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# Executive Summary

Partnerships Involving Stakeholders in the Celtic Sea Ecosystem (PISCES) aimed to improve implementation of European marine policy through multi-sector collaboration. PISCES was an innovative three and half year project (2009-2012) that created a unique partnership of sea-users from the UK, Ireland, France and Spain to jointly explore ways of governing and managing activities in the Celtic Sea more sustainably. An important driver for the project was the ‘ecosystem approach’, which is proposed as a solution to address unsustainable and uncoordinated resource use and is a central principle in EU marine policy. PISCES focused on seeking ways to help improve stakeholder participation in marine policy and management, as both a key principle of the ecosystem approach and an important component of a stakeholder-led project. To help support this, PISCES also explored ways of improving engagement between sea-users and between sea-users and government at the trans-boundary or regional level.

The specific objectives for PISCES were:

***Objective 1:*** *By 2012, relevant marine stakeholders in the Celtic Sea have a significantly greater shared understanding of the ecosystem approach of integrated marine management.*

***Objective 2:*** *By 2012, cooperation and coordination between all relevant representative marine stakeholder groups has led to the development (and Celtic Member State recognition) of agreed mechanisms for implementing the ecosystem approach in the context of EU Marine Strategy and Directive.*

***Objective 3:*** *By 2012, the outcomes of the project are effectively disseminated to the wider marine community in the Celtic Sea and upscaled to other marine sub-regions within EU maritime waters.*

***Objective 4:*** *By 2012, the project is technically and financially managed and monitored coherently within the timeframe of the project, and stakeholders have committed to a shared strategy to ensure the project’s future sustainability*

PISCES was coordinated by WWF-UK, in partnership with The Environment Council and WWF Spain. Two organisations were subcontracted to carry out engagement work in Ireland (Coastal and Marine Research Centre - CMRC) and France (SeaWeb). The Environment Council brought expertise in stakeholder engagement and facilitation and WWF-UK, WWF Spain, CMRC and SeaWeb were ideally placed to engage with stakeholders and governments in their respective countries. The multi-country model of organisations allowed for strategic and coordinated engagement across the Celtic Sea.

PISCES explored a stakeholder-led approach, where stakeholders are at the heart of decision-making. The initial phase of the project involved identifying relevant stakeholders and increasing their knowledge of marine policy and the ecosystem approach (objective 1). The project engaged primarily with a key group of 30 stakeholders representing seven different sectors in England, Wales, Ireland, France and Spain. Online tutorials were held on marine policy and information was provided at workshops and on our project website. In the original project proposal we hoped to secure commitment from the key stakeholders to engage in project activities within the first six months. In implementation it became apparent that the stakeholder engagement activity was more resource intensive than originally anticipated and we successfully requested a six month extension to the project to allow for more engagement events. Stakeholder engagement became an ongoing activity throughout the project to ensure that stakeholders remained involved.

One of the key objectives of the project was the production of guidelines as a mechanism for practical implementation of the ecosystem approach in the context of EU marine policy (Objective 2). The guidelines were produced primarily through a series of five workshops with core stakeholders, Advisory Group members and wider stakeholders. In addition to the workshops there were a number of stages involving reviews, tasks, interviews and information provision by key stakeholders. In the final stages of development there was a detailed review process where 200 moderating stakeholders were invited to comment. In total 102 stakeholders contributed to at least one step of guidelines development. The guide was completed in October 2012 and printed in English, French and Spanish, with a summary leaflet also created. The final guidelines were endorsed by 25 key stakeholders as a representation of their commitment to sustainable cross-sectoral management through use of the ecosystem approach. The guidelines made recommendations for stakeholders and governments to implement the ecosystem approach through EU marine policy, which are applicable to all marine regions in Europe.

Communication was a vital element of PISCES (objective 3). In the early stages we developed a communications strategy to ensure we could reach our different target audiences in the right way and with the right messages. We developed a project website to communicate the project to wider stakeholders that included audio-visual and written materials. We maintained contact with key and wider stakeholders through regular e-newsletters and developed our social media outreach. Throughout the project the team attended conferences and meetings to present the project activities.

Communication with government decision-makerswas another important area for the delivery of the communication objective. Our stakeholders wanted to feel that the information they were supplying through the project will be used to influence the implementation of marine policy in the Celtic Sea. Government advocacy plans were developed for each country in order to ensure that we were aware of the political context in each country, maintained and developed appropriate contacts to ensure interest in the PISCES guidelines. Specific meetings and events were held to ensure the guidelines were communicated to government stakeholders reaching an estimated audience of 339.

In the final phase of PISCES we instituted a comprehensive outreach and dissemination programme to reach as many people as possible. We held three events with celebrity guest speakers, high-profile experts and PISCES stakeholders. The PISCES key stakeholders communicated the project to approximately 1,500 people in their sectors and the PISCES team presented the project to more than 11,000 people across Europe with over 2,000 at 27 conferences in the last six months of the project. Copies of the guidelines were mailed to key government and industry representatives in all four PISCES countries and online versions are available on the PISCES website. The guidelines have been widely cited and referred to in stakeholder networks, conferences, government meetings, reports and communications.

*“The PISCES report is a ‘how to’ guide for achieving a well-managed Celtic Sea, yet it doesn’t stop there – the lessons learnt can help improve the future for other vital marine area*s” Monty Halls, Marine Biologist and TV presenter.

A comprehensive monitoring and evaluation process was established to ensure that the project was meeting its objectives and expected results and to monitor the stakeholder engagement process (objective 4). This allowed the project to adapt management approaches as needed. All project actions were delivered within the timeframe and budget and the overarching expected results were achieved. The majority of key stakeholders and moderating stakeholders identified project commitments they would like to take forwards. The trust and understanding established during the project has led to participants working together to tackle the important and increasingly urgent issue of how to manage marine activities more sustainably, in line with European legislation.

A final evaluation of stakeholders was carried out through interviews and surveys with 67 respondents, to attain feedback on the success of the project and the results were overwhelmingly positive:

* More than 75% of those surveyed were highly confidence in their ability to take forward elements and recommendations from the PISCES guidelines and felt it was a useful tool for both policy makers and sea-users.
* Government representatives felt that they now have a greater understanding of the views of stakeholders because of PISCES
* 76% believed that PISCES had improved communication between sea-users in the Celtic Sea and made it easier for them to work together.

The project was pioneering in terms of successful stakeholder engagement, which is crucial to the implementation of sustainable marine activities needed to achieve ‘good environmental status’ required by European legislation. A stakeholder engagement evaluation report was produced to advise and inform future engagement processes which will be invaluable for other initiatives tackling similar issues in all areas of marine conservation.

PISCES has demonstrated how stakeholders can add value at each step of the policy implementation process and has identified a mechanism for stakeholder input to be included through multi-sector forums at a regional scale. The inclusion of stakeholders in policy implementation will result in measures being more widely accepted and implemented, thereby resulting in long-term benefits. Ultimately this will likely lead to greater compliance with European marine policy by the sectors and activities that impact the marine environment thus resulting in the increasing the likelihood of achieving environmental targets. This is true not only for the Celtic Sea, but if PISCES results are applied in marine regions the results will be amplified further. PISCES results have relevance for all marine sectors and activities in Europe both in terms of the recommendations made by a multi-sectoral, multinational group of stakeholders and the process used to engage them.

The main challenge for delivery of PISCES was the complexity and intensiveness of the stakeholder engagement work. Maintaining commitment and interest requires continual engagement efforts, information provision and expectations setting. Marine sectors are very varied and engagement with some sectors was more challenging than others. In particular the fisheries sector proved challenging to engage. This was at least partially due to the priority fisheries stakeholders were understandably giving to the Common Fisheries Policy that was undergoing reform during PISCES. The project modification mid-way through the duration allowed for a new approach to engagement efforts that increased the number of engagement points and the resources available for engagement work. We have identified valuable lessons on stakeholder engagement from our experience that will help to inform others.

The economic situation during PISCES was very different to that experienced during the application in 2007 and had a significant impact on project delivery. Many organisations were forced to cut staff, freeze pay and place travel bans on employees. This was particularly true for the public sector and affected the ability of government representatives and statutory agencies to attend workshops and input into the guidelines development process. We tried to address this by holding workshops in each project country and using additional methods to allow input (e.g. online tasks, interviews). The economic situation also affected the project beneficiaries and in particular The Environment Council found it increasingly difficult to allocate staff resources to PISCES when faced with financial difficulties. In addition, staff turnover in all project beneficiaries was a challenge for delivery. Effective briefings and refreshers of project objectives and contractual obligations helped to alleviate this issue.

A budget modification was approved for PISCES due to changes in staff composition in the beneficiaries and reduced salaries as compared to the project proposal. PISCES was delivered 11% below the revised budget. This was largely due to lower than anticipated spend on personnel. This was a result of staff changes and the financial situation. Despite the expenditure being below the budgeted costs, the project delivered fully on all objectives and delivered value for money by delivering highly regarded stakeholder guidelines using an in-depth process involving five workshops and exceeding targets for communication through a comprehensive programme of outreach and dissemination.

# Introduction

Like oceans and seas globally, the health of marine ecosystem in the Celtic Sea region is under significant threat due to a variety of external pressures and uncoordinated management of activities. Implementation of the ecosystem approach is widely advocated as the solution to reversing damage to the marine environment. This project aimed to address the problems identified by working closely with target stakeholders from a number of Member States in the Celtic Sea region to test collaborate methodologies for implementing the ecosystem approach.

This project was specifically aligned to contribute to ‘*the effective implementation of the EU Marine Strategy’* as outlined under Pillar 2 of EC LIFE+: Environment Policy and Governance, Principal Objective ‘Water’. In addition, the project contributed to the specific objectives of LIFE+ Environment Policy and Governance to:

* facilitate the implementation of Community environmental policy, with particular emphasis on implementation at local and regional level;
* provide support for better environmental governance by broadening stakeholder involvement, including that of NGOs in policy consultation and implementation

PISCES focused on the implementation of the ecosystem approach in the Celtic Sea through European marine policy. The project applied a demonstration approach, and the findings of this ‘pilot project’ in the Celtic Sea will have future EU added value for other sub-regions and regional seas in EU maritime waters.

PISCES aimed to improve policy and governance through developing guidance for effective engagement and delivery of the ecosystem approach, developed by key marine stakeholders and in close collaboration with governments in the Celtic Sea. In order to meet this broader objective, there were four main objective areas which were targeted:

**Objectives:**

(i) Policy and governance: ***Objective 1:*** *By 2012, relevant marine stakeholders in the Celtic Sea have a significantly greater shared understanding of the ecosystem approach of integrated marine management.*

(ii) Increased knowledge, understanding and interaction: ***Objective 2:*** *By 2012, cooperation and coordination between all relevant representative marine stakeholder groups has led to the development (and Celtic Member State recognition) of agreed mechanisms for implementing the ecosystem approach in the context of EU Marine Strategy and Directive.*

(iii) Effective communication: ***Objective 3:*** *By 2012, the outcomes of the project are effectively disseminated to the wider marine community in the Celtic Sea and upscaled to other marine sub-regions within EU maritime waters.*

(iv) Effective project management: ***Objective 4:*** *By 2012, the project is technically and financially managed and monitored coherently within the timeframe of the project, and stakeholders have committed to a shared strategy to ensure the project’s future sustainability*

This three-year multi-stakeholder project provided expert facilitation to guide the identified group of 30 marine stakeholdersto develop creative methodologies; test solutions to stakeholder engagement; explore their understanding of the ecosystem approach, and agree with wider stakeholders groups on what this means in the Celtic Sea. The main results of PISCES were an increase in understanding of the ecosystem approach among Celtic Sea stakeholders, a set of guidelines for implementing the ecosystem approach through the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive and the identification of processes and techniques for multisector, regional engagement. The results contribute to the knowledge base for the development, assessment, monitoring and evaluation of EU environmental policy and legislation and should improve stakeholder participation and understanding of, and compliance with, the ecosystem approach.

# Administrative part

## 4.1 Description of the management system

The PISCES working method consisted of three main phases. Each phase contained a number of activities and tasks as well as overarching activities throughout the project duration. The phases and activities are summarised below (see also project Gantt chart in Appendix A.1). The first phase lasted for 13 months and was completed when the target group of stakeholders had been contacted about the project and had received information on the ecosystem approach and marine policy to develop common understanding. The second phase began at the first guidelines development workshop (second project workshop) and continued until the guidelines report was completed and signed off by stakeholders. The final stage involved targeted outreach and dissemination activities to promote and advocate the guide. Throughout the project duration there were overarching activities to plan, manage and monitor the project. There were also communications activities that spanned the project duration including the development and updating of the project website and the outreach work to develop the contacts database.

### 4.1.1 PISCES phases

**Phase 3: Final outputs outreach and dissemination**

*July 2012 to December 2012*

The final phase involved outreach and dissemination activities including holding final events in Madrid, London and Brussels and presenting PISCES at a number of conferences, meeting and workshops. Training for team members had been held on media training and messaging. A communications plan was developed for dissemination beyond the project end date.

Actions: 13, 19, 29

**Phase 2: Guidelines development**

*November 2010 to June 2012*

Phase 2 involved the development of the PISCES guidelines through a series of four workshops, online tasks, meetings and a number of review stages. Key stakeholders endorsed the final guidelines and 30 moderating stakeholders provided comments through a review. We interacted with other projects and secured their involvement in workshops and the review process. Drafts of the guidelines were translated into French and Spanish to allow for effective review from French and Spanish stakeholders.

Actions: 8, 16, 17

**Phase 1: Stakeholder identification and collaborative learning**

*September 2009 to October 2010*

This phase involved identifying a network of stakeholders and starting to build relationships with them as well as government decision-makers. The initial communication plan and the project website were developed. In this phase we attempted to increase knowledge of the ecosystem approach, marine spatial planning and EU marine policy with key stakeholders. We held our first workshop and a PISCES launch event.

Actions: 1, 2, 3 4, 5, 6, 7, 10,

##

**Project planning and management and communications (throughout)**

Throughout the project duration project planning and management activities occurred. The team was recruited and an inception meeting was held. A steering group and advisory group were formed and met throughout the project and provided input into the process. Coordinating and associated beneficiaries ensured the project was well managed and that technical and financial reporting was delivered on time. Monitoring and evaluation was used to assess progress against indicators and adapt the approach as needed. The stakeholder engagement process was continually monitored and reviewed and a final analysis provided learnings for future work. The financial audit was held before completing the final project report.

Communications activities also occurred throughout the project through website development, e-newsletters, press and media work and the presentation of PISCES at meetings and conferences. Meetings with government decision makers were held regularly. Outreach work throughout aided the development of a project contacts database.

Actions: 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28

**Project management structure**

WWF-UK was the coordinating beneficiary for PISCES, with WWF Spain and The Environment Council as associated beneficiaries. Two organisations were subcontracted to engage with stakeholders in Ireland (Coastal and Marine Research Centre) and France (SeaWeb).

A partnership agreement was developed by WWF-UK and signed by the associated beneficiaries. Quarterly financial and technical reports were required by WWF-UK before payments were made to beneficiaries (initially reports were required every six months but this was altered in February 2011). Two country technical leads were sub-contracted through the standard tendering process and also provided quarterly technical reports alongside their invoices (see Annex A.2 for all technical reports from associated beneficiaries and country leads).

The key project team in WWF-UK included a full-time project manager, policy liaison officer and communications officer along with part-time contributions (noted as part time in the diagram in relation to contribution to the project but not necessarily on part-time contracts) from an administrator, web developer and finance officer and these staff members were involved in the day-to-day running of the project. Additional WWF-UK staff supported the key project team. WWF Spain initially contributed time from the head of marine and a communications officer. In 2011 WWF Spain employed a full-time project officer to assist with project delivery and outreach in Spain. The Environment Council contributed the time of an engagement manager, engagement officer and facilitator. Due to internal organisational changes the roles changed during the project.

The project manager arranged fortnightly teleconference meetings with all project team members in all organisations (including country technical leads). Steering group meetings were held alongside each of the five workshops and two separate planning workshops were held in London with team members from each organisation to inform development of the PISCES outputs.

