using the sea space. Other important documents like Maritime Policy are vague in terms of sector integration. Various sectors are welcomed but hardly integrated. The document discusses sectors separately and voids addressing the trade-offs or conflicts between them

Knowledge integration is provided through various international research projects but here, the drawback is that this integration is much stronger at international level than inside the country. There is no legal requirement to integrate MSP relevant knowledge in Poland and there are no incentives to share such knowledge. It is extracted and integrated on an ad hoc basis related to preparation of various MSP relevant documents such as stock-taking report or Natura 2000 management plans. It is based on the authority of the Ministry responsible for MSP and/or Maritime Administration. The stocktaking report and Natura 2000 management plans are the best examples of knowledge integration in relation to MSP in Poland so far. For instance, the stocktaking report was prepared by scientists representing various disciplines: oceanography, fishery, ecology, economics, geography, spatial planning, transport, geology, navigation, and some others. Integration was achieved through discussions of various subjects from the perspectives of different disciplines. Only tacit knowledge of some sta-



keholders has not been properly integrated (e.g., fisherman), but this has been described in other parts of the report.

Stakeholder involvement in MSP belongs to important concerns and as a rule, the Maritime Administration involves stakeholders at the very beginning of the MSP processes even if not required by law. This is a good practice in Poland. All identified stakeholders are invited regardless of their status, no fisherman is excluded. However, large stakeholders have better capacity to participate. So far, involvement has been limited to consultations. Participation in preparation of the stocktaking report was limited to a few scientific institutions. From a legal point of view, the stakeholders' involvement is prescribed by Polish law on MSP that stipulates that maritime spatial plans should not only be consulted, but also agreed with local governments. Other legal acts require public consultations of such plans during their preparation and public participation in the SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment) procedures. The drawback is that the detailed prescriptions on how such involvement should look like are missing. This gap is filled with the documents to be prepared by the HELCOM-VASAB WG on MSP, i.e., guidelines on transboundary consultations, cooperation and public participation (but not formally reflected in the Polish MSP law/regulations). Also, the Handbook on multi-level consultations in MSP developed by the PartiSeaPate project with active involvement of Poland might play a crucial role. However, all those documents form only a "soft law". The soft law is important because the MSP planning culture in Poland is still in the process of creation and the pieces of soft law influence this process. In Poland, MSP has only to a limited extent been influenced by the terrestrial planning culture. The reason for this is that MSP has been assigning to authorities that have traditionally not been engaged with spatial planning. This is explained further in the next section of this report.

Transboundary integration is not required by Polish law except with regard to SEA procedures. Also here the gap is filled in by soft law as described above. The Maritime Administration has involved neighboring countries into preparation of the Polish maritime spatial plan from the very beginning, although it is not required by law. But a key hindrance is lack of understanding of the interest and plans of the other neighbors. Polish authorities plan retroactively, as an answer to the key initiatives of other countries. Thanks to the Baltic Scope and PartiSeaPate projects, the Polish Maritime Administration knows the plans of neighboring countries better but still the Administration must learn how to use this knowledge in real planning and how to plan in collaboration with other countries (e.g., through visualization of options).

Multi-scale integration is stipulated by Polish law (as stated in the previous section) mainly between the central (Maritime Administration) and the local and regional levels (municipalities, regional governments). However, the existing practice shows that the Maritime Administration also consults with a very wide range of stakeholders with regard to MSP, including those outside administrative realm. Relative responsibility/ca-

capacity to influence/pursue interests differs among scales. Although large stakeholders are not more privileged according to MSP law, the praxis shows that they have better resources to participate and influence the MSP process. There is also integration within the Maritime administration. Three offices act together as far as MSP is concerned and only one plan covering the entire Polish sea area will be prepared.

## INTEGRATION OF SEA USES

In Poland sea uses have been identified and mapped and work with them has been initiated in the framework of preparation of the stocktaking report and Natura 2000 management plans.

Sector integration is among key elements of BSR MSP Vision of BaltSpace. Poland is at the beginning of this process. Polish Maritime Administration knows what sectors use the Polish sea space, roughly understands what other sectors might emerge in the future and has reached the stage of hypothetical discussions between scientists, stakeholders and Maritime Administration. However, in practice, cross-sector integration has not been observed so far. There are no examples of co-uses. The debate on trade-offs among sectors has not been launched so far with notable exception of the discussions between the offshore energy sector and some other stakeholders. The reason is perhaps the (still common) non-intensive use of Polish sea space (with few exceptions mainly related to the coastal belt) as pointed out in the second part of this section. Another reason can be the dominant position of some sea users like, nature protection, navigation, tourism or fishery.

Knowledge integration with regard to synergies among sectors is limited. The existing knowledge is sector-oriented, i.e., data on trends/developments in the most important areas. The team of Maritime Institute researchers tried to use this knowledge in the MSP stocktaking report and the findings have been discussed with stakeholders. But still there is a feeling that better knowledge integration should be aimed for. In particular social sciences should be better integrated with natural sciences. There have been some attempts to do so and they must be continued [37, 39] As a consequence, it is not clear how synergies on sea uses will impact development of coastal communities. So far, stakeholders have not asked for such expertise. The Maritime Administration is aware that intensified use of sea space will create demand for such an analysis; so far, it has no financial resources to support their development. The only solution lies in scientific projects developed by research institutes themselves.