## 4.2 Evaluation of the management system

In February 2011, workplans were developed for each associated beneficiary and country technical lead and a new reporting template was developed that linked to the workplan (see Annex A.3 for workplans and reporting template). The workplan was split into seven main objectives with the activities and expected results listed. This allowed for a better understanding of roles and responsibilities in PISCES for all organisations. Capacity issues were identified in WWF Spain which resulted in the appointment of a full-time project officer to work solely on PISCES in Spain in 2011 (see Annex A.4 associated beneficiary reports on project management).

The Environment Council brought expertise in stakeholder engagement and facilitation that was important for the delivery of the project objectives. WWF Spain, Coastal and Marine Research Centre and SeaWeb were ideally positioned through their knowledge, understanding an experience of marine policy and management to deliver country engagement and liaison with key stakeholders and governments in their respective countries (Spain, Ireland and France).

The multi-country partnership model was designed to allow for coordinated and strategic engagement with multiple marine sectors and governments across a marine sub-region – the Celtic Sea. This was required for the development of a multi-country, cross-sectoral stakeholder group and a set of guidelines for implementing the ecosystem approach in the context of European marine policy (EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive).

One of the greatest challenges for PISCES was the stakeholder engagement activity. In delivering the project it became clear that there were greatly increased time and capacity requirements to deliver the stakeholder engagement elements of the project. This was not something that could have been foreseen before the project commenced and it was only through the implementation of the project that it became apparent. An extension of the project by six months was granted to improve the quality of the results and ensure delivery of the four objectives. A much more intensive and extended engagement process was implemented with an increase in the number of workshops from three to five and this was supplemented with in-depth and continuous engagement activity, including follow up phone calls, meetings and semi-structured interviews to ensure engagement and allow evaluation of results.

Alongside our project modification we also successfully proposed a budget modification to decrease the total budget. This was due to changes in the personnel category and lower salary levels than those included in the original budget. Due to staff restructuring many of the posts included in the original budget no longer existed. We therefore decreased the personnel budget and increased the external assistance budget.

Another challenge experienced was the staff turnover in all beneficiaries. Nearly all staff members were different at the end of the project than at the start. Mitigation measures were in place to ensure adequate handover but it did take time for relationships to be built and a suitable level of understanding to be reached. Towards the end of the project the Associated Beneficiary, The Environment Council (TEC), experienced very challenging financial conditions and was unable to commit the same level of staff resources to the project.

Multi-sector, multinational stakeholder engagement is extremely challenging but the PISCES model used to facilitate stakeholder involvement in the implementation of the ecosystem approach through the Marine Strategy Framework Directive demonstrated many successes and therefore could be replicated in other marine areas of Europe. It is also applicable to other marine policies requiring regional coordination (e.g. Marine Spatial Planning, Integrated Coastal Zone Management).

Project beneficiaries and technical leads ensured successful delivery of all PISCES objectives:

***Objective 1:*** *By 2012, relevant marine stakeholders in the Celtic Sea have a significantly greater shared understanding of the ecosystem approach of integrated marine management.*

We worked with a key group of 30 stakeholders to increase understanding of the ecosystem approach through tutorials, workshops, presentations and the process of developing PISCES guidelines. In the final evaluation interviews with 24 stakeholders, 43% had increased their understanding and 60% had increased confidence to apply and communicate the ecosystem approach to others. PISCES brought together stakeholders across sectors and across countries to achieve this representing one of the few examples of engagement at this scale.

***Objective 2:*** *By 2012, cooperation and coordination between all relevant representative marine stakeholder groups has led to the development (and Celtic Member State recognition) of agreed mechanisms for implementing the ecosystem approach in the context of EU Marine Strategy and Directive.*

The PISCES key stakeholders developed guidelines on stakeholder participation in the ecosystem approach and marine policy (Marine Strategy Framework Directive). The guidelines included recommendations and actions for stakeholders and governments. It was endorsed by 25 key stakeholders, supported by an Advisory Group and reviewed by 44 wider stakeholders. It presents the voice of stakeholders and represents the agreed views of a diverse range of sectors and countries. The majority of stakeholders and government representatives interviewed stated it was a useful and important document.

***Objective 3:*** *By 2012, the outcomes of the project are effectively disseminated to the wider marine community in the Celtic Sea and upscaled to other marine sub-regions within EU maritime waters.*

The PISCES guidelines have been widely disseminated and will continue to be available as a model that can be replicated in other marine areas in Europe and beyond. The project reached 11,187 marine stakeholders across Europe and used innovative and effective tools such as the project website, e-newsletters and social media to increase reach and impact. The AfterLIFE communications plan identifies the approach that will be taken to continue to disseminate the outputs beyond the project duration (see Section 7.3).

***Objective 4:*** *By 2012, the project is technically and financially managed and monitored coherently within the timeframe of the project, and stakeholders have committed to a shared strategy to ensure the project’s future sustainability*

PISCES was effectively managed and all actions were delivered within the timeframe and budget. A thorough monitoring system allowed for the identification of the need to change the stakeholder engagement approach (resulting in the project modification) and also ensured evidence and data was collected throughout the project durations. The success of the PISCES approach can be partly demonstrated through the expressed desire and commitment of project participants to continue to engage with each other and with governments on a cross-sectoral and multi-country scale in the future.

See the PISCES logical framework for details of delivery against objectives (Annex A.5). The logical framework includes a final evaluation against expected results.

In order to maximise the benefits and successes of PISCES it will be important to maintain engagement opportunities at the regional level. For this reason, WWF-UK and partner organisations submitted a proposal to LIFE+ for the Celtic Seas Partnership project that was approved and began on 1st January 2013.

# 5. Technical part

**Actions 25 (project management by WWF-UK), Action 26 (project management by TEC) and Action 27 (project management by WWF Spain) are all discussed in Section 4 – Administrative part.**

**Actions 9 (website), 11 (communications strategy), 12 (government decision-makers) 13 (final event), 19 (outreach training) are all discussed in Section 5.4 – dissemination.**

**Action 28 (final audit) is included in Section 6.**

SEE PROJECT GANTT CHART FOR TIME SCHEDULE (Annex A.1)

(Note that throughout section 5 the referenced Annexes are numbered in relation to the Action number)

**Action 1: Establishing a network of marine stakeholders**

**Expected results***:*

* By end December 2009, utilising stakeholder analysis methodologies, over 25 key marine stakeholders from target groups are identified
* By November 2010, at least 25 marine stakeholders have committed to being involved with the project
* By the end of the project, continual relationship building and analysis will have led to stakeholder input into the development of PISCES ecosystem approach guidelines.
* By the end of the project, a network of 25 stakeholders exists that represents the interests of the marine community in the Celtic sea Region; recognises its members as equal partners, and is willing to promote the ecosystem approach for sustainable marine management in the target region

**Overall result**

By the end of the project, the expected results had been achieved with a total of 30 stakeholders as part of the ‘key stakeholder group’[[1]](#footnote-1) representing eight different sectors (fisheries, mariculture, renewables, offshore infrastructure, ports, coastal tourism and recreation and statutory agency) and including four women (see Annex 1.1 and Annex 1.2). The key stakeholder group was included in all project communications, invited to all workshops and meetings and was asked to provide input into the drafting of the PISCES guide (see Action 8). The key group were invited to all project activities and were asked to provide comments and input on all aspects. The average attendance at workshops from the key group was 11 and comments were received on the PISCES guidelines from all key stakeholders at some stage.

The final evaluation interviews (see Action 24) of the key group demonstrated an increased capacity among the respondents to promote the ecosystem approach. Of the 13 key stakeholders that were interviewed all have shared PISCES information with people in their sectors and the majority felt the PISCES had made it easier to promote the ecosystem approach, identify sector needs and solutions, to find ways of working together and to provide a clear policy context for the ecosystem approach (see Annex 1.3 for key group interview results).

 “*PISCES removed the "fear factor" around the ecosystem approach - helped to establish the link between ecosystem approach and sustainable development, and that the ecosystem approach is not anti-development*.” Key stakeholder Ireland

**Activities**

Key stakeholders were initially identified through a long-listing process that included representatives from the different sectors across the project country. This was then rationalised into a short-list while still representing the eight sectors across the project countries. By December 2009, staff from WWF-UK and TEC had carried out interviews with those shortlisted and invited participants to the first PISCES workshop.

Recruitment was a continuous process that involved relationship building to maintain the stakeholders as part of the project. We developed in-depth relationships with each key stakeholder to understand their motivations, drivers, issues and concerns and their preferred means of engagement. This informed the process used to develop guidelines (see Action 8). This was a more fluid and dynamic approach than the one identified as most suitable at the time of the original application in 2007. We worked closely with a self-selecting group of individuals, within the 30 key stakeholders, who were most driven to creating the PISCES guidelines. We needed to be adaptable to the situation where individuals moved on in their own roles and were replaced be others. We maintained channels of communication with both the key stakeholder group and wider stakeholders (moderating and wider stakeholders) so that others could join in with the project as they wished (see Problems/challenges section below). The key group grew in number reaching 30 by November 2010.

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK was the coordinating beneficiary for this action. TEC supported delivery through holding telephone interviews and assisted WWF-UK in the guideline development process to maximise stakeholder input. WWF-Spain and the two country leads delivered stakeholder liaison in their respective project countries.

**Indicators**

* A core group of stakeholders is engaged in delivery of the project objectives and has the tools to communicate the project within their sector (Means of Verification: All key stakeholders were engaged in the project and were able to input into the development of the guidelines. Attendance at workshops varied with an average of 11 people in attendance. One-to-one liaison with non-attendees and other online tasks and activities ensured that those who did not attend workshops were still engaged (see Action 8)
* At least one member of each target sector is represented in the established network, and there are at least two female members (**Means of Verification**: network participation list – Annex 1.1 includes representatives for most sectors and four female members. Some key stakeholders were unable to attend workshops but did input to the guidelines process, e.g. from the marine aggregates sector.)

**Problems/challenges**

There were challenges of engaging some sectors and variations between different project countries. The challenges of stakeholder engagement resulted in a modification request for the project to increase the project duration by six months allowing more time for engagement. We suggested a new dynamic approach to address engagement where we worked with a self-selecting group of committed stakeholders rather than the original approach with was more rigid and required consensus building on all aspects across all sectors (see Action 24 and associated Annex 23.2 for more detail).

In France we have found that it has required a greater level of input to secure commitment. This could be due to cultural differences, lack of familiarity with stakeholder engagement projects and the ecosystem approach or a combination of these factors.

In order to address this we held a regional meeting in Rennes, Brittany in April 2011 and invited recruited stakeholders and potential stakeholders. This was an opportunity to update on progress of the project, answer any questions and allow interaction between stakeholders. The recruited stakeholders played a vital role in advocating the benefits of being involved in the project to the potential stakeholders and this had a greater impact than hearing the benefits from the project team. A brief report of the meeting was produced (Annex 1.4).

The fisheries sector has been challenging to engage with. This is due to a number of different reasons including:

* Timing – the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) was undergoing reform during PISCES, which required extensive efforts from all fisheries stakeholders
* Priority – the CFP is the most important policy mechanism for fisheries. Although MSFD is relevant any regulation to fishing activity can only be delivered through the CFP, making the MSFD seem less relevant to fisheries stakeholders.
* Distrust – some fisheries stakeholders appeared to believe that the involvement of WWF in PISCES meant that there were ‘ulterior motives’ to push an agenda that would not be supported by the industry.
* Fear – the fisheries sector has largely existed on its own, with its own legislation and little requirement to work with other sectors. The kind of approach being advocated by PISCES (and suggested through policy mechanisms like marine spatial planning) could potentially require fisheries to have an equal seat at the table with all the other sectors. This might lead to the fear that fisheries would have to give up some of their fishing area to other activities.

It was challenging to engage fisheries stakeholders in Spain due to their status as ‘visitors’ to the Celtic Sea. Spain has no jurisdiction in the Celtic Sea so it is naturally less of a priority area than Spanish waters to both sea-users and government representatives. This resulted in a change of approach where PISCES was promoted as a demonstration of how to engage multiple stakeholders and to implement the MSFD that provided lessons for Spain for implementation of the MSFD and other policy mechanisms.

See Action 24 – evaluating stakeholder engagement, for further detail on the challenges of stakeholder engagement and the lessons learned.

**Action 2: Resource materials on the ecosystem approach prepared**

*Expected results*:

* By end May 2010, briefing documents are prepared to conduct training on the ecosystem approach, addressing identified knowledge gaps workshop of participants
* By end June 2010, an interactive map is published online, with language components translated into French and Spanish, conveying environmental and sectoral data from the Celtic Sea and acting as a directory of related projects.
* By end June 2011, the interactive map displays related projects in the Celtic Sea area.

**Overall result**

The expected results were achieved. Briefing documents on the ecosystem approach were prepared for the first workshop in May 2010 and formed the basis of a substantial information resource on the ecosystem approach in the PISCES online reference library. An online interactive map was developed that included environmental and sectoral information as well as information on related projects.

**Activities**

A number of background materials on the ecosystem approach were written to prepare stakeholders for the first workshop in May 2010. The PISCES website includes information on the ecosystem approach, marine spatial planning, European marine news and the Celtic Sea. Information was either obtained from literature sources or was produced and reviewed by the PISCES project team. A number of ecosystem approach case studies in the Celtic Sea and around the world were identified and were used to inform PISCES workshops and the creation of ecosystem approach guidelines (see Action 8 and the PISCES guidelines for case studies).

The PISCES interactive map of the Celtic Sea was launched in June 2010 to allow stakeholders to see the range of activities in the Celtic Sea in map format and better understand the need to work together to safeguard the future of this marine ecosystem. The map contained an outline of the project extent using the ICES (International Council for the Exploration of the Seas) co-ordinates plus a range of data; from species and protected areas, bathymetry and geological features, to telecom cables and shipping navigation. Not all of the data was comparative across the whole of the Celtic Sea area as most data sources are typically country specific (see Annex 2.1 for screen grabs of the interactive map and an example of an exported map). In addition, the map showed other related projects in the Celtic Sea region to increase understanding of the different projects in the regions and overlaps and synergies. The projects included on the map were Finding Sanctuary, KnowSeas, Making European Fisheries Ecosystem Plan Operational (MEFEPO) and Marine Protected Areas in the Atlantic Arc (MAIA). The project boundaries could be viewed along with links to the projects’ websites. The interactive map was available until the end of December 2012 when PISCES (and associated funds) ended.

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK was responsible for the delivery of this action. Elements of the technical GIS elements of the map were sub-contracted to a specialist company.

**Indicators used**

* Relevant reference materials on the ecosystem approach collated and analysed (Means of Verification: copies of reference materials were collated and are available online)
* At least 5 related projects included on the interactive map (Means of Verification: interactive map included 4 related projects and was viewable online during the project duration)
* Reference materials on the ecosystem approach translated (Means of Verification: translated materials, leaflets and briefing documents – see Action 11 in Section 5.2)
* Baseline understanding of participants knowledge on the ecosystem approach established, and gaps in knowledge identified (Means of Verification: questions answered by 22 stakeholders during recruitment interviews demonstrated moderate levels of understanding – see Annex 2.2).

**Problems/challenges**

It was originally hoped that all sectors would provide data for the interactive map but this was not possible due to the variation in format of data and because some representatives felt concerned about sharing potentially commercially sensitive information and the possibility of the data become outdated very quickly. However, the map was useful in giving an indication of the range of activities taking place in the area and the addition of the related project information was beneficial. Although many related projects were identified and researched it was not always possible to include them on the map as they could not provide accurate coordinates or GIS information for their project extent.

**Action 3: Agreement with target stakeholders on EA**

*Expected results*:

* By end May 2010, 20-25 target marine stakeholders are aware of the benefits of applying an ecosystem approach in the Celtic Sea region
* By end May 2010 20-25 target marine stakeholders are willing to engage in the project and commit to developing guidelines at the next workshop.

**Overall result**

The expected results were achieved. The first PISCES workshop was held in May 2010 and included presentations, exercises and materials to clearly identify the benefits of applying the ecosystem approach. Attendees identified an increased understanding of the ecosystem approach through the end of workshop evaluation questionnaire. Key stakeholders suggested some modifications to the approach taken but expressed an interest in attending further workshops and developing the PISCES guidelines.