Stakeholder involvement in MSP varies among users. Some users are well-organized but with a limited evidence base (e.g., fishery), some others (e.g., offshore energy) are well-organized and well-prepared for discussions. Some stakeholders (municipalities, navy) have good access to the decision-makers, some others (scientists) are powerful only if supported by mass media (general public). Stakeholder involvement suffers from uneven

capacity. The actual influence of stakeholders is somehow related to the existing policies and legal acts outlining the discretionary power of various stakeholders in terms of their freedom to use the sea space. For instance, shipping holds a more privileged position than other sea users. Many activities take or have taken place in the sea outside the planning regime. Private entities have already received a few location permits for the off-shore wind farms before the MSP started. Hence, these location permits are currently shaping the positioning of sea uses, and they have to be taken into consideration in the future planning. Policies are not stable. They are changed with changes in the ruling power (even declarations remain the same). The private sector has difficulties to cope with that.

Transboundary integration of uses is non-existent, although a conceptual work on connecting offshore wind farms (Baltic-grid) has just only started. In many cases sea uses are not integrated cross-borders. Multi-scale integration is limited. In some sectors like fishery, national and local administration support each other. But in many cases (energy, tourism) local and regional/national interest sharply differ. An example can be a law banning windmill farms in territorial waters lobbied by municipalities that have made the Polish sea waters less attractive for off-shore energy investors.

## INTEGRATION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL LENSES

As revealed by the stocktaking and Natura 2000 management plans preparation process, nature conservation is among the most prominent and strong sea users in Poland. The strengths of this sector has come from the strength of HELCOM, EU legal provisions supporting environmental concerns in planning, engagement of key and powerful scientists devoted to that issue. More than 60% of Polish territorial waters are protected somehow. This affects all types of integration.

Sector integration is of limited scope. Although Natura 2000 should not exclude other types of sea uses; in practice, in many cases it is a serious limiting factors. As revealed by the stakeholder process related to stocktaking, synergy is seen in Poland between nature protection and Navy training areas, and between nature protection and development of a fish stock. Nature protection is also not so limiting for shipping. Perhaps there is a synergy between nature protection and windmill farms, but this requires further research.

Knowledge integration with regard to environment is scattered. Preparation of the stocktaking report has shown that there is lack of knowledge on impacts of some sectors on ecosystems' functioning (mainly wind farms) – but this is improving and vice versa knowledge on impacts of nature protection on development of coastal communities is limited.

Stakeholder involvement in ecological issues was very active during preparation of management plans for Natura 2000 si-

tes. However, the quality of stakeholder participation in those planning processes was sometimes unsatisfactory. Evidence-based participation was limited.

Transboundary integration and multi-scale integration with regard to ecological issues is stipulated by law demanding transboundary and cross-sectoral consultations of the SEA reports. The limiting factor is the quality of reports and the very late stage of their preparation when such consultations are conducted. Despite HELCOM supervision, the protected areas are not always integrated across the borders. The concept of pan-Baltic blue corridors in reality is not existing. For instance, Polish sea areas, which are planned to be assigned for industrial uses, simultaneously share a marine border with Swedish sea areas assigned for the nature protection. Such issues are subject to cross-border discussions but a uniform Baltic approach to transboundary integration in terms of ecosystem functioning is missing.

## KNOWLEDGE AS AN INTEGRATION CONSTRAINT.

The stocktaking report and three pilots allow for an evidence-based assessment with regard to the impact of exiting information and knowledge on various types of integration. In fact, the stocktaking report should be treated as an important testing ground with regard to the availability and quality of MSP relevant information and knowledge in Poland.

The existing knowledge is definitely not sufficient for sector integration. Information regarding the mutual impact of different sea uses is scarce, and planning for co-existence is difficult. As previously mentioned, the only sector proactively organizing discussions with other sectors is offshore energy. Such engagement creates new information and reveals tacit knowledge. Information for knowledge integration is sufficient as it is provided through various international research projects but here, the main barrier is a disclosure gap (Polish research centers are unwilling to share data and information they possess) and lack of appropriate boundary spanning objects. Also lack of national financing for scientific projects might matter.

Information is not a barrier for stakeholder involvement in MSP, although the disclosure gap is still a problem. However, at least the information available is sufficient for attracting stakeholders to participate in the planning efforts.

Information for transboundary and multi-scale integration is not sufficient due to lack of processes for sharing information between countries and scales. Perhaps the newly-created MSP Data Expert Group will help to solve this problem.

## CONFLICTS PREVENTION OR ENHANCING INTEGRATION?

Conflict is one of a kind of relations between the different uses

of maritime space. Part of the stocktaking work was identification of various conflicts (see the second part of this section). In the stocktaking report the initial analyses of conflict and synergies have been performed, examining both the stakeholders' opinions as well as the experts'. The observation of the stakeholder process related to stocktaking and preparation of Natura 2000 management plans have allowed us to come to the observation that conflicts interfere with various types of selected integration challenges.

Sector integration is usually achieved by overcoming conflicts with finding common benefits, but in Poland it is difficult to reach. The sectors organize themselves against certain planning solutions. This was clearly seen during preparation of the management plans for Natura 2000 sites. In the MSP process, the majority of conflicts are of future or potential nature so the negative impact of conflicts on sector integration is less visible. One cannot find any case or example in Poland in which conflict has led to better sector integration although offshore energy sector currently is undertaking an effort to find common ground with other sectors and may possibly be an example of synergies between sectors (but rather at a very general level and with regard to all types of stakeholders). In contrast, lack of sectoral integration makes conflict resolution much more difficult. Still, as mentioned several times, an initiative of the offshore energy sector, and intensive talks with fisherman might change this in the long run.

Knowledge integration is insufficient to prevent conflicts. Studies have noticed the difficulties with answering the question of whether the conflicts indicted by stakeholders are really conflicts. Knowledge conflicts exist between "emotional", i.e., value based and "real", i.e., evidence-based types of knowledge. Thus, the hope is that conflicts will induce a new type of research and influence the research themes financed under HORIZON or national funding sources. This has, however, not yet been noticed in Poland on a large scale. But even new pieces of evidence if achieved would require a huge effort to be accepted by all stakeholders in particular those fixed in their negative emotions.

Stakeholder involvement in MSP is stimulated by conflicts. In a conflict situation, such involvement is more active but in many cases incompetent or emotional. In a conflict situation many stakeholders, e.g., fisherman display lack of trust, however, it is hoped that such involvement might contribute substantially (still in the long run) to conflict resolution due to constant interactions, sharing of tacit knowledge, better articulation of interests of various groups of sea users.

Transboundary integration has not been affected by conflicts, at least not in the Polish case, since only a few sea uses in Poland have transboundary impacts. However, genuine transboundary conflicts do exist, e.g., on the jurisdiction of the grey zone south to Bornholm. Fortunately, they are subject to international discussions between countries affected and compromise solutions are to be agreed.

Multi-scale integration has been affected by conflicts to some extent. Plans will be elaborated in Poland in different resolutions/scales. The more detailed plans will be elaborated in order to address spatial conflicts. In addition to the plan in a 1:200 000 scale, there will be "local" plans in various scales from 1:10 000 to the 1:1000. It seems that the coordination between those plans will not constitute a problem. Recently, the law on MSP has been improved to ensure better multi-scale integration but it was not due to the intensity of conflicts but rather as a future-oriented solution preventing conflicts between different planning scales in the future.

## IMPACT OF LAND-SEA INTEGRATION IN TERMS OF THE SCOPE AND INTENSITY OF THIS INTEGRATION

Land-sea integration as stipulated by Polish law takes place mainly between different public authorities. It is enhanced by the existing legislation giving the Maritime Administration important decision-making power with regard to the coastal belt and providing local administration with an opinion say with regard to maritime spatial plans (see the second part of this section). In practice (as revealed by stocktaking and Natura 2000 management plans preparation) land-sea integration is also dependent on the good will of the Maritime Administration and the prevailing planning culture in terms of inviting stakeholders and sectors to participate in the MSP process.

Sectoral aspects are taken into consideration (at least in the stocktaking report), e.g., location of tourism infrastructure (piers), transmission cables for bringing energy from off-shore wind mills, or establishing blue corridors for migrating fish. This was just a wise solution, adopted by the authors of the report and the Maritime Administration. However, at this stage of development of MSP in Poland it would be very difficult to assess the extent to which sectors will be/are involved in practice in the enhancement of land-sea integration through MSP. Some sectors like nature conservation or energy sector are proactive and even run their own projects explaining their plans and approaches to stakeholders. Some other sectors (e.g., fishery) are passive and full of pretensions, or they are poorly-organized (tourism) to be visible.

Knowledge integration with regard to land-sea aspects is insufficient. Only selected impacts of many land activities on what is happening on sea have been identified and researched so far mainly in relation to ecological issues. However, socio-economic impacts of sea activities have not been researched so far. The exception are few international projects, e.g., SPI-COSA. This issue is weak in the stocktaking report. Only recently has the issue started to be researched more vigorously [33].

Stakeholder involvement in MSP as a vehicle to improve land-sea integration seems to work but is limited by the already described disclosure gap. As stated before, some stakeholders are active but many of them are passive. Even the attitude of local

Tab. II. Summing up of the results.

	SECTOR/POLICIES	STAKEHOLDER	INTEGRATION CHALLENGES	
			KNOWLEDGE	TRANSBOUNDARY/CROSS-BORDER/ MULTI-SCALE
MSP law	WI	WI	WI (problem with tacit knowledge)	I (multi-scale) I (cross-border but here soft law)
Sectoral set-up (what sectors are active in Polish sea areas)	B	B	B	NE
Environmental considerations	LI	LI	LI	I (cross-border)
Existing knowledge on sea areas	B	B (disclosure gap)	B (disclosure gap)	B
Intensity of conflicts	LE	B	WI	LE (cross-border) I (multi-scale)
ICM	I	WI or B (disclosure gap)	B	LI (cross-border) I (multi scale)

Legend: I – integrator (driver), WI – weak integrator, B – barrier, LI – neutral or limited impact, NE – not relevant or not existent, LE – lack or little of evidences  
Sources: authors' own elaboration

governments of coastal municipalities varies. This was clearly seen in the stocktaking process. Sometimes the reason of their passivity is insufficient capacity of those governments to tackle long-term strategic problems. The general public has still only very general ideas about the essence and importance of MSP.