**Activities**

The key group of stakeholders were invited to attend the first workshop which was held over three days in Cardiff. It included presentation from a range of international experts on the ecosystem approach (see Annex 3.1 for the programme and speaker biographies and Annex 3.2 for presentations). Background information was provided in advance on the ecosystem approach, the Celtic Sea and the policy framework (see Annex 3.3).

At the workshop the exercises completed by stakeholders started the process of thinking about what the ecosystem approach could mean for them in the Celtic Sea. A total of 12 key stakeholders attended the first workshop. Stakeholders were joined at various points during the workshop by 12 experts on the ecosystem approach and the Celtic Sea, three of which sit on the PISCES advisory group. The experts gave presentations to stakeholders to build knowledge in these areas. In addition, six observers from parties with an interest in the project were in attendance along with 13 PISCES project staff, on hand to answer stakeholder questions and support the process.

One of the major outputs of the workshop was the identification by stakeholders of the benefits and challenges of implementing the ecosystem approach, which formed the basis for developing the guidelines (see Action 8). Stakeholders also helped to develop an agenda and process on how to meeting the final objective of developing guidelines for implementing the ecosystem approach across sectors operating in the Celtic Sea.

The end of workshop evaluation forms were completed by four participants (see Annex 3.4). They indicated that the information provided on the ecosystem approach was useful but knowledge could be further increased by ensuring the inclusion of practical examples of implementation of the ecosystem approach to move beyond the theoretical framework.

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK led this action; organising the workshop programme, logistics and inviting attendees. TEC developed the process plan for the workshop in collaboration with WWF-UK. WWF Spain and country leads facilitated involvement from stakeholders in their respective countries.

**Indicators used**

* 20-25 target marine stakeholders have a significantly increased collaborative understanding of the ecosystem approach, and its relevance to the Celtic Sea region, from baseline information (**Means of Verification**: only four participants responded to the end of workshop questionnaire. They demonstrated an appreciation of the information provided but highlighted the need for more practical examples. Subsequent workshops sought to address this and the final evaluation of stakeholders (see Action 24) indicated 43% increased their understanding of the ecosystem approach. The others already had a high level of understanding. Confidence to communicate the ecosystem approach increased in 71% of respondents)
* 20-25 target marine stakeholders indicate a willingness to be involved in the development of practical guidelines (**Means of Verification:** key stakeholders continued to attend workshops and fed into the development of the guidelines through Action 8 with 25 stakeholders endorsing the final guidelines)

**Problems/challenges**

Workshop attendees expressed some concerns about the project and the methods used. In particular:

* stakeholders required more information on the project and what it would achieve and how it is different to other projects
* stakeholders found the bottom-up, stakeholder-led approach challenging and new
* information on the ecosystem approach provided by experts needed to be supplemented with practical examples of implementation of the ecosystem approach

We addressed these issues in a number of ways:

* We modified our approach to stakeholder recruitment to reflect the fact that this is a continuous process that requires in-depth relationship building with a need to focus efforts on those who are most willing to be part of the project.
* The Policy Officer developed a detailed project description by August 2010 (available in English and French) with a FAQ section (Annex 3.5 and 3.6).
* We contacted each stakeholder who had attended to explain next steps and address any concerns.
* We developed a structure for the stakeholders to work within to develop practical guidelines, thereby giving some information but allowing the space for stakeholders to do the work (see Action 8)
* We realised and communicated to stakeholders, that although we need to start from an understanding of the ecosystem approach, this would be further developed throughout the project through the process of guidelines development.
* We included practical examples of implementing the ecosystem approach in subsequent workshops.

**Action 4: Shared Best Practice principles on ecosystem approach documented for outreach**

*Expected results:*

By the end of November 2010, a document is published and disseminated to identified direct and indirect target groups (including targeted government officials) outlining the progress made at the first stakeholder workshop

**Overall result**

The expected result was achieved as the full workshop report was produced by July 2010 and was sent to the key stakeholder group. A short summary of Workshop 1 was developed and was sent to all key stakeholders, the Advisory Group and government contacts by June 2010 and to a further 165 stakeholders in November 2010 (linked to e-newsletter).

**Activities**

TEC developed the full workshop report, which includes the programme, presentations, exercises and full verbatim transcripts of the workshop (Annex 4.1). Due to the inclusion of the transcripts the full report is not available on the website. A summary workshop report was developed by TEC and WWF-UK in response to stakeholder feedback that this would be more useful for disseminating to colleagues within their sectors (Annex 4.2). WWF-UK sent the summary report to key stakeholder, Advisory Group members and government contacts and was attached to the PISCES e-newsletter which was distributed to 165 stakeholders. The summary report is available on the PISCES website. The full report and all workshop materials, including presentations were available on the PISCES intranet, which was accessible by key stakeholders.

**Who was responsible**

TEC prepared the report with input from WWF-UK. WWF-UK and country leads distributed the report

**Indicators used**

* All workshop material presented is uploaded and freely available on the project website (Means of Verification: all workshop materials were available on the project website or the intranet if it included sensitive information. Workshop summary reports on the website for at least the next five years).
* A report written including the methodology necessary to reach agreed best practice principles on the ecosystem approach (Means of Verification: the full workshop report includes information and recommendations for an approach to be taken through Action 8 to develop agreed principles and guidelines. This was produced by July 2012 and was available to stakeholders on the intranet (restricted due to sensitive information)).

**Action 5: Collaborative learning with target stakeholder group on relevant EU and international marine policy**

*Expected results:*

* By October 2010, concise and accessible reference materials are available to direct and indirect stakeholders on EU and international marine policy through links to the PISCES website.
* By end October 2010 target marine stakeholders have significantly increased understanding of an ecosystem approach in the context of the EU and international marine policy framework

**Overall result**

The expected results were achieved. The online tutorial was held in October 2010 with 10 participants and was subsequently sent on DVD to a further 30 stakeholders. We secured high-profile presentations from the European Commission (DG MARE and DG Environment) and from the UK, Spanish and French Governments.

**Activities**

The online workshop was held with the aim of increasing understanding of the EU Integrated Maritime Policy, in particular the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD), the implementation in relevant Member States and the integration of the MSFD with the Common Fisheries Policy (see enclosed DVD or Annex 5.1 for weblink and screengrab). The tutorial was available for one week initially (11-15 October 2010) and we tried to encourage viewing within this timeframe. We had 10 participants in the week but follow up discussions revealed that many more wanted to view it but couldn’t find the time. We produced DVDs for the tutorial that we distributed to the key stakeholder group and to all the presenters (30 DVDs distributed). The online tutorial was made available on the PISCES intranet. We were unable to post the tutorial on the website as some government contributors felt it should be restricted to PISCES stakeholders only. A report was developed that details the methodology, considerations and results of the marine policy online tutorial and the marine spatial planning online tutorial created for Action 6 (see Annex 5.2 for tutorial report).

In order to determine stakeholders baseline knowledge a ‘quiz’ was developed for both Action 5 and 6 combined using an online tool (survey monkey) <http://www.surveymonkey.net/pisces-quiz-1> (Annex 5.3). A total of eight stakeholders completed the quiz. At the end of the tutorial there were links to the PISCES website reading room for further information on the subject area. The quiz was re-sent following the tutorial to ascertain knowledge increase, however, we only had one response (it showed an increase in knowledge). We received further positive feedback during a facilitated feedback session at the second workshop in November 2010.

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK led this action in coordination with partners and country leads, developing the programme, technical aspects and content. A specialist subcontractor was used to develop the online tutorial web portal.

**Indicators used**

* Reference materials on EU and international are distributed to 20-25 direct target group members, and available to and utilised by at least 250 indirect target group members (**Means of Verification**: reference materials were available to all on our website – see Action 9. Online tutorial restricted to 30 PISCES stakeholders due to presenter permissions)
* Member State government and EC officials input information and/or resources for the workshop (**Means of Verification:** Two EC officials were actively involved in the action through the contribution of presentations and materials)
* The questionnaire is used the end of the workshop to evaluate the impact of the workshop on participants’ levels of knowledge on marine policy (**Means of Verification:** questionnaire showed increase in knowledge (see Annex 5.4 for results), though there was low participation so a workshop session at the second workshop was held were participants verbally expressed an increase in knowledge)
* Target marine stakeholders indicate a willingness to communicate workshop materials for project outreach (**Means of Verification:** 30 DVDs were provided for stakeholders to share the tutorial with colleagues in their sectors)

**Problems/challenges**

The project team investigated and assessed various techniques for delivering this action and the related Action 6. It was felt that a real-time facilitated session would not be appropriate given the constraints of multiple languages, securing availability of speakers and securing availability of stakeholders. Instead it was decided that a pre-recorded tutorial with expert speakers would be the best way of securing an impressive and informative deliverable. The tutorial was made available online over a week-long period in order to be flexible to maximise stakeholder involvement, while still encouraging viewing within a specific timeframe. We used a web portal provided by Arkadin that integrated powerpoint presentations, video and audio in an easy-to-use display that also gave the ability to submit questions to the speakers to be answered at a later date.

Unfortunately the Irish Government did not feel they were in a position to contribute due to internal discussions on MSFD implementation. We worked with them to supply an explanatory paragraph to stakeholders.

**Action 6: Collaborative learning with target stakeholder group on Marine Spatial Planning (MSP)**

*Expected results*:

* By end September 2010, 20-25 target marine stakeholders have a significantly increased understanding of Marine Spatial Planning and linkages to implementing the ecosystem approach.
* By end September 2010 target marine stakeholders have significantly increased capacity to undertake outreach activities and apply Marine Spatial Planning tools for integrated management of the marine environment in the Celtic Sea region

**Overall result**

The expected results were achieved. An online tutorial on Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) was held in September 2010 with 9 participants and was subsequently sent on DVD to a further 30 stakeholders. We secured high-profile presentations from the European Commission (DG MARE) and international experts.

**Activities**

The tutorial was held in September 2010 and included presentations by world experts, DG Mare representatives and case studies from the US. We also developed a very simple cartoon to explain MSP called ‘how to become a maritime spatialist’ that was included at the start of the tutorial. This cartoon is available as a resource for the PISCES project and the key stakeholders to communicate MSP in a clear and simple way (see enclosed DVD or Annex 6.1 for weblink to the tutorials and screen grab). We had 9 participants during the week-long spell that the tutorial was initially available (21-24th September 2010). The DVD was posted to the remaining key stakeholders and the presenters, with a total of 30 DVDs distributed. The tutorial is available on the intranet and the PISCES website and You tube site (see Section 5.2). All speakers agreed to the wider distribution of the MSP tutorial, in contrast to those involved in Action 5.

A quiz was developed on MSP (in tandem with Action 5 – see Annex 5.3) to understand the baseline level of knowledge amongst stakeholders. The knowledge levels were quite low so we used the tutorial to engage them in the subject area and then supplied links to further information on the PISCES website. The quiz was re-sent following the tutorial to ascertain knowledge increase, however, we only had one response (the same respondent as for Action 5). We received further positive feedback during a facilitated feedback session at the second workshop in November 2010.

The same approach as detailed in Action 5 was applied to Action 6 and the online tutorials report for both is included in Annex 5.2.

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK led this action in coordination with partners and country leads, developing the programme, technical aspects and content. A specialist subcontractor was used to develop the online tutorial web portal.

**Indicators used**

* 20-25 target marine stakeholders have a significantly increased collaborative understanding of Marine Spatial Planning, and its relevance to the ecosystem approach in the Celtic Sea region (**Means of Verification**: questionnaire showed increase in knowledge (see Annex 5.4), though there was low participation so a workshop session at the second workshop was held where participants verbally expressed an increase in knowledge)
* 20-25 target marine stakeholders indicate a willingness to communicate workshop materials for project outreach (**Means of Verification:** 30 DVDs were provided for stakeholders to share the tutorial with colleagues in their sectors).

**Action 7: Best Practice examples of Stakeholder Engagement processes analysed and disseminated to target groups**

*Expected results*:

* By end May 2010, target marine stakeholders are aware of the benefits of applying the ecosystem approach in the Celtic Sea region through participatory stakeholder engagement processes
* By end December 2012 target marine stakeholders understand best practice principles for stakeholder engagement processes, and have collaboratively designed a comprehensive stakeholder engagement strategy through which effective exchange of experiences, and recommendations for change can be facilitated from multiple perspectives

**Overall result**

The expected results were achieved and key stakeholders were aware of the benefits of stakeholder engagement processes and understood best practice. A series of films were produced that demonstrated the value of stakeholder engagement in an informative and engaging way. The films were shared with stakeholders to encourage consideration of best practice in stakeholder engagement and to inform the PISCES engagement process. A stakeholder engagement process report was developed to capture the activities, learning and best practice principles from the project.

**Activities**

*Indicators for monitoring stakeholder engagement*

As part of the stakeholder engagement strategy in the workshops, a framework for the evaluation of the stakeholder engagement process has been developed (see also Action 24). This contains a number of objectives, assigned under themes, for the evaluation of the process. These themes are ‘Accountability’, ‘Impact’ and ‘Learning and Development’. These encompass engagement effectiveness from the perspectives of both product and process. Each objective under these themes had an individual indicator assigned to it which was measured at key points throughout the project. Monitoring against the indicators allowed us to continually evaluate and adapt our approach. For example, feedback from stakeholders on value and whether needs were met, was used to inform data gathering on: whether a stakeholder-led approach has made the guidelines developed more robust and sustainable (impact) and to monitor whether the engagement process was effective at the workshops (learning and development). See Action 24 for more detail.

There were two staff reflections during the project and it was apparent from this that there was a need to re-assess the stakeholder analysis and to capture stakeholder engagement efforts more effectively between workshops. This was also complemented by a stakeholder evaluation that sought to demonstrate the project outcomes as perceived by stakeholders and demonstrate the learning experienced by the stakeholders from their involvement in the project.

*Reflections on change films*

Three films were commissioned specifically for the project to present lessons learnt and best practise on stakeholder engagement processes from previously implemented marine projects. A further, fourth film was edited to 4 minutes from a 20 minute original film about Port Orford in USA – showing collaborative fisheries management through a stakeholder process. Captured, using the creative medium of film, each case study is shown through the eyes of stakeholders who describe their experience of making their voice heard and gives an idea of what can be achieved by working together (see DVDs enclosed also see Annex 7.1 for screengrabs). A creative brief for filmmakers was developed in order to deliver a coherent suite of films and a research brief for partners was prepared to assist them in identifying suitable case studies for the films (see Annex 7.2 and 7.3)

The ‘reflections on change’ suite of films were shown at the third and fourth workshops and have been promoted on the PISCES internet and intranet sites, YouTube, WWF intranet and via external links,e.g. newsletters and conferences (using copyright and licensing letters for permission to use) (view the films here: <http://www.projectpisces.eu/background/developing_the_guide/sharing_what_we_learnt/stakeholder_engagement_case_study_films/>). In addition to the Reflections on Change series, we filmed researcher Heather Ritchie who gave a presentation at the second PISCES workshop on the role of stakeholders in marine spatial planning.

*SWOT analysis (desktop study) and Stakeholder Engagement Strategy*

The final draft of the SWOT analysis was received by December 2010 and reviewed by WWF UK (see Annex 7.4). The Stakeholder Engagement Strategy was initially drafted by December 2010 but has since been continually updated to set out the approaches used and to capture developments, changes and learning in the stakeholder engagement process as they occur and to provide indications of best practice or recommendations for future projects. Significant updates to the document occurred at key points in the process such as after stakeholder workshops, and was reviewed and amended at the end of the project in light of project outputs and learning (see Annex 7.5).

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK led this action with input from TEC. Film work was subcontracted to a specialist film maker. Partners and country leads assisted in identifying suitable case studies for films.