Land-sea transboundary integration is a minor problem in Poland. In fact, Poland has only one problem revealed in a stocktaking report about the German airport that might use the Polish sea space over Polish territorial waters.

Multi-scale land-sea integration constitutes a strong driver that enhance integration due to involvement in the MSP of both local and regional authorities.

In Poland, the so-called “technical belt” stretches landward from the coast. Planning of the belt is done by local governments in agreement with the Maritime Administration and in line with restrictions prescribed in the law. The protective belt is adjacent to the technical belt. Planning and development of the belt is done by local governments in agreement with the Maritime Administration. Both belts are established by the Maritime Administration, however, the boundaries of the protective belt must be agreed with the local governments and the regional governor (state representative in the region). Also, the Polish law stipulates seaward integration. As already stated, maritime spatial plans are to be elaborated by the Maritime Administration but have to be agreed with local governments. For unknown reasons, regional-self governments have been excluded from this mechanism, although they are responsible for preparation of regional spatial plans.

## CONCLUSIONS

The Polish MSP will constitute a legal binding document governed by the Maritime Administration. A standardization of MSP integration challenges was made under the BONUS BALTSAPACE project there, in which four challenges were established. The sectoral and policy integration in Poland is achieved

at the highest policy level, therefore, the Polish MSP deals mainly with usage of the sea space. Knowledge integration is much stronger at international level than inside the country. The Polish MSP will be in usage of the Maritime Administration, so there is no legal initiative to integrate MSP relevant knowledge. Stakeholder integration is among important to the Maritime Administration, by involving maritime stakeholders at the beginning of the MSP process. In addition, public participation is prescribed by Polish law in the Polish MSP. Transboundary integration is not required by Polish law, nevertheless the Maritime Administration has involved neighboring countries into preparation of the Polish MSP. Multi-scale integration is set down by the Polish law between the central marine-oriented Ministry and regional marine offices, which consult the Polish MSP with a large range of stakeholders. The summary results of research are provided in table 2.

As revealed in table 2, the main barrier for MSP integration is not due the existing legal or institutional set-up. On the contrary, insufficient integration is due to the shift factors such as attitudes of sectoral actors, narrow minded mentality of environmental actors and the inability of the research side to support MSP with knowledge. Also, the disclosure gap plays an important, negative role. The key problem of the Polish MSP is a high level of ambitions with regard to integrated MSP being in clinch with the existing short-term oriented planning culture (at least in terrestrial spatial planning [47]) that makes meeting/fulfilment of those ambitions very difficult. The planning authorities are open but they need policy suggestions and tools to convince the other participants in the MSP process to its open, far-sighted and integrative form. The key risk is that without the pre-planning phase focused on building of stakeholder capacity (and this opportunity is already gone), the MSP will be not properly understood by stakeholders who will not recognize its integrative potential.

Another interesting finding is with regard to cross-border issues. Here, the evidences give a mixed picture. The SEA procedure puts environmental consideration at the forefront of MSP integration across the national borders. Another engine



is a soft law, mainly VASAB-HELCOM principles; however, the rest is terra incognita and knowledge acts as a barrier. So it seems that Poland is not properly prepared to plan in or for the broader Baltic set-up. Even if a discourse on the MSP in Poland is closely attached to the Baltic MSP, the Polish planning perspective remains national. This is not the fault of Poland but it can be attributed to the absence of a broader pan-Baltic long-term perspective (and relevant know-how) on how we want to develop our common sea. The existing Baltic Sea MSP vision [66] is mainly focused on the MSP process and does not provide any Baltic planning targets or arrangements. The other Baltic Sea Region countries, i.e., Germany or Sweden face a similar problem. For instance, despite consulting the German or Swedish plans with neighbors, the plans are anchored in national interests. Moreover, Poland has been surprised by the proposal of the others like Nord Stream. Poland has participated in many international projects tackling those problems (Baltic Scope or Baltic Lines) but their results have not effected in the creation of a pan-Baltic MSP common perspective, e.g., in a form of a Baltic agreement of key international issues we want to address together (how much sea should be protected, where to channel navigation, how to ensure blue connectivity, where to place international navy training grounds, etc.). An additional weakness of Poland lies in its changeable policies and lack of clearly spelled interests/priorities for the use of sea space; the policy objectives are general. Thus, even if the Maritime Administration wanted to plan in a broader framework beyond the established national limits, it would be very difficult for them in practice. Hence, there is a need for tools and approaches allowing transboundary planning, that would respect each other interests and would empower “axiological

weak” countries to reveal their interests in a decent way (e.g., via analyzing different options etc.).

Below are some proposals of the research on key integrative challenges important for Poland in the international context: Joint transboundary planning requires knowledge integration, stakeholder integration and sector integration. Research in the following areas is needed:

- ◆ how to understand and respect each other's interest in transnational settings, e.g., via preparing planning alternatives where stakeholders are all on equal footing,
- ◆ how to plan together in a situation of different time spans for the planning process (e.g., case of Poland and Denmark),
- ◆ how to plan together such issues like wind farm marine extraction of hydrocarbons, nature protection (harbor porpoise) in a situation of different types of plans and MSP goals and ambitions (e.g., the case of Poland and Sweden),
- ◆ how to build trust among international stakeholders in the MSP process resulting in sharing of tacit knowledge, diminishing or alleviating rent-seeking behavior, incompetent or emotional attitudes among international stakeholders.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper is based on the results achieved under the BONUS BALTSAPACE project which has received funding from BONUS (Art 185) funded jointly from the European Union's Seventh Program for research, technological development and demonstration, and from Baltic Sea national funding institutions, including the Polish National Centre for Research and Development.

## References:

- [1] Ehler C., Zaucha J., Gee K. (2019) Maritime Spatial Planning at the interface of research and practice. In: Zaucha J., Gee K. (Eds.) Maritime Spatial Planning, past, present, future. Palgrave, London (In Press).
- [2] EC (2014a). Directive 2014/89/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2014 establishing a framework for maritime spatial planning. Official Journal of the European Union, L 257/135.
- [3] Zaucha J. (2018) Methodology of Maritime Spatial Planning in Poland. Journal of Environmental Protection and Ecology 19(2): 713–720.
- [4] Zaucha J. (2008). Sea Use Planning and ICZM Input to the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective, Final report from working group 3. Riga: Vision and Strategies around the Baltic Sea. Available at: <http://www.vasab.org/east-west-window/documents.html> (last accessed on 25 October 2018).
- [5] Węstawski J.M, Urbański J., Kryla-Staszewska L, Andrulewicz E., Linkowski T., Kuzebski E., Meissner W., Otremba Z., Piwowarczyk J. (2010). The different uses of sea space in Polish Marine Areas: is conflict inevitable? Oceanologia, 52(3): 513–530.
- [6] Zaucha J. (2009). Planowanie przestrzenne obszarów morskich. Polskie uwarunkowania i plan pilotażowy. Gdańsk: Instytut Morski w Gdańsku, 149.
- [7] Zaucha J. (2009). The Marine Economy in the Face of New Development Trends (Spatial Aspects). In: Markowski T. (ed.). The Polish Spatial Development Concept versus European Vision of Spatial Development perspectives. Warsaw: Polish Academy of Science, Committee for Spatial Economy and Regional Planning, 134–156.
- [8] Zaucha J. (2009). Baltic Sea Potential and Threats. In: Cieślak A., Zaucha J., Ścibior K., Jakubowska P., Staśkiewicz A. (eds), Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning Systems in the Baltic Sea Region. Gdańsk: Instytut Morski w Gdańsku, 86–91.
- [9] Zaucha J. (2009). Przestrzeń morska w koncepcji przestrzennego zagospodarowania Kraju 2030. W: Zaucha J., Matczak M., Przedzrymirska J. (ed.), Przyszłe wykorzystanie polskiej przestrzeni morskiej dla celów gospodarczych i ekologicznych. Gdańsk, Instytut Morski, 217–234.
- [10] Zaucha J., Ścibior K. (2009). Maritime spatial planning – pilot maritime plan in Poland. Coastal Regions, 17: 144–158.
- [11] Cieślak A. (2009). Maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea. Informationen zur Raumentwicklung, 8/9. 2009: 607–612.
- [12] Cieślak A., Zaucha J., Ścibior K., Jakubowska P., Staśkiewicz A. (eds.) (2009). Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning Systems in the Baltic Sea Region. Gdańsk: Instytut Morski w Gdańsku.
- [13] Zaucha J. (2010). Pilot Draft Plan for the West Part of the Gulf of Gdańsk. First Maritime Spatial Plan in Poland. Gdańsk: Instytut Morski, 81.
- [14] Zaucha J. (2011). Planowanie przestrzenne obszarów morskich w Polsce i w krajach bałtyckich – specyfika, doświadczenia i perspektywy wdrożeniowe. In: Transgraniczne planowanie przestrzenne. Szczecin: Regionalne Biuro Gospodarki Przestrzennej Województwa Zachodniopomorskiego, 89–99.
- [15] Zaucha J., Matczak M. (2011). National and regional strategies with relevance for Polish maritime space. Gdańsk, Instytut Morski, 63.
- [16] Zaucha J., Matczak M. (2011). Developing a Pilot Maritime Spatial Plan for the Southern Middle Bank. Gdańsk, Instytut Morski, 79.
- [17] Käppeler B., Toben S., Chmura G., Walkowicz S., Nolte N., Schmidt P., Lamp J., Gee K., Göke C. and Mohn C. (2011). Developing a Pilot Maritime Spatial Plan for the Pomeranian Bight and Arkona Basin. BaltSeaPlan Report no. 9. Available at: <http://www.baltseaplan.eu/index.php/reports-and-publications;809/1> (last accessed on 29 October 2018).
- [18] Jay S., Flannery W., Vince J., Liu W.-H., Xue J.G., Matczak M., Zaucha J., Janssen H., van Tatenhove J., Toonen H., Morf A., Olsen E., Suárez de Vivero J.L., Rodríguez Mateos J.C., Calado H., Duff J., Dean H. (2013). Coastal and marine spatial planning. In: Chircop A., Coffen-Smout S., McConnell M. (ed.). Ocean Yearbook. Leiden: Brill (Ocean Yearbook, 27): 171–212.