**Indicators used**

* By end December 2010 meaningful indicators are determined by stakeholders for monitoring stakeholder engagement processes (**Means of Verification:** see the Monitoring Protocol document, see Action 24)
* By end June 2011, lessons learnt and best practise on stakeholder engagement processes from previously implemented projects captured using creative technologies (**Means of Verification:** ‘Reflections on change’ films produced and available online)
* By end July 2010, a wide variety of stakeholder engagement methodologies from different contexts are analysed (**Means of Verification:** a desktop study or SWOT analysis was produced.)
* By end December 2012 a stakeholder engagement strategy will be finalised (**Means of Verification:** Stakeholder engagement strategy has been finalised)

**Problems/challenges**

The initial versions of the stakeholder engagement strategy and analysis were broadly developed in the form of a forward plan, which encompassed an exploration of potential engagement approaches for the project and their rationale. This was useful as it provided insight to support the initial development of the PISCES stakeholder engagement process. However, it was recognised to have a limited value in terms of continuing to inform the project moving forward and in providing any future benefit or wider application outside the immediate PISCES project. For this reason the stakeholder engagement strategy was continually updated throughout the course of the project.

**Action 8: Guidelines on implementing the Ecosystem Approach in the Celtic Sea developed collaboratively with stakeholders**

*Expected results:*

* By end June 2012, 20-25 target marine stakeholders have collaboratively developed guidelines to implement the ecosystem approach to marine management, addressing unsustainable marine resource use in the Celtic Sea sub region facilitating Member State implementation of the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive
* By end December 2012, at least 200 wider marine stakeholders have been able to meaningfully engage in the development of the guidelines and have increased capability and knowledge to manage marine resources in the Celtic sea sustainably
* By end of December 2012 3,000 wider marine stakeholders are aware of the benefits of the guidelines developed

**Overall result**

Expected results were achieved. Guidelines on implementing the ecosystem approach in the context of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive were developed through a series of workshops, exercises, tasks and a number of iterations of drafts with the key stakeholder group. Advisory Group members and government officials were invited to contribute and participate. In the final stages of drafting the guidelines were shared with 197 stakeholders known as ‘moderating stakeholders’ and 30 of them provided detailed comments on the drafts. A programme of outreach and dissemination was delivered throughout the project with a particular focus in the final few months for promotion and dissemination of the PISCES guidelines (see Section 5.4).

**Detailed description of action**

The development of guidelines was one of the main activities of the PISCES project. It was delivered through a series of workshops, remote tasks and collaborative drafting (see Annex 8.1 for guidelines development process diagram).

**Guidelines stage 1 (June 2010 to November 2010)**

Feedback from the first workshop in Cardiff suggested that stakeholders needed more convincing to ensure their full commitment to delivering the project objectives, needed more information on the project, preferred a lighter touch style of facilitation and needed a clear structure to work within. We addressed each of these points by carrying out one-to-one discussions with stakeholders in advance, producing a detailed project description in August 2010 as reported under Action 3 (see Annex 3.5), modifying the facilitation techniques to be more formal and by developing a structure and providing the first step in this structure through a ‘strawman of ecosystem approach principles’ (Annex 8.2). The provision of the strawman to the stakeholders was intended to provide a starting point for discussion rather than overly influence the process.

The Policy Officer developed a structure and methodology for developing the guidelines in the second PISCES workshop that involved a hierarchical model for the ecosystem approach with principles, objectives and actions plans (Annex 8.3 for three-tier approach). This was determined based on information drawn from other ecosystem approach projects around the world and processes to integrate the ecosystem approach in the marine environment.

The second PISCES workshop was held in Cork, Ireland on 22-23rd November 2010. A workshop summary was sent to key stakeholders and Advisory Group members (Annex 8.4). A full workshop report has been produced and was available on the PISCES intranet (Annex 8.5). Despite early notice of the workshop dates, we had attendance from only 11 of the 27 key stakeholders. This appears to be due to the high profile of our stakeholders and the competing demands on their time. We had representation from Wales, England, Ireland and France. Unfortunately we did not have any Spanish stakeholders present. Following the workshop we held re-engagement phone calls with 10 key stakeholder who were unable to attend to encourage future involvement.

The workshop was very successful with positive and constructive input from stakeholders that resulted in good progress on the process of developing guidelines. The stakeholders also formed collaborative links between them, learned more about international projects that are implementing the ecosystem approach and about stakeholder engagement challenges and techniques.

For example, a stakeholder said: "It’s great to be here with stakeholders who have a lot of information and knowledge of what’s going on, and we’re all coming here to share the objective that there are real advantages to us all if we can get this ecosystem based management thing right.” (Play this video for more stakeholder perspectives: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xclhseCVwOU>).

**Guidelines stage 2 (December 2010 to June 2011)**

Following the second PISCES workshop in Cork, we identified the need to further develop the guidelines and to involve those stakeholders who were unable to attend. We conducted telephone discussions with each of the Cork attendees to ascertain the best approach to develop the guidelines remotely. The stakeholders stated that their preference was to receive short and simple ‘tasks’ with a short (one week) turnaround for comments. The stakeholders felt that this was the best way to accommodate PISCES on top of their normal workload.

The PISCES team developed a number of ‘tasks’ for the stakeholders to work on to develop the guidelines and emailed them every 2/3 weeks with a one week deadline (see Annex 8.6). The number of responses to the tasks was: task 1 – 8, task 2 – 2, task 3 -2, task 4 - 3. The draft guidelines were also sent to the Advisory Group requesting general comments on the structure and content (also other interested people, e.g. Crown Estate). For the final task we included all of the previous tasks and drafts on to the intranet site and invited all key stakeholders to visit the site and provide comments on the draft guidelines before the next workshop.

The third PISCES workshop was held in Dinard, France on 14th and 15th June 2011. A summary of the workshop was circulated to stakeholders (Annex 8.7). A full workshop report was produced and was available on the intranet (Annex 8.8). The aim of the workshop was to move the guidelines on further, involve stakeholders who had not previously been present, and integrate comments and discussion from the Advisory Group and government experts. We trialed a new tool - mind-mapping (used to visually present complex information with lots of contributors) in the workshop to develop ideas and ensure a broad scope of thinking (see Annex 8.9 for stakeholder mindmaps).

**Guide stage 3 – July 2011 to November 2011**

Following the stakeholder workshop in France in June 2011, the ‘mindmap’ outputs produced by stakeholders were reviewed by the team and a number of overlaps were seen across the different objectives. For this reason, and to link more closely to EU marine policy, the policy officer proposed an amended framework for further guidelines development (Annex 8.10). The framework grouped the objectives and actions from the mindmaps according to five implementation steps for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive. This new approach was communicated to key stakeholders and was approved by them.

A subgroup of key stakeholders volunteered to work on the development of the guidelines draft. Each volunteer was sent instructions on how to develop the step they were allocated from the mindmap outputs (Annex 8.11) and the requirements were discussed in a telephone call. A stakeholder survey was also designed in order to collect further information from stakeholders on sectoral measures in order to help develop specific sections of the guidelines in the following workshop (Annex 8.12). A new draft of the guidelines was developed in advance of the fourth PISCES workshop and all key stakeholders and the Advisory Group were able to review and provide comments (Annex 8.13).

**Guidelines stage 4 – December 2011 to June 2012**

The fourth PISCES workshop (third in guidelines series) took place in November 2011 in Dorking, UK (Annex 8.14) and focused on the issues and challenges of implementing the ecosystem approach through Marine Strategy Framework Directive delivery in the Celtic Sea. There was attendance from 14 stakeholders and 9 Advisory Group members and related project representatives. The guidelines follow a step-by-step approach that the stakeholders went through systematically. There was also opportunity for stakeholders to share experiences from their sectors on the use of sustainable practices. The ‘Reflections on change’ films (Action 7) were also shown to demonstrate the range of other experiences in different areas. The stakeholders then reflected on the information to consider how they might apply some of the initiatives in their own sector or in their own area. Stakeholders found the workshop to be a rewarding experience and some of their views were captured in a short film (Annex 8.15).

Following the fourth PISCES workshop, we held two team workshops (December 2011 and February 2012) in order to learn from stakeholder feedback on the structure, length and style of the guidelines and finalise the layout. It was clear that stakeholders wanted the guidelines to be as short as possible, in plain and simple language and with practical examples and case studies. Further drafts were developed and a pre-workshop 5 draft was circulated to stakeholders and the advisory group for comment in advance of the workshop (see Annex 8.16). This draft was translated into French and Spanish to ensure full input from French and Spanish stakeholders.

The final workshop was held in Madrid in May 2012 (see Annex 8.17 for full workshop report) with attendance from 12 stakeholders and 6 other attendees from related projects, PISCES advisory group and the Spanish Government. At the workshop, attendees agreed the final structure and style of the guidelines, supplied information for quotes and case studies and considered the future mechanisms for regional stakeholder collaboration beyond PISCES.

A number of drafts were produced following the fourth workshop that were reviewed by the key stakeholders and the team. A draft was produced in mid-June that reflected the input from the final workshop developed to a point where it was suitable for wider review and was translated into French and Spanish (Annex 8.18). This draft was reviewed by key stakeholders, the project team, advisory group members and was sent to approximately 200 moderating stakeholders. We received comments from 30 moderating stakeholders (see Annex 8.19 for comments register). In response to key stakeholder feedback, we commissioned a final review by an editor to simplify the language (Annex 8.20). This final draft was then sent to the key stakeholder group for final sign-off and 25 key stakeholders endorsed the final version. The final document was then designed, translated into French and Spanish and printed by the 1st of October and made available on the PISCES website (see enclosed hard copy or Annex 8.21).

(See Annex 8.22 for full breakdown and timetable of activities and drafts in stage 4.)

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK led this action with input from partners and country leads to liaise with stakeholders in the development of the guidelines and to provide comments and review on the guidelines drafts.

**Indicators used**

* Capacity is available to support refinement of the Guidelines (**Means of Verification**: A total of 110 stakeholders contributed to the different stages of guidelines development. The guidelines were endorsed by 25 key stakeholders.)
* Quantity and quality of comments made to drafts from direct and indirect target groups (**Means of Verification:** A number of review periods allowed for input to be received from direct and indirect target groups, government bodies and project Advisory Group.)
* Number of participants attending and actively engaging in the workshops (**Means of Verification:** Workshop reports demonstrate the attendance and process for each workshop)
* Target marine stakeholders indicate a willingness to communicate workshop materials for project outreach (**Means of Verification:** see Section 5.4 - dissemination)
* 200 Moderating stakeholders are able to comment on the Guidelines (**Means of Verification:** Guidelines sent to 200 moderating stakeholders (see Annex 8.23) and carefully considered comments received from 30 moderating stakeholders)
* At least 3,000 wider stakeholders have their awareness raised in relation to the Guidelines (**Means of Verification:** See Section 5.4 - dissemination)

**Problems/challenges**

In delivering PISCES it became clear that the challenges of stakeholder engagement and creating a stakeholder-led process meant that it took longer to get stakeholders fully committed to the project. This has had knock-on impacts in terms of the guidelines development. It was also challenging to deliver a fully comprehensive set of guidelines in two workshops. We have attempted to work remotely with stakeholders to maximise input and facilitate the process but given that our stakeholders are giving their time on top of their key work commitments, it is difficult to get full and thorough responses. It is also more beneficial and productive to hold face-to-face meetings and an essential part of the process to ensure that stakeholders remain bought-in to a process that they feel is their own. We requested additional workshops and meetings to ensure the best possible results in terms of the guidelines, allow for multiple, adequate and thorough review stages by moderating stakeholders, Advisory Group and government representatives and ensure that the PISCES stakeholders feel a strong sense of ownership of the guidelines (and are therefore are more committed to taking them forwards beyond the project timeframe). The original proposal did not allow for the stakeholders to respond to the peer-review and we felt this would lead to a feeling of disengagement from the process. The new approach taken after approval of the amendment request represents a more detailed and comprehensive approach than was originally envisaged in the project application.

**Action 14: Recruitment of Key Project Management Team Staff**

*Expected results (quantitative information when possible)*:

* Project Manager and Finance Officer recruited by July 2009
* Policy Liaison Officer, Communications Officer, Web Producer, and Admin Support Officer recruited by the end of December 2009.

The key project management team staff were recruited by December 2009. The Finance Officer was recruited by July 2009, the Project Manager by September 2009 (target date July 2009). The Policy Liaison Officer, Communications Officer, Web Producer, and Admin Support officer were recruited as per proposal by end December 2009.

Since then the Administration Officer has left and a number of temporary staff members have been used. Recruitment of the post for the remaining duration of the project was carried out in December 2010 and a new staff member was appointed in January 2011 for the remainder of the project. The part-time Communications Officer was made a full-time post in November 2010. Since then the Communications Officer has taken maternity leave (April 2011) and a cover was appointed. The new Communications Officer then took maternity leave in September 2012 and was replaced for a 3.5 month period by a communications expert on a service contract. The Project Manager resigned in December 2010 and the Policy Liaison Officer was appointed to the role in February 2011. A new Policy Liaison Officer was recruited and appointed in June 2011.

**Action 15: Reporting**

*Expected results (quantitative information when possible)*:

* All project reports are of high quality, and are submitted on time to the EC

*Indicators of progress:*

* Reports and are available on the project website in either Word orPDF format, or distributed via email, unless specifically required in hard copy. (Means of Verification: all reports were available on the PISCES intranet).

**Overall result**

The expected result was achieved as all reports were submitted on time and to a high standard. Some questions were outstanding in early reports that were fully addressed in subsequent reports.

**Activities**

The Inception Report was the first report required to be submitted to LIFE+ and this was submitted within 9 months of the project start date. The first progress report was submitted to LIFE+ at the end of June 2010. The second progress report was submitted in January 2011 for the period July to December 2010 (this should have been the mid-term report but the appropriate spend threshold had not been reached). The mid-term report was submitted in July 2011. A progress report was submitted in July 2012. The final report was prepared and returned by 31 March 2013 (see Annex 15.1 for all reports submitted to LIFE+).

Internal PISCES reporting consists of quarterly technical and financial summaries. Meeting minutes were also available via the PISCES GoogleDocs website to all partners and subcontractors.

Partners and country leads submitted quarterly technical and financial reports to WWF UK and partners submitted a final PISCES report for the project duration (see Annexes A.2 and A.3).

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK was responsible for providing all reports to the EC. Associated beneficiaries and country leads were responsible for providing timely reports to WWF-UK.

**Action 16: Exchange of lessons with other EC and other donor projects**

**Expected results**

* Throughout the project duration, lessons are learnt and experiences are shared from at least 3 relevant EC and other donor funded projects

**Overall result**

The expected result was achieved as regular contact was maintained with 10 other EC and other donor projects (see Annex 16.1 for outreach diary – exchange with other projects).

**Activities**

The PISCES team developed and maintained links with other projects. The PISCES project manager sits on the Advisory Group for the FP7 project Knowseas and vice versa. We had representation at PISCES workshops and events from KnowSeas, MEFEPO, CAMIS, ODEMM and MESMA (see Annex 16.1 for project details). PISCES was also communicated through presentations and posters at INDEMARES, Marine Socio-economic Network, Transboundary Planning the European Atlantic, MESH Atlantic and MAIA events. We continue to monitor the other related projects and have a section on our website dedicated to this. The PISCES team has developed a summary of all the relevant and related projects, which was used to inform development of the interactive map (Annex 16.2).

The WWF team have also drawn on experiences with other EC projects that WWF is involved with – One Planet Mobility and OPEN EU. Both of these projects are applying innovative stakeholder engagement techniques and have proved valuable in informing stakeholder engagement for the PISCES project.

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK led on liaising with other projects assisted by project partners and country leads who attended meeting and events where possible.

**Indicators used**

* At least 2 representatives of other relevant EC projects attend project launch and final events (Means of verification: representatives from 5 related projects attended PISCES workshops and events. The PISCES team presented to a further 5 related projects.

**Action 17: Translation**

*Expected results:*

* Throughout the project key project documents are translated, and interpretation is available at project events to ensure direct and indirect target groups are able to fully contribute to the project

**Overall result**

The result was achieved as project documents were translated at key points to ensure involvement of French and Spanish stakeholders. Simultaneous interpretation was only required at one workshop but allowed for greater involvement of French stakeholders.