- [19] Zaucha J. (2012). Offshore spatial information – maritime spatial planning in Poland. *Regional Studies*, 46(4): 459–473.
- [20] Zaucha J., Matczak M., (2012) Identification of maritime spatial planning best practices in the Baltic Sea Region and other European Union maritime regions. *Maritime Institute in Gdańsk*, Gdańsk.
- [21] Pyć D. (2013). Zasady morskiego planowania przestrzennego i zintegrowanego zarządzania strefą przybrzeżną. *Prawo Morskie*, 29: 117–136
- [22] Zimna J., Przedzryńska J., Matczak M., Zaucha J. (2013). Mapa Drogowa rozwoju polskich obszarów nadmorskich opartej na czerpaniu korzyści z innowacyjnych form wykorzystania zasobów Bałtyku. Gdańsk: Instytut Morski w Gdańsku, 62.
- [23] Pyć D. (2011). Podejście ekosystemowe do morskiego planowania przestrzennego jako praktyka postępowania w zarządzaniu działalnością człowieka. In: Adamowicz M., Nawrot J. (red.). *Europeizacja prawa morskiego*. Gdańsk: Arche, 15–35.
- [24] Wrześniewska I., Zarzycki T., Ciołek D. (2015). Modelowanie ekonomicznej wartości denyfikacji jako jednej z usług ekosystemowych Zatoki Gdańskiej z wykorzystaniem WTP. *Zarządzanie i Finanse (Journal of Management and Finance)*, 13(4/2): 317–336.
- [25] Węślawski J.M., Andrulowicz E., Kotwicki L., Kuzebski E., Lewandowski A., Linkowski T., Massel S.R., Musielak S., Ołańczuk-Neyman K., Pempkowiak J., Piekarek-Jankowska H., Radziejewska T., Różyński G., Sagan I., Skóra K. E., Szeffler K., Urbański J., Witek Z., Wołowicz M., Zachowicz J., Zarzycki T. (2006). Basis for a valuation of the Polish Exclusive Economic Zone of the Baltic Sea. Rationale and quest for tools. *Oceanologia*, 48(1): 145–167.
- [26] Węślawski J.M., Warzocha J., Wiktor J., Urbański J., Bradtke K., Kryla L., Tatarek A., Kotwicki L., Piwowarczyk J. (2010). Biological valorisation of the southern Baltic Sea (Polish Exclusive Economic Zone). *Oceanologia*, 51(3): 415–435.
- [27] Zaucha J., Zotov S. (2008). Plan meropriyatii po vnedrenyu prostranstvennogo planirovaniya morskikh akvatorii Rossii. W: Zaucha J., Fedorov G., Limonov L., Odning N. (ed.), *Severo-zapad Rossyi v Regione Baltijskogo Moria: Problemy i perspektivi ekonomicheskogo vzaimodejstviya i sotrudnichestva*. Kaliningrad: Kant University, 263–272.
- [28] Zaucha J. (2014). The Key to governing the fragile Baltic Sea. *Maritime Spatial Planning in the Baltic Sea Region and Way Forward*. Riga: VASAB, 110.
- [29] Zaucha J. (2014). Sea basin maritime spatial planning: A case study of the Baltic Sea region and Poland. *Marine Policy*, 50: 34–45.
- [30] Zaucha J., Brodzicki T. (2016). Niebieski wzrost w Polsce. W: Klimek H. (ed.) *Porty morskie w perspektywie przestrzennej, ekonomicznej, transportowej, logistycznej i społecznej*. Gdańsk-Sopot: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 129–155.
- [31] Zaucha J., Conides C., Kloudatos D., Noren K. (2016). Can the ecosystem services concept help in enhancing the resilience of land-sea social-ecological systems? *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 124: 33–41.
- [32] Zaucha J., Davoudi S., Slob A., Bouma G., Van Meerkerk I., Oen A.M., Breedveld G.D. (2016). State-of-the-lagoon reports as vehicles of cross-disciplinary integration. *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*, 12(4): 690–700.
- [33] Zaucha J. (2018) *Gospodarowanie przestrzenią morską*. Warszawa: Sedno.
- [34] Zaucha J., Gilek M., Hassler B., Luttmann A., Morf A., Saunders F., Piwowarczyk J., Gee K., Turski J., 2017. BONUS BALTSAPACE Deliverable D2.6: Bonus Policy Brief: Challenges and Possibilities for MSP Integration in the Baltic Sea, Stockholm: Bonus Baltspace 2017. (<http://www.baltspace.eu/index.php/published-reports>) (access 27 March 2018).
- [35] Zaucha J., Matczak M. (2011). Developing a Pilot Maritime Spatial Plan for the Southern Middle Bank. *BaltSeaPlan Project report 10*. Gdańsk, Instytut Morski, 79. Available at [www.baltseaplan.eu/index.php/Reports-and-Publications;809/1#middlebank](http://www.baltseaplan.eu/index.php/Reports-and-Publications;809/1#middlebank) (last accessed on 26 October 2018).
- [36] Lukic J., Schultz-Zehden, A., Fernandez, J., Pascual, M., Nigohosyan, D., de Vet, J. M., Jay, S., Jones, H., Ramieri, E., Bocci, M., Zaucha, J. (2018) *Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) for Blue Growth. Marine spatial planning makes room for offshore aquaculture in crowded coastal waters*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Available at [https://www.msp-platform.eu/sites/default/files/20180419\\_published\\_version\\_4.pdf](https://www.msp-platform.eu/sites/default/files/20180419_published_version_4.pdf) (last accessed on 21 October 2018).
- [37] Piwowarczyk J., Wróbel, B. (2016). Determinants of legitimate governance of marine Natura 2000 sites in a post-transition European Union country: A case study of Puck Bay, Poland. *Mar. Policy* 71, 310–317.
- [38] Hassler B, Saunders F, Stalmokaite I, Gilek M, Morf A, Luttmann A, Strand H, Zaucha J, Gee K, (2018) Collective Action and Agency in Baltic Sea Marine Spatial Planning: Transnational Policy Coordination in the Promotion of Regional Coherence. *Marine Policy*, 92: 138–147
- [39] Ciołek D, Matczak M, Piwowarczyk J, Rakowski M, Szeffler K, Zaucha J, (2018) The perspective of Polish fishermen on maritime spatial planning. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 166: 113–124
- [40] Matczak M. (2016). Polskie porty morskie jako biegun rozwoju gospodarczego kraju i regionów lokalizacji. *Gdynia: Actia Forum*, 39.