**Activities**

All key project documents have been translated into French and Spanish including the PISCES guidelines. Project partners and subcontractors have assisted with communications with non-English speakers. Recruitment interviews have been carried out in the preferred language of the individual. Interpretation facilities were provided for the third PISCES workshop in France to ensure inclusivity and respect cultural differences but were not required by attendees for the other workshops. External interpreters were contracted to deliver this service at the French workshop as this is not something that can be provided by the project team (due to the complexity of the subject area, the need for fluency in multiple languages and the need for real-time interpretation). The interpreters offered simultaneous interpretation of presentations and plenary sessions as well as one-to-one interpretation during small group working. This was essential to the delivery of workshop 3 and meant that we could include French participants equally in discussions. Translation of drafts of the guide was necessary to ensure that stakeholders from France and Spain were able to meaningfully engage and comment upon the guidelines. The final products were translated so they could be disseminated widely in the project countries. Simultaneous interpretation was also available at the technical seminar in Madrid; part of the outreach and dissemination programme for the guidelines.

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK was responsible for delivering this action and identified which documents needed to be translated at what stages. WWF Spain and SeaWeb assisted in identifying suitable translators in their respective countries and liaised with them to complete the tasks. SeaWeb identified simultaneous interpretation providers for the French workshop and liaised with the subcontractor on the requirements for the event.

**Indicators:**

* Stakeholders are able to fully engage in workshops and understand key project documents **(Means of Verification:** workshop interpretation, reports and project materials are translated into French and Spanish.)

**Problems/challenges**

The translation of documents added greater complexity to the development of the guidelines as extra time and more review stages needed to be built in. Collating and incorporating comments in three languages was also challenging. This was overcome by allowing the necessary time in the schedule and maintaining a record of all comments and a list of all versions and who they were sent to. Simultaneous translation at the French workshop was challenging as it slowed down the process and did not allow for free flowing discussion. However, it was vital to allowing for good engagement with French speaking stakeholders.

**Action 18: Project Inception Workshop**

**Expected result**

* By September 2009 a successful project inception workshop is held and the project Steering Group are aware of the contractual obligations and roles and responsibilities required for the project

**Overall result**

The expected result was achieved as a project inception workshop was held in the first three months of the project and involved representatives of the coordinating and associated beneficiaries.

**Activities**

A successful project inception workshop was held 1-4th Sept 2009, in Cardiff, Wales. The inception meeting covered contractual and financial requirements as well as initial discussions on delivering the project objectives and developing the work programme. In October 2010, the WWF-UK Government and Aid Agencies (GAA) Team arranged a one-day workshop with the WWF-UK Project team to run through the project management and contract management processes in place for PISCES. The GAA role provides support to the project to ensure compliance with the EC contract. The original project inception meeting was held in September 2009 in order to provide the whole PISCES project team with an in-depth knowledge of contractual obligations and understanding of roles and responsibilities within the project.  This follow-up session in October 2010 was intended as a refresher for the team and a chance to revisit roles and responsibilities to ensure effective management of the project. A number of actions were agreed to improve coordination and monitor the activities of partners and subcontractors.

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK was responsible for organising the workshop and all associated beneficiaries attended.

**Indicators used**

* Members of the project Steering Group demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the contractual obligations of the project and roles and responsibilities (**means of Verification**: Inception Report identified the programme and topics covered.)

**Problems/challenges**

A turnover of staff in all the beneficiaries meant that information from the inception workshop had to be communicated to new staff members.

**Action 19: Training to facilitate project outreach**

**Expected results:**

* By March 2010, all relevant staff and associated beneficiaries for the project obtain a similar level of skill in facilitation and messaging to support project communication

**Overall result**

Members of the PISCES project team received media training and facilitation training which meant the expected result was achieved.

**Activities**

Facilitation training was provided by The Environment Council in April 2010 and was attended by six project team members. Media and press training was provided by Axis Media Group and took place in June 2011, a bespoke course for PISCES, and was delivered after the third workshop - to make travel easier for all partners to attend. All except one team member (due to illness) took part in the training (see Annex 19).

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK was responsible for identifying the training needs and the media and messaging training. TEC was responsible for delivering facilitation training and all parnters and country leads were responsible for attending the training.

**Indicators**

* All relevant project staff and associated beneficiaries demonstrate a strong aptitude in facilitation and messaging (**Means of Verification**: team members assisted in facilitation at project workshops and identified media opportunities in their respective countries).

**Problems/challenges**

The trainer that WWF-UK had used for media training unfortunately died during the project period and it took some time to find a replacement trainer.

**Action 20: Project Steering Group**

**Expected results**

* Three effective project Steering Group meetings are held annually to ensure effective project management (including reviewing results of monitoring activities)

**Overall result**

The steering group met regularly and was able to input into the project process, identifying the best approach and reviewing progress to date. The expected result was therefore achieved.

**Activities**

Steering group members first met face-to-face at the Inception workshop (Sept 2009), and at each of the four project guidelines workshops (see Annex 20.1 for meeting minutes). The Project Manager also convened two team workshops to assist the guidelines drafting process. The Project Manager held individual meetings with each member of the Steering Group (in London, Cork and Madrid) in February/March 2011 to consider progress and the best ways of moving the project forwards. Regular discussions were held by telephone throughout the course of the project between the Project Manager and the lead member of each partner and sub-contractor.

**Indicators**

* There is full attendance and participation from Steering Group participants at meetings (**Means of Verification**: Steering Group meeting minutes provided.)

**Problems/challenges**

It was often challenging to find availability of all steering group members and for this reason we coincided the meetings with the project workshops.

**Action 21: Project Advisory Group**.

**Expected results**

* Bi-annual effective project Advisory Group meetings are held throughout the project duration

**Overall result**

The expected result was achieved as the Advisory Group have formally held two teleconferences, have met in person at PISCES workshops and a total of approximately 20 one-to-one conversations and meetings have been held between the PISCES team and advisory group members. The Advisory Group members were invited to all workshops (attendance from at least three members at each workshop) and provided comments on drafts of the guidelines throughout their development.

**Activities**

The Project Advisory Group was established in February 2010 and included Professor David Johnson (OSPAR), Fanny Douvere (UNESCO), Sian Prior (Independent Consultant), Simon Walmsley (WWF International), Professor Laurence Mee (SAMS and KnowSeas project). The majority of the Advisory Group attended the first PISCES workshop and at least three representatives attended the subsequent workshops. We have held two Advisory Group teleconferences (see Annex 21.1) and members were kept informed of projects developments by e-mail and regular one-to-one phone conversations. During the guidelines development process additional Advisory Group members were recruited – Charles Ehler (Ocean Visions Consulting) and Professor Ed Maltby (University of Liverpool).

Advisory Group members contributed to the ongoing drafting of the guidelines through informal one-to-one telephone discussions and providing detailed written comments. This greatly helped to inform the development of the guidelines and acted as a peer review.

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK was responsible for convening the Advisory Group. Partners and country leads provided input on who should become members. WWF-UK liaised with the Advisory Group to provide ongoing information on project progress and to facilitate input, views and comments from the Advisory Group.

**Indicators**

* There is full attendance and participation from Advisory Group participants at meetings (**Means of Verification**: Advisory Group meeting minutes provided.)

**Problems/challenges**

The high profile status of Advisory Group members meant that it was extremely challenging to find a suitable time when the majority were available for a physical meeting. We tailored our approach to instead trying to speak to each member on a one-to-one basis and to circulate drafts of guidelines to all for comment.

**Action 23: Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Expected results**

* Throughout the project duration, qualitative and quantitative evidence is sourced on project progress which enables assessment of the project in terms of its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability

**Overall Result**

The expected result was achieved. This can be demonstrated by the fact that the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system set up at the beginning of the project with associated evaluation criteria (Annex 23.1), assisted in identifying the unsuitability of the consensus model of stakeholder engagement and informed the adoption of a “dynamic” approach. This dynamic approach not only supported the stakeholder-led development of the PISCES guidelines, it also enabled the project and stakeholders to adapt the workshop design so the number of these events increased and they style of events was adapted. It also encouraged teams to adapt country specific stakeholder engagement strategies to engage more reluctant stakeholders between workshops and allowed the team to reflect regularly and capture emerging lessons. As a result the project teams co-produced an updated stakeholder analysis (Annex 23.2) which presented the operating context per country with a description of the approach taken and the lessons learnt.

There were three key areas where M&E processes were used regularly and to good effect; informal stakeholder engagement process, guidelines development process and project management. Overall results can be summarised in the following way.

* *Stakeholder engagement throughout the project activities*: Out of 102 individuals that participated in project activities there were 33 marine users involved in developing the guide through the workshops (resulting in 30 key stakeholders), 25 of these key stakeholder signed the guide, 16 moderating & 22 wider stakeholders participated in the workshops (but not the guide development), and 30 moderating stakeholders reviewed drafts of the guide.
* *Degree of Stakeholder participation in guidelines development*: There were 23 stakeholders very active in 10 key PISCES Guide steps (5 workshops, 4 draft review processes & signing): 1 key stakeholder contributed to 9 of these, 9 key stakeholders contributed to either 6 (7) or 5 (2) of these steps and 10 key stakeholders and 3 PISCES advisory group members contributed to either 4 (6) or 3 (4) of these steps, with the remaining 79 individuals contributing to either 1 or 2 of these steps.
* *Adaptive Project Management*: apart from participating in the various project management monitoring activities, the coordinating and associated beneficiaries adapted their teams in response to changing circumstances to improve results. In 2010 TEC changed their facilitating and documentation team in order to respond to emerging stakeholder needs, WWF-UK brought in extra assistance from the Design and Impact team at the end of 2010 to support the project delivery, result quality, M&E, and reporting activities. WWF-Spain employed a PISCES officer in 2012 to support the more intense stakeholder engagement required, and all teams agreed to extend the project design to support the guidelines development and increase impact.

**Activities**

*Informal Regular Dialogue & Review*: Partners and subcontractors participated in fortnightly teleconferences to review ongoing progress on the project. Partners have met twice to review and capture emerging project lessons.

*Quarterly meetings of the Project Steering Group*: Regular attendance at Steering Group meetings to review project progress

*Qualitative and Quantitative information of Project Progress*: Partners provided quarterly technical and quarterly financial reports to verify expenditure against assigned actions and provide an assessment of progress against objectives over the reporting period.

*M&E assistance*: Since 2011 TEC and WWF-UK met quarterly to discuss M&E updates on the stakeholder engagement process and documentation. WWF-UK met regularly with WWF Spain to monitor engagement efforts, information flow and reporting. WWF-UK increased its M&E support to the project in 2012 to improve the quality of lessons captured, stakeholder project evaluation process and stakeholder engagement process documentation.

*Data base management*: Two key database management tools have been used by the project teams to create an evidence base of engagement efforts that could be contributed to by all partners and subcontractors: the contact database in highrise (containing 1485 engagement contacts with stakeholders) and a google docs site that contains all project information. The PISCES intranet has been an invaluable tool for supporting and monitoring the engagement of stakeholders in various activities of the project.

**Who was responsible**

All partners and country leads were responsible for this action, but each tended to lead on particular aspects; TEC led on the workshop stakeholder engagement monitoring and feedback evaluations, WWF-Spain, French and Irish sub-contractors (Seaweb and CMRC led on country specific stakeholder engagement processes (coordinated/supported by TEC) and WWF-UK led on project management, marine policy advocacy, communication strategy coordination and stakeholder engagement M&E support.

**Indicators Used**

* Qualitative and quantitative information is sourced to monitor project progress (**Means of verification:** Monitoring Protocol, Surveys, questionnaires in the Stakeholder engagement strategy documentation (Annex 7.5), re-engagement interview notes and stakeholder feedback (Annex 23.3 and 23.4), five workshop reports (Annex 8) and stakeholder evaluation (Annex 23.5),Progress reports and Interim and Final Project reports (Annex 15) as well as SWOT analysis, initial stakeholder analysis 2010 (Annex 7), Updated stakeholder analysis 2012 (Annex 24) and PISCES guide (Annex 8)). See Annex 23.6 for stakeholder engagement timeline.

**Problems/challenges**

The stakeholder engagement proved to be more challenging and resource intensive that originally envisaged, resulting in greater effort by country specific teams to engage with stakeholders reluctant to participate in project activities. There was a number of staff changes in the teams with was challenging for continuity of relationships with stakeholders and understanding of the project process.

**Action 24: Evaluating stakeholder engagement**

**Expected results**

* Throughout the project duration, stakeholder engagement processes are transparently and collaboratively monitored to assess its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, and potential for outreach impact beyond the project lifetime

**Overall Result**

The expected result was achieved and a number of stakeholder evaluation tools and processes (telephone interviews, questionnaires, and verbal feedback) were used throughout the project to solicit their opinions on a variety of topics including:

1) Workshop design and expectations,

2) Workshop feedback

3) Knowledge and Understanding of marine policy subjects

4) PISCES guidelines content

5) Interest in the project

6) Reasons for leaving the project (1)

7) Assess project achievements.

The evaluation processes led to various changes and adaptations:

* change in the format and design of the briefing materials, information and workshops after the first workshop
* more marine policy relevance in workshop 2
* French side event to seek more stakeholders before workshop 3
* increased number of government participants in workshop 3
* WWF-Spain used a technical seminar to identify more Spanish stakeholders before workshop 4
* Practical examples of voluntary measures in workshop 4
* translated versions of the guide draft before workshop 5 and there was participation of Spanish stakeholders (government and commercial fisheries) in workshop 5
* Three launch events were facilitated to launch the guideline (Madrid, London, and Brussels)
* Capturing of lessons learned from stakeholder engagement, as well as clarity on what the stakeholders gained from participating in this project.

A final stakeholder evaluation in late 2012 demonstrated an increase in knowledge and understanding of the ecosystem approach, increased confidence, a recognition of the importance of the stakeholder process and the value of the guidelines by stakeholders and government representatives (see Annex 24.1)

**Activities**

Three methods were used with frequency throughout the project: semi-structured interviews,

questionnaires and surveys, as well as informal and transparent dialogue/exchange of experiences, in the following of ways:

* An initial stakeholder analysis was produced at the beginning of the project highlighting the key organisations the project wanted to engage. From this long list recruitment interviews were held.
* The Environment Council (TEC) consistently used an evaluation framework it developed during initial phase of the project to systematically assess the effectiveness of the stakeholder engagement in the workshops by designing feedback questionnaires. The results of the data gathered was summarised in a workshop report and shared with both the project team and stakeholders. This data was also used to adapt the workshop content and style to respond to stakeholder suggestions e.g., 4 stakeholders feedback after workshop 1, 10 stakeholders feedback after workshop 2, 13 stakeholders feedback after workshop 4 and 7 stakeholder feedback after workshop 5 using questionnaire feedback forms (see Annex 24).
* In-between the workshops TEC called stakeholders to assess their expectations and willingness to participate in the next activities. In one case 8 stakeholders responded to an online survey gaging their marine policy knowledge in September 2010 (Action 5), in another 10 stakeholders were interviewed in January 2011 for their suggestions on the workshop content (Annex 23.3) and in Sept 2011, 13 stakeholders completed a survey on what kind of voluntary measures their sector was using (Action 8).
* During the workshops the facilitator and team engaged informally with stakeholders to sense check the workshop design and exchange experiences.
* In early 2012 a video was used to encourage stakeholders to prepare for the 5th workshop instead of traditional e-mail communication.
* An exit survey was also prepared and facilitated by phone to enable the team to assess why a stakeholder was leaving and who in their organisation could take up their role in participating in the project workshops.
* In order to evaluate feedback on the project achievements in Dec 2012 a series of semi-structured interviews and online survey questionnaires were prepared for key, moderating, wider and government stakeholders to assess how well they thought the project had achieved key objectives. 30 interviews were facilitated by various members of each team, and 37 online questionnaires were filled out by four types of stakeholders, Key, Moderating, Wider and Government stakeholders (there were three sets of questions and questionnaires with slight differences tailored to each type of stakeholder). (See Annex 24.1 and Section 5.2.)

**Who was responsible**

TEC was responsible for designing the workshop feedback questionnaires, engagement interviews and documenting stakeholder responses and well as providing supporting guidance notes to assist each of the country partners and sub-contractors facilitate the interviews. WWF-UK was responsible for quality control, design of the final project stakeholder evaluation interviews and online questionnaires, analysing data and synthesizing various data sources.