- [41] Matczak M., Przedzryńska J., Zaucha J., Schultz-Zehden A. (2014). Handbook on multi-level consultations in MSP PartSeaPate. Available at: <http://www.partseapate.eu/results/> (last accessed on 23 November 2018).
- [42] Matczak M., Zaucha J. (2015). Planowanie morskie w Polsce. Zaawansowanie i kontekst międzynarodowy. *Folia Pomeranae Universitatis Technologiae Stetinensis Oeconomica*, 317(78)1: 59–72.
- [43] Matczak M., Zaucha J., Szeffler K. (2016). Dynamika zmian luk informacyjnych w planowaniu przestrzennym obszarów morskich w Polsce w latach 2008–2015. *Barometr Regionalny*, 14(2): 63–71.
- [44] Komornicki T. (2015). Present and Future Spatial Accessibility of the Polish Sea Ports. *Bulletin of Maritime Institute*, 30(1): 59–71.
- [45] Zaucha J. (2019) Can Classical Location Theory Apply To Sea Space? In: Zaucha J., Gee K, (Eds.) *Maritime Spatial Planning, past, present, future*. Palgrave, London (In Press).
- [46] Zaucha J., Matczak M. (Eds.), 2015, *Study of Conditions of Spatial Development of Polish Sea Areas*. Gdańsk: Instytut Morski w Gdańsku. Available at: [http://www.umgd.gov.pl/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/INZ\\_Study\\_of\\_conditions.pdf](http://www.umgd.gov.pl/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/INZ_Study_of_conditions.pdf) (last accessed on 23 November 2018).
- [47] Cieślak, A., Matczak M., Zaucha J., 2017, *Maritime Spatial Planning In Poland. A dialogue at various geographical scale*. *Nordregio News* 2017/3: 8–9.
- [48] Saunders, F., Gilek, M., Hassler, B. & Tafon, R. (2015) BONUS BONUS BALTSAPACE Deliverable D1.1: An Analytical Framework – Examining Integration in MSP in the Baltic Sea. Internal guidance document: Analytical and methodological framework for analysing MSP
- [49] Saunders, F., Gilek, M., Gee, K., Göke, C., Hassler, B., Lenninger, P., Luttmann, A., Morf, A., Piwowarczyk, J., Schiele, K., Stalmokaite, I., Strand, H., Tafon, R., Zaucha, J., (2016) BONUS BALTSAPACE Deliverable D1.2: Possibilities and Challenges for MSP Integration. Available at: [https://www.baltspace.eu/images/publishedreports/BONUS\\_BALTSAPACE\\_D1-2.pdf](https://www.baltspace.eu/images/publishedreports/BONUS_BALTSAPACE_D1-2.pdf) (last accessed on 29 May 2018).
- [50] Jones, P. (2014) *Governing marine protected area: Resilience through diversity*. Earthscan series. Routledge: Oxford.
- [51] Flannery W. and Ellis G. (2016) Do we need a fairer approach to marine spatial planning? Available at: <http://www.rtpi.org.uk/briefing-room/rtpi-blog/do-we-need-a-fairer-approach-to-marine-spatial-planning/> (Last accessed on 24 July 2018).
- [52] Davoudi, S., Zaucha, J. & Brooks L. (2016) Evolutionary resilience and complex lagoon systems. *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management* 12(4): 711–8.
- [53] Gilbert, A. J., Alexander, K., Sardá, R., Brazinskaite, R., Fischer, C., Gee, K., Jessopp, M., Kershaw, P., Los, J. H., Morla, D. M., O'Mahony, C., Pihlajamäki, M., Rees, S., & Varjopuro, R. (2015) *Marine spatial planning and Good Environmental Status: a perspective on spatial and temporal*.
- [54] Saunders, F., Gilek, M., Gee, K., Dahl, K., Hassler, B., Luttmann, A., Morf, A., Piwowarczyk, J., Stalmokaite, I., Strand, H., Tafon, R., Zaucha, J., (2017) BONUS BALTSAPACE Deliverable D2.4: MSP as a governance approach? Knowledge integration challenges in MSP in the Baltic Sea. Available at: [https://www.baltspace.eu/files/BONUS\\_BALTSAPACE\\_D2-4.pdf](https://www.baltspace.eu/files/BONUS_BALTSAPACE_D2-4.pdf) (last accessed on 25 May 2018).
- [55] B. Hassler, N. Blažauskas, K. Gee, M. Gilek, H. Janßen, A. Luttmann, A. Morf, J. Piwowarczyk, F. Saunders, I. Stalmokaite, H. Strand, J. Zaucha, (2017) BONUS BALTSAPACE Deliverable D2.2: Ambitions and Realities in Baltic Sea Marine Spatial Planning and the Ecosystem Approach: Policy and Sector Coordination in Promotion of Regional Integration, Södertörn University, Huddinge.
- [56] Morf, A., Strand, H., Gee, K., Gilek, M., Janßen, H., Hassler, B., Luttmann, A., Piwowarczyk, J., Saunders, F., Stalmokaite, I., Zaucha, J. (2017). BONUS BALTSAPACE Deliverable D2.3: Possibilities and Challenges for Stakeholder Integration in MSP
- [57] Qiu, W. and P.J.S. Jones (2013). The emerging policy landscape for marine spatial planning in Europe. *Marine Policy* 39: 182–190.
- [58] Kidd, S. (2013) Rising to the Integration Ambitions of Marine Spatial Planning: Reflections from the Irish Sea. *Marine Policy*, 39: 273–282.
- [59] Portman, M.E. (2011). *Marine Spatial Planning: Achieving and Evaluating Integration*. ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil, 68(10): 2191–2200
- [60] Schultz-Zehden, A. and K. Gee (2013). *BaltSeaPlan Findings – Experience and Lessons*. Available at: <http://www.baltseaplan.eu/index.php/Reports-and-Publications;809/1> (last accessed on 25 November 2018).
- [61] Douvrou, F. and C. Ehler. (2009) New perspectives on sea use management: initial findings from European experience with marine spatial planning. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 90: 77–78.
- [62] European Commission (2007). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. An Integrated Maritime Policy for the European Union*.
- [63] Kidd, S. and G. Ellis (2012). From the land to sea and back again? Using terrestrial planning to understand the process of marine spatial planning. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 14(1): 49–66.

- [64] Healey, P. (2006) Territory, integration and spatial planning. In: Tewdwr-Jones, M; Allmendinger, P, ed. Territory, Identity and Spatial Planning: Spatial Governance in a Fragmented Nation. London: Routledge, 64–79.
- [65] Kidd, S. (2007). Towards a framework of integration in spatial planning: an exploration from a health perspective. *Planning Theory and Practice* 8(2): 161–181.
- [66] Gee, K., Kannen, A. and Heinrichs, B. (2011) BaltSeaPlan Vision 2030: Towards the sustainable planning of Baltic sea space. Hamburg: BaltSeaPlan, 46.
- [67] Levina, N Vaaste., E. (2004) The Emergence of Boundary Spanning Competence on Practice: Implications for Information Systems' Implementation Use. NYU Working Paper, 2451/14121. Available at: [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1281318](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1281318) (last accessed on 26 October 2018).

Word count: 8390 Page count: 11 Tables: 2 Figures: – References: 67

Scientific Disciplines: Natural science section

DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0012.7650

Full-text PDF: <https://bullmaritimeinstitute.com/issue/11463>

Cite this article as: Turski J., Matczak M., Szałucka I., Witkowska J.: Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) as an integrative factor in POLAND: BMI, 2018; 33(1): 83-93

Copyright: © 2018 Maritime Institute in Gdańsk. Published by Index Copernicus Sp. z o.o. All rights reserved.

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Corresponding author: Jakub Turski; Instytut Morski w Gdańsku, Polska; E-mail: [jturski@im.gda.pl](mailto:jturski@im.gda.pl)

 The content of the journal „Bulletin of the Maritime Institute in Gdańsk” is circulated on the basis of the Open Access which means free and limitless access to scientific data.



This material is available under the Creative Commons - Attribution 4.0 GB. The full terms of this license are available on: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/legalcode>