**Indicators Used**

* All targeted stakeholders respond to surveys and questionnaires (**Means of Verification:** completed questionnaires and surveys)
* At least 20 stakeholders input to semi-structured interviews (**Means of Verification:** 8 online baseline surveys of stakeholder knowledge and understanding of key marine policy concepts, 30 stakeholder evaluation semi structured interview transcripts, and 37 online stakeholder evaluation questionnaires, Completed feedback forms from 5 workshops (4, 10, 13, 12, and 7), survey results from 10 re-engagement surveys Jan 2011, survey results from 13 voluntary measures survey).

**Problems/challenges**

Staff changes in TEC during the last few months of the project reduced their analytical pool of staff that they could draw on. TEC produced a qualitative account of the stakeholder engagement process dynamics and prior, post and during the five workshops, which drew together lessons and stakeholder feedback results as well as tools, questionnaires, interview questions and key information shared with stakeholders. This was revised by WWF-UK team to combine quantitative analysis and graphical summaries. WWF-UK designed the final evaluation interviews and questionnaires with stakeholders.

## 5.2 Evaluation

**Methodology**

Actions 23 and 24 describe key elements of the overall stakeholder led methodology for the project that was both inclusive and adaptive to the priorities of stakeholders. Annex 7.5 describes in qualitative detail the way that stakeholder views were solicited and responded to, and this was supplemented with a stakeholder analysis to ensure lessons were drawn out at every stage of the project and every step of the guidelines development process (Annex 23.2) and a final evaluation (Annex 24.1). Mixed methods were applied that included, semi-structured interviews, standardized questionnaires, target specific questionnaires and interviews, journal taking (highrise), culturally adapted engagement events, participatory workshops, tasks and tutorials, reflective learning by the team and stakeholder evaluation to demonstrate project outcomes. These combined to support the dynamic response methodology, which was chosen above the consensus building model which was originally envisioned. As a result the project duration was extended, thus; more workshops were added, more country specific events were added between workshops to support the continuous engagement process, more communication channels were added including social media and more final dissemination events were added and an innovative stakeholder evaluation method added to demonstrate project outcomes. A project modification was approved mid-way through the project which included a reduced total budget. Therefore the project delivered more, at higher quality for less cost, which demonstrates a higher cost efficiency ratio than originally anticipated.

**Comparison of results against objectives**

The project evaluation (Annex B.1) clearly demonstrates that the objectives (outcomes) of the project were met. See the following summary table:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objectives**  | **Expected Result** | **Actual Results** | **Evaluation Scores** |
| **Objective 1:** By 2012, relevant marine stakeholders in the Celtic Sea have a significantly greater shared understanding of the ecosystem approach of integrated marine management. | By Dec 2012 at least 20 Key Marine stakeholders in the Celtic Sea have increased their understanding of the ecosystem approach of integrated marine management by at least 75% | In the Stakeholder Evaluation of 24 stakeholders, 43% shifted their understanding of EA to an increased level of 4 or 5, and 38% increased their understanding of the benefits of applying the EA approach. However the project did increase the confidence of 60% these stakeholders to apply elements of it, and 50% with their confidence explain elements of it and its importance to MSFD implementation12 Actions were completed under this objective. 83% of them achieved or over achieved their expected results; scoring 5,6 or 7, with 50% scoring 5 in the evaluation. | **Evaluation: 5.** This is considered a good result given the stakeholder evaluation results suggest marine stakeholders were more familiar with the concept than was assumed in the original design and therefore we were unlikely to have achieved 100% stakeholders increasing their knowledge by 75%. We have been able to demonstrate the value of the project in increasing knowledge and understanding of the EA for stakeholders as well as confidence to apply the knowledge gained. |
| **Objective 2:** By 2012, cooperation and coordination between all relevant representative marine stakeholder groups has led to the development (and Celtic Member State recognition) of agreed mechanisms for implementing the ecosystem approach in the context of EU Marine Strategy and Directive. | By Dec 2012 at least at least 20 stakeholders (including from at least 3 targeted sectors) have collaboratively developed guidelines for implementing the ecosystem approach using the 11 areas of guidance as their basis | The stakeholder analysis update shows that there were 77 stakeholders actively contributed to the Guide, 33 by participating in workshops, representing 8 sectors & 44 by revising text. From the stakeholder evaluation 92% of stakeholders felt the Guide was useful. 38% commented that the stakeholder engagement and participation element of the project was more important than the product.16 Actions were completed under this objective. 75% of them achieved or over achieved their expected results; scoring 5, 6 or 7, with 31% scoring 6 and 5. | **Evaluation: 6:** Overall the result has been very good. From the stakeholder evaluation 65% were satisfied with the efforts of the project staff to keep them involved and 26% felt that no more could have been done to by them to increase their involvement. There was over achievement as 92% of sample stakeholders felt the Guide was useful and under achievement as stakeholders felt there were sectors that were missing therefore a score took account of this variety |
| **Objective 3:** By 2012, the outcomes of the project are effectively disseminated to the wider marine community in the Celtic Sea and up-scaled to other marine sub-regions within EU maritime waters. | By Dec 2012 at least 3000 stakeholders in the Celtic Sea Marine Community are aware of the guidelines produced by PISCES and at least one other RAC knows about PICSES Guidelines | From the stakeholder evaluation 83% of target stakeholders were highly confident (level 4 and 5) about understanding the purpose of the Guide and the process that was used to develop the content. 51% more stakeholders were highly confident in understanding the Guide when compared with wider stakeholder community.17 Actions were achieved under this objective, 97% of them achieved or over achieved their expected results; scoring 5,6 or 7. With 35% scoring 7 and 29.5% scoring 6 and also 5. | **Evaluation 7:** Result was considered excellent as The project has reached 11,187 marine stakeholders of which 220 are RAC members through being informed at four different RACs, and 94% of stakeholders had a good impression of the Guide, All stakeholders felt that the Guide was useful to Marine stakeholders and policy makers. Most (88%) felt it needed no changes. |
| **Objective 4:** By 2012, the project is technically and financially managed and monitored coherently within the timeframe of the project, and stakeholders have committed to a shared strategy to ensure the project’s future sustainability | By Dec 2012 targets have been 100% achieved in at least 85% of Actions and at least 75% of target stakeholders are committed to sustaining project commitments | From the Stakeholder Evaluation 86% of target stakeholders that answered identified project commitments that target stakeholders would want to take forward and 77% of stakeholders also identified elements of the project they would want to see repeated in other similar projects.17 Actions were achieved (18th being the audit), under this objective, 88% of them achieved or over achieved their expected results; scoring 5, 6 or 7. Where 53% of them scored 5. | **Evaluation: 5:** Overall Good result as 100% of the actions have been completed, 86% (53 actions out of 62 obtain a score of 5, 6 or 7) have performed well, with 18% scoring excellent and delivering significantly more than expected. However the project is 11% underspent. In the stakeholder evaluation 69% of target stakeholders identified elements of the project that they personally expected to take forward – noting that no commitment had been made yet. |

The evaluation included an assessment of all 62 out of 63 indicator actions that relate to the Actions of this project. The evaluation scored project results against expected results and 18% of Actions achieved excellent results (score 7), 27% achieved very good results (score 6), 40% achieved good results (score 5), 13% achieved fair results (scored 4), and 2% or 1 action achieved a poor result (score 3) (note this was because although we showed the majority of stakeholders understood the topic it was not attributable to the project actions, as we showed we only significantly shifted the understanding of 8 stakeholders rather than the 20 expected). A logframe was used to monitor overall progress on these actions and to ensure the project delivered on all sub-actions supporting the 28 project actions.

PISCES identified key lessons for stakeholder engagement from the methodology applied (see Annex 24.1 for full report):

1. **Clearly explain purpose, role and** **benefits**: ensure the benefits are individually tailored to sectors so they link to their own objectives, priorities and interests and where possible help them achieve their objectives.
2. **Engage early and continuously:** not just for workshops and events, but informally to identify issues, build trust and confidence
3. **Create an open and transparent process**: share information and seek input and clearly demonstrate how stakeholder views have been taken into account
4. **Work with neutral (preferably external) facilitators:** to reduce perceived influence from partners and create a trusted process.
5. **Continue efforts to engage those who are disinterested but focus activities on those who are positive and committed**: although it is essential to keep building on engagement it should not be at the expense of the stakeholders who are willing and keen to be involved.

## 5.3 Analysis of long-term benefits

**Environmental benefits**

The ecosystem approach involves the consideration of all aspects of the ecosystem, including human activities, and is vital to delivering healthy and biodiverse seas. PISCES aimed to increase the capacity of stakeholders to apply the ecosystem approach and communicate it more widely through the process of collaboratively developing the guidelines. The extent that the stakeholders found the guidelines to be useful can be used, therefore, as a proxy for their likelihood of applying and communicating the ecosystem approach. A final evaluation survey (see Annex 24.1) showed that 92% of stakeholders surveyed found the guidelines to be useful. A total of 85% of stakeholders felt PISCES made it easier to talk about the ecosystem approach and 89% now felt more comfortable talking with others about how it fits within the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD).

The Marine Strategy Framework Directive is the environmental pillar of the EU’s integrated maritime policy and Member States are committed to maintaining or achieving Good Environmental Status in their seas by 2020. PISCES aimed to facilitate the implementation of this Directive in order to help reach the goals of healthy and sustainable seas. PISCES has demonstrated how stakeholders can add value at each step of the MSFD implementation process through assisting in monitoring, data collection, testing measures and providing social and economic evidence. PISCES stakeholders have also identified a means of facilitating stakeholder input into the policy implementation process through a regional stakeholder forum. The inclusion of stakeholders in policy implementation will result in measures being more widely accepted and implemented, thereby resulting in long-term costs savings. Ultimately this will likely lead to greater compliance with the MSFD by the sectors and activities that impact the marine environment thus resulting in the increasing the likelihood of achieving of Good Environmental Status. This is most likely in the Celtic Seas, however if PISCES results are applied in marine regions, as suggested by government stakeholders (Annex 12.3) then results will be amplified further.

Another aspect of the MSFD that PISCES focused on was the need for multi-sectoral, multi-country co-ordination at a regional level, and this was identified as a project lesson by stakeholders. This is a vital component for delivering the ecosystem approach and is required by the MSFD. Currently the mechanisms for regional coordination are at the government level and there is no forum for multi-sectoral, multi-country stakeholder engagement and coordination. Activities are not restricted to national waters therefore it is vital the sectors coordinate activities at a regional level. The stakeholder group established through PISCES developed a strong commitment to continue to collaborate and engage with other sectors at a regional level. This will facilitate implementation of the MSFD and could also facilitate implementation of the forthcoming Marine Spatial Planning Directive.

PISCES results have relevance for all marine sectors and activities in Europe. The guidelines include recommendations for sea-users and governments on implementing the ecosystem approach through the MSFD and the role they can play in policy implementation. The fact that the guidelines were developed by multi-sectoral stakeholders gives them added relevance and resonance with marine sectors. As one stakeholder pointed out, no one sector was allowed to dominate the guide development process, therefore ensuring a representative number of sea user voices were heard through the process, increasing legitimacy of the guidelines and project results.

**Long-term sustainability**

*Long-term environmental governance benefits*

PISCES has enhanced understanding of the ecosystem approach amongst stakeholders (sea-users, government representatives and others). In doing so, it has also raised the profile of marine environmental issues and/or solutions in the Celtic Sea and beyond. In turn, both are expected to improve marine governance generally, enhancing marine ecosystems and reducing conflicts between sea-users.

In all, some 11,000 people have been made aware of PISCES’ key messages. Key to this success has been the motivation of PISCES core stakeholders, who have proactively disseminated PISCES materials within their sectors (in some cases to up to 500 other individuals). Notably, this dissemination activity has bridged a number of historically hard-to-reach sectors, particularly the fishing industry (e.g. via fishery regional advisory councils).

PISCES has also provided government policy-makers with a better understanding of the potential benefits of greater stakeholder participation in implementation of marine policy, and what the expectations of stakeholders are. The UK government has pledged to develop an MSFD-specific stakeholder engagement strategy, a key PISCES recommendation. Government stakeholders also confirmed that they will draw on the PISCES guidelines when implementing the MSFD (e.g. in developing the programme of measures) and during marine planning (e.g. the UK Marine Management Organisation).

PISCES has also helped to catalyse international cooperation in the Celtic Sea, particularly via improved exchange between industry sectors (see sections below on socio-economic benefits). There is also evidence of increased exchange and discussion between national governments (UK, Ireland and France) and within government agencies (e.g. DG ENV and DG MARE) on related issues, as a result of PISCES advocacy (e.g. at trans-national meetings of OSPAR and the EC, and at the high-profile PISCES guidelines launch event in Brussels).

PISCES has also widely championed the concept of transnational multi-sector stakeholder forums, which are increasingly acknowledged as key to enabling effective collaboration at the regional seas-level. Providing a fuller “proof of concept” (and realisation of the benefits) of such forums will, however, take a number of years. Ultimately, the extent of benefits may also hinge on the way in which they themselves are governed (e.g. statutory underpinning may make them more effective).

*Long-term economic benefits*

PISCES has helped to stimulate collaboration between sea-users to identify tangible benefits from working in partnership (e.g. ways to share sea-space, avoid conflict, jointly engage in projects/initiatives etc). Follow up interviews revealed that many participants were working with new contacts and/or felt they had better relationships with existing contacts through PISCES. Stakeholders highlighted that it was now easier due to the better relationships made, where trust and knowing people better were key factors (making it easier to simply “pick up the phone”). Others felt they were given new reasons to re-engage with existing contacts. In a number of instances, commitments were made to continue new relationships in terms of specific projects / collaborations.

*Long-term social benefits*

There is evidence that PISCES has provided employment-related benefits to many individual participants. Some have found their own role at work changing as a result, both in terms of increased responsibility and extent to which others engage with them as a specialist / key contact in the field. Key factors seem to be improved confidence in communicating the ecosystem approach to others in their own sector / organisation, and simply being involved in a cutting-edge project. The sense of shared achievement amongst participants has also led to wider socio-economic benefits amongst the marine community-of-practice.

*Time-lag*

There will inevitably be a time-lag between PISCES project and the realisation of many benefits. A key “test” will be the extent to which PISCES’ recommendations are adopted by national governments during implementation of the MSFD (especially development of the Programmes of Measures). There are a variety of barriers and challenges that may affect the degree of impact here, including lack of government funds / resources for engagement (exacerbated by the economic downturn), political will, stakeholder fatigue and others.

**Replicability and innovation and demonstration value**

PISCES has a high degree of replicability to other marine regions. PISCES was specifically designed to demonstrate how stakeholders can work together and participate in EU marine policy at a multi-national scale. The results of PISCES - the recommendations in the guidelines and also the stakeholder engagement process used, can be applied to other marine regions in Europe by stakeholders and national and EU governments. Although stakeholder engagement is resource intensive, it can lead to long-term social, economic and environmental benefits as described above. Stakeholder engagement is therefore highly cost effective, as if done well the results are owned and sustained by stakeholders themselves. Barriers still remain in terms of increasing the involvement of the commercial fishing sector, however recommendations from the stakeholder analysis will be applied in the expansion of the project through future work.

**Long-term indicators of project success:**

The project goal is to improve policy and governance through developing guidance for effective engagement and delivery of the ecosystem approach, developed by key marine stakeholders and in close collaboration with governments in the Celtic Sea. The overall theory of change for the project that leads to a conservation impact could be considered as the level of multi-sector stakeholder involvement in MSFD implementation resulting in the achievement of good environmental status of the Celtic Sea. In this case, quantifiable impact indicators to be achieved within 10 years could be:

* GES status is achieved in the Celtic Sea for at least 10 of the 11 descriptors.
* Number of marine user stakeholders, from multiple sectors and multiple countries that are actively involved in marine policy implementation activities.
* Commercial fish species caught in the Celtic Sea are at sustainable yield levels

Suggested indicators for future evaluation of PISCES against the project objectives:

Objective 1:

Extent that stakeholder relationships are continued that were established through PISCES

Type/frequency of collaborative interactions resulting from PISCES contacts

Objective 2:

Extent that the recommendations in the guidelines are applied by stakeholders and the results of this application

Extent that PISCES lessons applied or referred to by other projects/stakeholders/ sectors

Objective 3:

Extent that stakeholders involved in PISCES share and disseminate the results in their networks and the extent that the Guide is cited.

Extent that policy makers implement PISCES recommendations in other marine environments

Objective 4:

Extent that PISCES stakeholders are actively involved in other projects implementing marine policies and in particular MSFD implementation in other marine regions.

The extent that PISCES stakeholders are actively promoting and implementing sector specific sustainable marine resource management measures in the Celtic Sea and other marine regions.

## **5.4 Dissemination issues**

Communication and dissemination was a vital component of PISCES that received considerable attention and development throughout the project duration. In the early phase of the project we developed a communications strategy, website and products and started to develop marine and government contacts. We reviewed, maintained and further developed our communications as the project continued with regular dissemination at events and meetings and the building up of contacts. There was a particular emphasis on outreach and dissemination in the final phase of the project (last six months). At this point we reviewed the website, attended a large number of conferences seminars and meetings, held events and disseminated our final products to a wide audience of marine stakeholders.

**This section will cover the following actions that relate to communications and dissemination activities:**

**Action 9 – website, Action 11 – communications strategy, Action 12 – government liaison, Action 13 – final communications event, Action 22 – contacts database**

### 5.4.1 Dissemination: overview per activity

**Action 9: Project Website**

**Expected results:**

* By December 2009, an interactive website is operating effectively (and in existence for 5 years after the end of the project), communicating important information about the project to the Steering Group, Advisory Group, target stakeholder groups and external audiences.
* By end September 2012, project outreach is achieved through publication of the project outputs on at least 5 external third party websites

**Overall result**

The expected results were achieved. The PISCES website was published online in May 2010 and since then content has been continually reviewed, updated and added to both the website and intranet. By the end of December 2012 the number of unique visitors had reached 10,485. All project outputs are available through the website, including the PISCES guidelines (in English, French and Spanish). Reciprocal links with five third party websites have been established.

**Activities**

*Website and intranet*

The content of the website has been reviewed regularly to keep the site fresh and dynamic and reflect the importance of this key communications tool for PISCES. Verbal positive feedback on the functionality and content of the website has been received from wider stakeholders. The total number of unique visitors to the website was 10,485, visiting an average of 3.13 pages per visit and average visit duration of 2 minutes 28 seconds (see Annex 9.1 for full website analysis). A total of 30% of all visitors returned to the PISCES website. A PISCES promotional film was produced and added to the website in May 2011 in order to create a visually engaging way of explaining the project to website visitors.

The PISCES guidelines document was finalised in October 2012 and was made available for download on the PISCES website. The layout of the website was altered in order to highlight the guidelines as the key project output. A short film was commissioned to sit on the home page which gives final thoughts on the project and its successes from a range of people involved. This film was produced at the PISCES final event in London (see Action 13) and features the celebrity Monty Halls, PISCES stakeholders and team members giving perspectives on involvement in the project.

The PISCES intranet (accessed through the website) was used as an information resource in guidelines development (Action 8) for key stakeholders. There were 208 unique visitors to the intranet with an average viewing time of 6 minutes 50 seconds. Intranet usage peaked during the guidelines development tasks (see Annex 9.2 for intranet analysis and screengrabs).

Reciprocal links were made with a number of organisations and projects: [Fundacion OEASA](http://www.fundacionoesa.es/proyectos-i%2Bd-destacados); [Future of the Atlantic Marine Environment](http://www.fameproject.eu/en/links/%29) (FAME); [MESH Atlantic](http://www.meshatlantic.eu/index.php?id=89); [INDEMARES](http://www.indemares.es/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1478%3Aseminario-tecnico-directiva-marco-sobre-la-estrategia-marina-la-participacion-como-instrumento-de-planificacion&catid=14%3Anoticias&Itemid=1&lang=en); Marine Protected Areas in the Atlantic Arc ([MAIA](http://www.maia-network.org/homepage/related_initiatives/projects_and_initiatives)); [KnowSeas](http://www.knowseas.com/links-and-data/project-links).

*Films*

The PISCES website includes all films produced during the project. The films are also on the PISCES YouTube channel which is linked from the website. The YouTube channel includes the four ‘Reflections on Change’ films (Action 7), three films of stakeholder reflections on workshops, the marine spatial planning online tutorial (Action 5), PISCES promotional film, a film about PISCES produced by Marks and Spencer’s (who provide funding to WWF-UK) and a final project wrap-up film <http://www.youtube.com/user/piscescelticsea>. The PISCES promotional film was produced to sit on the homepage of the PISCES website in order to explain the project in a simple and engaging way. It was also used by the project team at events and meetings (including project workshops) to present the project. Towards the end of the project the promotional film was moved from the website home page and replaced with the final project wrap-up film. This film was produced at the London final event (see Action 13) and presented the perspectives of various people on involvement in the project: the celebrity marine biologist Monty Halls who opened the event and was very positive about PISCES, two PISCES stakeholders, an Advisory Group member (OSPAR) and some members of the PISCES team ([www.projectpisces.eu](http://www.projectpisces.eu)).

*E-newsletters*

A total of nine e-newsletters were produced during the course of the project on a quarterly basis (see Annex 9.3). The number of people signed up to receive the newsletter grew steadily and reached 1,074 by December 2012. Stakeholders were emailed to ask whether they wanted to receive the newsletter (we did not SPAM) so this number represents those who had positively responded to that request. The e-newsletters contained project news and updates as well as a relevant story from each project country.

*Twitter*

A total of 472 tweets (the majority linking back to the website) have been published since the website went live. We now have 354 followers (mostly with marine interests) on Twitter. PISCES Twitter is listed by 9 other Twitter users (see: <http://twitter.com/projectpisces> or Annex 9.4).

*News stories and promotion*

A total of 52 project news stories and 77 marine news stories have been published on the PISCES website since May 2010 (<http://piscesproject.eu/background/news/project_news/>) (see Annex 9.5). The website URL is promoted on all email communication from the project team and is added to all PISCES publications. The e-newsletter has been designed to drive traffic to the website with all headline links relating to pages on the website. Almost 10% of all traffic to the project website since the beginning project came from email newsletters or event invitations. A reciprocal links campaign has identified 18 related projects that we have linked to on our website and have a link to PISCES on their websites. The PISCES final events were promoted on the website with information on logistics and agendas. Following the events, summaries were added to the website under news stories.

*Partners’ websites*

The project is promoted on partner/contractor websites:

WWF-ES: <http://www.wwf.es/que_hacemos/mares_y_costas/nuestrs_soluciones/areas_marinas_protegidas/proyecto_pisces/>

SeaWeb <http://www.seaweb.org/initiatives/pisces.php>

CMRC <http://cmrc.ucc.ie/pages/research_project_page.php?project_code=pisces>

The Environment Council: http://www.the-environment- council.org.uk/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=238&Itemid=330

*Information exchange*

The PISCES website is a comprehensive source of information on the ecosystem approach, marine policy and marine management. The background section of the website contains a range of information including the stakeholder engagement videos- “Reflections on Change” (Action 7). Videos on marine planning and stakeholder engagement in the Irish Sea are also viewable. The reading room holds all summary documents on the five PISCES workshops <http://piscesproject.eu/background/developing_the_guide/sharing_what_we_learnt/>.

*Stakeholder intranet*

The stakeholder intranet was accessible by key stakeholders and PISCES staff who were trained on its usage in 1:1 sessions and workshops 2 and 3 by the web producer. All project documents (in English and French) were posted on the intranet, including presentations. In order to facilitate remote development of the guidelines (Action 8), a new page was added to the intranet with the drafts and the ‘tasks’ stakeholders were set. This also included a ‘comments’ function so that stakeholders could exchange thoughts and information with each other. The online PISCES tutorials (Actions 5 and 6) were available on the intranet up until the end of December 2012 (the marine spatial planning tutorial available through the YouTube channel).

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK was responsible for developing the website style and content. Partners and country leads provided country specific news and information and provided e-newsletter stories. Partners and country leads also promoted the PISCES website through their own websites.

**Indicators used:**

* Structure, layout and access to the website agreed between stakeholders (Means of Verification: positive feedback on the website was received from stakeholders.)
* Number of visitors to the project website (Means of Verification: Usage statistics were recorded and analysed).
* Formal project documents, audio and visual material published on the website, placed subject to agreement on access rights (Means of Verification: Documents uploaded on project website)
* At least 15 links inserted on third party websites, including WWF’s own network websites (Means of Verification: Links inserted on relevant and credible third-party websites)
* Final versions of the Guidelines (combining common principles, objectives and actions on the ecosystem approach) published on at least 5 external websites (Means of Verification: Links to the online PISCES guidelines on third party websites – Fundacion OESA, FAME, MESH Atlantic, MAIA and Knowseas).

**Problems/challenges**

The user engagement on the intranet was reasonably high at particular points during the development of the guidelines but overall was quite low. It is difficult to identify why this is but could be due to the type of content, volume of content, whether the stakeholders had time to use it, whether they didn’t like having to log on every visit etc. An intranet site is now quite an ‘old fashioned’ mechanism compared to the social alternatives. For future projects we would recommend consideration of tools such as LinkedIn and Google+, which is becoming increasingly powerful as it can connect members to each other and the project, as well as manage documents, handle video conferencing and aggregate news items.

**Action 10: Launch Event and Media related activities**

**Expected results**

* A project launch event is held by May 2010 which raises awareness of the project to direct target groups, and relevant government decision-makers and the media across the target countries (France, Spain, Ireland and the UK)

**Overall result and activities**

The expected result was achieved. A total of 282 were invited to the launch event and of those 70 accepted the invitation and a total of 55 people attended the event. Please see Annex 10.1 for the list of attendees and Annex 10.2 for details of the 282 people who were contacted and invited. The launch event was held on the first evening of the first PISCES workshop but was a separate event, though most of those who attended the workshop also attended the launch event. Press releases were sent to media outlets along with an invitation to the event (see Annex 10.3). The producer of the BBC programme ‘Coast’ attended the event and made a short presentation. Professor Callum Roberts (University of York and author) made the keynote address at the event.

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK was responsible for organising the launch event. Partners and country leads identified suitable stakeholders to invite and provided input into the event programme.

**Indicators**

* At least 40 participants (including press) attend the project launch event (Means of verification: invitation and attendee lists)

**Problems/challenges**

It proved challenging to get much interest in PISCES at this very early stage of the project. We held the launch event on the evening of the workshop in order to maximise attendance and minimise travel costs.

**Action 11: Implementing the communication strategy**

**Expected results**

* 750 marine stakeholders have increased awareness of the project through presentations at other marine conferences
* 300 contacts of EU wide marine organisations such as OSPAR, UNESCO, RACs and Sea Users associations have increased awareness of the project through presentations at seminars and conferences
* At least 10 media outlets are contacted to promote the project annually, across each of the target countries (Spain, France, UK and Ireland).
* At least one event/activity to raise awareness of PISCES is delivered per year.

**Overall result**

The PISCES team of partners and country leads have presented at a total of 142 conferences, events and meetings to a total estimated audience of 11,172 people, greatly exceeding the expected result of 750 marine stakeholders. Within this number, 34 presentations were made at OSPAR, European Commission, RACs and industry association events to a total audience of 2,041 people, again exceeding the target of 300 EU marine organisation contacts. A total of 17 press releases were sent out to 130 media outlets in the project countries, exceeding the target of 10 media outlets. Awareness raising activities included promotion of workshops, conference presentations, final events, news stories, and greatly exceeded one per year.

**Activities**

A communications strategy was developed that set out key targets, roles and responsibilities for the project team (see Annex 11.1). To sit alongside the strategy we developed a detailed workplan for the partners and subcontractors (see Annex 11.2). The workplan set out the specific duties and deadlines required of each partner and sub-contractor throughout the duration of the project. It set out the key deliverables which were centrally coordinated by WWF-UK.

*Conferences and events*

An outreach diary was centrally managed by WWF-UK with partner input on shared a Google docs site. A total of 11,172 people have heard about PISCES at these events. Presentations were given and materials were shared with participants. The breakdown of outreach in different countries is: UK: 2,396 France: 745 Spain: 1,121 Ireland: 1,887 Europe: 2,870, International: 2,081 (see Annex 11.3). The country origin of the audience was based on the scope of the event, e.g. if the event was targeting a European audience it was recorded under Europe rather than the country where the event was held.

*Promotions and media coverage*

There have been a total of 13 PISCES news releases disseminated in multiple languages to promote the launch of the project, workshops, final events and other project news stories (see Annex 11.4). Press releases were sent to 130 media outlets in total (36 in France, 44 in UK, 22 in Ireland and 28 in Spain) (Annex 11.5).

Twelve messages were sent internally to WWF-UK staff using the organisation’s intranet ‘Arena’ (~300 people) (see Annex 11.6). In WWF Spain a news about the PISCES workshop in Madrid appeared in the summer 2012 issue of the Panda magazine (WWF publication) with 28,000 copies printed and distributed among membership and stakeholders (government, private companies, NGOs, etc.).

The Western Mail newspaper included a story on PISCES in September 2009 (see Annex 11.7 news stories). A full page advert for PISCES was included in Welsh Coast Magazine in May 2011 (see Annex 11.8). A radio programme called [Country Focus](http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b01m7syb) on BBC Radio Wales featured PISCES on 26 August 2012 with interviews from the PISCES Project Manager and two PISCES stakeholders, who both made positive comments about the project.

The press release regarding the final event in Madrid (see Action 13) resulted in attendance at the event by four journalist and coverage in 6 online news/blog articles, including on the El Pais website (Spain’s national newspaper). WWF Spain also included a story on the event on their website (see Annex 13.2 for event and media summary).

Following the event in London to launch the PISCES guidelines, two news stories appeared in national press: the Western Mail and the Mail Online (see Annex 11.7). The Mail Online is the online version of the Daily Mail newspaper and is the second most viewed English language newspaper website in the world (after the New York Times). The Mail Online article was written by Monty Halls, the celebrity marine biologist who opened the PISCES event. Monty Halls also included the PISCES event information on his [website](http://www.montyhalls.co.uk/monty-halls-news/pisces-event-7th-november-london) and [tweeted](https://twitter.com/MontyHalls) about the event in the lead up (Monty has 8,939 followers on twitter).

After the PISCES final event in Brussels the DG MARE website ([here](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/mare/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=9176&subweb=342&lang=en)) included a piece on PISCES, as a result of attendance at the event by representatives of DG MARE (see Action 13). The website ‘fishnews.eu’ included a piece on the PISCES event and launch of the guidelines.

In February 2013 a two-page article on PISCES was published in the most important environmental magazine national wide in Spain (named *Quercus* – see Annex 11.9). The link to the PISCES project web page to download the guidelines was included in the article. This magazine has a circulation of 12,000 copies per month. In Ireland an article on PISCES was included in the publication ‘Inshore Ireland’ (see Annex 11.10), the leading publication for marine issues with a readership of approximately 2,000. The article was included in the December 2012/January 2013 edition and was online from February 2013.

*Products and promotional material*

A project description “All about PISCES” was developed which was downloadable from the website and was used to communicate the project to ‘new’ stakeholders (Annex 11.11). It was translated into French and Spanish (Annex 17). A briefing sheet on communications outreach was developed for stakeholders in English and French (see Annex 11.12). The project team disseminated approximately 2,200 original PISCES leaflets at events and 800 postcards (see copies enclosed and Annex 11.13). A cartoon style booklet introducing Marine Spatial Planning in the Celtic Sea was produced and available on the website. This supports the MSP tutorial (Actions 5&6) (See Annex 11.14). A display board was produced and displayed in Cardiff Bay (Annex 11.15). In order to promote the PISCES guidelines, new leaflets were developed in 2012 in English (2,000), French (1,000) and Spanish (1,000) (see Annex 11.16). A total of 3,500 leaflets were distributed at events and meetings. Conference posters were developed for UK, France, Ireland and Spain (see Annex 11.17) in the final outreach phase to communicate the guidelines. The posters were presented at 5 different conferences (2 in France, 1 in UK, 1 in Ireland and 1 in Spain).

*Stakeholder communications mapping*

During the project we have worked with stakeholders to understand the communications channels within their sectors: the trade magazines and newsletters they use and read, the annual meetings they attend and the websites and online forums they promote their organisation through. We also considered how many have a national body or central trade association their organisation belongs to, which is specific to their sector. We gained information on the government connections and contact with other sectors each organisation holds to help understand the best way of disseminating the PISCES guidelines via our stakeholders (see Annex 11.18). Of the 14 stakeholders interviewed representing 10 sectors, 6 organisations were linked with national representative bodies /trade associations. Each sector has a number of communications tools they use and read such as trade magazines, newsletters and websites which they recommended for helping to disseminate PISCES messages and the guidelines.

**Who was responsible**

WWF-UK was responsible for the delivery of this action. The Communications Officer led on the action, coordinating the input of partners and country leads. All team members had a role in communications ensuring that the project reached the widest audience possible and assisted in development of press releases, materials, and identified media opportunities.

**Indicators**

* By December 2009, a detailed communications strategy to facilitate project outreach is developed, including a media communication plan (**Means of Verification:** Communications Strategy and workplan developed).
* In the first year of the project, promotional materials are developed (**Means of Verification:** 3 pop-up banners, 2,200 leaflets and 800 postcards).
* By December 2011, publications are developed to enable stakeholders to promote PISCES within their sectors (**Means of verification**: communicating PISCES briefing produced).
* By December 2011, communications map/plan is produced for different sectors (**Means of verification**: sectoral interviews completed for 14 stakeholders demonstrating communications channels).
* By August 2012, a PISCES brochure is produced to promote the project and final guidelines (**Means of verification:** production and distribution of guidelines leaflet)
* By December 2012, all elements set out in the communications strategy have been followed and delivered (**Means of verification**: final report).
* At least 30 individual media outlets in each of the target countries are contacted and relationships established to promote the project annually (Means of verification: press releases distributed to 130 contacts).

**Problems/challenges**

The Communications Officer role was increased from part-time to full-time in November 2010. Due to maternity leave, a changeover of personnel in the Communications Officer took place at end of March 2011 and then again at the end of August 2012. A contractor was appointed on a service contract for the final four months of the project.

**Action 12: Government decision makers**

**Expected results**

* By end September 2009, a mutually beneficial, effective two-way dialogue between project stakeholders and targeted government officials is facilitated, resulting in government support for application of the Guidelines to implement the EU Marine strategy using the ecosystem approach

**Overall result**

The expected result was achieved and a two-way dialogue with government officials was facilitated. It was essential to the success of the project that it worked closely with government throughout. Government is a key target audience for the guidelines, as many of the recommendations it contains relate to actions by government agencies (national, regional, European). The development of strong working-relationships with government has enabled PISCES to:

* Raise awareness of PISCES’ aims/objectives and its relevance to government.
* Explore key governance issues of relevance to, for example, the Celtic Sea, policy implementation (e.g. MSFD) and the ecosystem approach (particularly challenges for government), to feed back in to guide development.
* Secure government input to the guidelines drafting process (mainly review of final draft).
* Identify opportunities to promote the guidelines, including final launch-related events.
* Generate government interest in applying / implementing the PISCES guidelines and recommendations.

**Activities**

* An **advocacy work plan** (see Annex 12.1) was developed for each partner and subcontractor that identified: objectives, activities, deadlines and responsibilities. These were regularly updated, and served to help with monitoring of progress.
* **Meetings with government** Meetings were held with carefully targeted local, sub-national, national, regional and EC government representatives (particularly those involved in the MSFD implementation, but also other policy areas) (see Annex 11.3 - outreach diary). In the various meetings we have discussed the PISCES project, its aims and objectives and have discussed the role and potential benefits of the project for policy implementation. We have identified the key steps and drivers for government policy formation and have integrated this into the PISCES project to ensure effectiveness and influence. We have supplied all relevant PISCES documents including promotional materials and more in-depth project documents.
	+ WWF-UK held six meetings with UK Government (Defra and the Marine Management Organisation) and Welsh Government.
	+ WWF Spain has attended three meeting with the Spanish Government: two with the team leading on the MSFD (Division for the Protection of the Sea) and one with the Sub-director of Control and Inspection of Fisheries, both at the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment (MAGRAMA).
	+ CMRC has held two meetings with Irish Government officials based in the Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government (DECLG).
	+ SeaWeb met three times with French Government representatives (MEDDTL).
	+ **Attendance of government at PISCES stakeholder events.** A range of government representatives have attended the PISCES workshops held during the course of the project (see Action 8), including, for example:
		- 3rd workshop: staff from DG ENV (EC), the team leading MSFD implementation in the UK (Defra), the Welsh statutory agency CCW (Countryside Council for Wales) and the Irish Government (DECLG);
		- 4th workshop: staff from Natural England and the Irish Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); and
		- 5th workshop: staff from the Division for the Protection of the Sea (Spanish Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment), one who gave a presentation, and the CEO of the State agency responsible for developing the seafish and aquaculture industries in Ireland.

Government attendees have given presentations on relevant topics/issues (e.g. progress in national implementation of the MSFD), joined in workshops discussions and activities, and met with stakeholders.

* **Attendance of PISCES team at government meetings / events.** PISCES has taken the opportunity to attend and present at a range of government organised meetings and events, providing an effective way of making contact with relevant government decision-makers. Events have included included: meetings of the OSPAR Commission (e.g. EIHA, ICG-MSP and ICG\_MSFD), the EC (MSCG), a joint HELCOM/VASAB, OSPAR and ICES workshop, and discussion of PISCES at national government meetings/forums (e.g. the UK MSFD stakeholder group). PISCES has also presented at various meetings of the fisheries Regional Advisory Councils (RACs), including the (North-west Waters RAC and South-west Waters RAC).
* **Presentations by PISCES team and stakeholders at public conferences attended by government.** Presentations about PISCES and the guide have been given at a wide range of conferences in the UK, France, Ireland and Spain, and elsewhere (including Estonia, Italy, Belgium, Denmark, Netherlands and elsewhere – see Annex 11.3 outreach diary). These events were typically well attended by government, as well as other stakeholders. A number of these events were specifically co-organised or sponsored by government, including for example:
	+ ‘Oceans of Potential’ conference in Plymouth in 2012 co-organised by the UK’s Marine Management Organisation;
	+ ‘Marine Strategy 2012’ co-organised by ICES in Copenhagen in May 2012;
	+ MARMONI project event on MSFD implementation in Tallinn in November 2012, attended by representatives of marine regulatory bodies from Estonia, Finland, Sweden, Lithuania, and Latvia;
	+ Atlantic Forum workshop promoted by DG MARE in Bilbao in November 2012;
	+ 3rd European Maritime Day Stakeholder Conference in Gijón in May 2011 (organized by the EC).
	+ ‘Littoral 2012’, a major European coastal/marine which was well attended by EC and national governments.
* **Direct inputs to the guide from government representatives.** In addition to the numerous informal discussions with government which helped to inform the development of the guide, ~10 government staff from the UK, Ireland, France and Spain provided specific written comments on earlier drafts.
* **PISCES launch-related events.** PISCES organized a programme of launch-related events to coincide with completion of the final guide which were well attended by governments (see Action 13). A key aim of these events was to target relevant government representatives in the UK, France, Ireland and Spain.

Key events included:

* + UK government technical seminar for Defra, Welsh government technical seminar in Cardiff in Dec 2012, attended by ~20 staff from the Welsh Government, Environment Agency Wales, Countryside Council for Wales and others.
	+ Spanish national technical seminar (on the MSFD: Participation as a planning tool), held in Madrid in September 2012, hosted by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment and attended by 39 government staff from 114 (39%), from Environment departments (MAGRAMA, but also other statutory bodies such as Fundación Biodiversidad, Fundación CETMAR, IEO and some local governments), the fisheries departments (MAGRAMA and local government) and also from the Public Works Ministry.
	+ Guide launch events in London and Brussels, at which keynote speeches were given by Defra and DG MARE respectively. Both events were well attended by government, including Member State governments and the EC (~30 in total).
* **Dissemination of PISCES guidelines to other government representatives.** Finally, the PISCES guide has been circulated to a wide range of government staff across the region. In the UK and Ireland, all relevant government bodies have received a copy. In Spain, copies were sent to ~70 staff in national and local government and other statutory agencies. Copies have also been provided to the EC and national government agencies in Northern Ireland, Portugal and elsewhere.

Recognition by government agencies (national and international) has been shown in a number of other ways including:

* Summary of the PISCES project in lists / databases of research projects (e.g. a DG ENV database of research projects related to the MSFD, a catalogue of European-funded maritime projects produced by the EC).
* Reference to PISCES in OSPAR meeting documents.
* PISCES presentation on Defra intranet (accessible by Marine Programme Team staff).
* Links to PISCES guide launch events on DG MARE website.
* Endorsement of the guide (and its recommendations) by many government representatives.
* The Spanish State Secretary for the Environment (MAGRAMA), Mr. Federico Ramos de Armas, signed a presentation letter to accompany the Spanish PISCES guide. In addition, he recognised the PISCES project during the opening of the Technical seminar of September 2012. A further seven MAGRAMA representatives expressed their interest in the guidelines.
* PISCES referenced by stakeholders in UK Parliamentary and Welsh Assembly evidence sessions (Annex 12.2).

It is too early to conclude about the longer term impacts of PISCES, including the extent to which governments implement the recommendations in the guide. However, signs are encouraging. For example, in the UK there has already been a strong indication that a stakeholder engagement strategy will be developed to inform the remainder of the MSFD implementation process. The Spanish Government are also keen to apply the recommendations to stakeholder engagement and development of marine strategies in Spain. Final interviews of five government stakeholders indicated recognition of the value of bringing stakeholders together across sectors to work together and four of the five stakeholders said they would use the guidelines and its recommendations (see Annex 12.3 government interviews collation).

**Indicators**

* 30 government officials have an increased awareness of stakeholder solutions to applying integrated management techniques of the marine environment in the Celtic sea region (**Means of Verification:** outreach diary lists the meetings attended with 339 government stakeholders and final evaluation survey indicate that 90% believe the guidelines to be useful).
* At least 50% of above government officials indicate their official recognition of the Guidelines (**Means of Verification:** Inclusion of the guidelines on DG MARE website and NWWRAC communication, PISCES mentioned in UK Parliament and Welsh Government evidence sessions by PISCES stakeholders, reference to PISCES in OSPAR meetings, support for the project by Spanish Government evidenced by joint final event)

**Problems/challenges**

Reduced capacity within government departments affected the extent to which they were able to engage in PISCES. Following the economic downturn, many government agencies placed a travel ban on staff members which increased the difficulty of securing government attendance at PISCES workshops. We held our workshops in each of the five project countries in order to help overcome this issue.

**Action 13: Final Communications Event**

**Expected results**

* At least 80 stakeholders (including national and EC government officials, direct and indirect target groups, and media) attend a final project event (by December 2011) to promote the project results

**Overall result**

The expected result was achieved through a comprehensive programme of final communications activities. Three final communications events were held as part of a phase of outreach and dissemination of project outputs in the final six months of the project. The events were supported by high profile government officials and celebrities and were well attended by governments and industry stakeholders. The events were complemented by a programme of outreach and dissemination at conferences, seminars, meetings and events.

**Activities**

We identified that in order to reach as wide an audience as possible and communicate and disseminate the project outputs to our target 3,000 wider stakeholders, a single final event would not be sufficient. A single event in any one project country would be likely to limit attendance from other countries as well as European level industry associations and government decision makers. We identified our key audiences as national level government representatives in project countries, European government representatives, national and European industry stakeholders and associations (Annex 13.1). We determined that the best approach to reaching our audiences was to develop an approach in each project country and hold one overarching event in Brussels for European audiences.

*PISCES events*

In September 2012, a PISCES technical seminar was held in Madrid in conjunction with the Spanish Government. The seminar was a full day event attended by 87 people from a range of sectors. The seminar was opened by the Secretary of State for the environment and the head of WWF Spain. This high-level and well-attended seminar explored issues surrounding MSFD implementation and stakeholder participation for the first time in Spain (Annex 13.2).

A PISCES event was held in London on 7th November to launch the guidelines to the UK government and marine industry stakeholders. The event was held in the early evening and in close proximity to Westminster in order to attract attendance from UK government representatives. We secured an opening address from Monty Halls – a TV presenter and marine biologist. We secured additional presentations from the head of the marine unit of DEFRA, the outgoing secretariat for the OSPAR Commission and two representatives from the PISCES stakeholder group. The ability to secure high profile presenters helped to increase attendance at the event. In total, 55 people attended the event.

Another PISCES event was held in Brussels following a similar format to the London event. The keynote speaker was Lowri Evans, Deputy Commissioner for DG MARE. We also had Bud Ehler (consultant and author of the UNESCO guide on Marine Spatial Planning) and two PISCES stakeholders from the UK and from Ireland. A French PISCES stakeholder was due to attend but had to cancel at the last minute. The event was timed to coincide with a meeting of the Marine Strategy Coordination Group, which proved to be a successful tactic as there was high attendance at the event from the meeting, which included representatives from all EU countries who work on MSFD implementation. A total of 41 people attended the event.

In France and Ireland it was felt that the most appropriate way to target the audiences there was through a series of outreach meetings and attendance and presentations at conferences and workshops. The Irish government did not express an interest in being involved in an event at this time. It is currently trying to identify capacity to deliver the MSFD. There was interest from the Marine Institute in Galway but lack of government support for an event meant it was not possible. The French government felt that the timing was not appropriate given their commitment to hold MSFD workshops in France. Instead the Irish and French country leads were involved in an extensive outreach programme through conferences, seminars and workshops (see below).

*Conferences, seminars and workshops*

During the outreach and dissemination phase, the PISCES team increased efforts to secure presentations of the project and the guidelines at a total of 27 conferences and meetings to a total estimated audience of 2,096. PISCES presentations were accepted at a number of high profile conferences through approval of a submitted abstract (e.g. ECCB, Littoral, Land-Ocean Connectivity, CAMIS and MARMONI).

**Indicators**

* 200 invitations sent to potential participants of the final communications event (Means of verification: invitations sent to >600 contacts, attendee lists for Madrid, London and Brussels events show total attendance of 183).

**Problems/challenges**

It was challenging to identify an approach to event development that would maximise attendance from our target audiences. Project events in Brussels are reasonably frequent and can therefore suffer from low attendance. In order to address this we consulted our WWF colleagues in our European Policy Office for advice and made efforts to secure a high profile key note speaker – Lowri Evans.

**Action 22: Contacts database**

**Expected results**

* By year 3 of the project, a database of at least 3,000 marine stakeholders is developed and updated in order to support the dissemination and outreach activities.

**Overall result**

The expected result of 3,000 stakeholders on the database was not achieved. However, this target was to facilitate outreach to wider stakeholders and despite the lower than anticipated number of contacts dissemination and outreach activities reached a combined audience of 11,172. The contacts database contains the contact details for 1,400 stakeholders. It was not possible to include all people who heard about PISCES on the database as we did not want to add names without their express permission. There was also a turnover of contacts and we kept the database constantly updated with changes.

The contacts needed to be strategically gathered to ensure a comprehensive spread across the target stakeholder groups as identified in the communications strategy. An assumption in the original planning proposal was that direct target groups would input from their own contacts into the database. This direct input was not possible due to the Data Protection Act.

**Activities**

We have reached over 1,400 contacts on the Highrise contacts database through outreach activities and promotional work. The contacts database underpinned all outreach and communications initiatives for the project, and was, therefore, a vital tool for delivering the project. The contacts database also contains the exchanges we have had with individuals and any notes about interactions. There has been quite a large turnover of contacts and we continually assess and remove out of date contacts. We have lost 200 individual contacts due to changes in positions and old addresses expiring. A mailing list subscription was set up on the PISCES website to capture new stakeholder contacts and sign-ups to the PISCES newsletter. We have only added contacts that have explicitly stated that they are interested in PISCES. We previously identified that we were unlikely to increase the numbers of contacts beyond 2,000 by the end of the project but through our outreach and dissemination work we ensured that we reached (and exceeded) our target of 3,000 marine stakeholders being made aware of PISCES (see Annex 22.1 for full contacts list).

**Indicators**

* By year 1 of the project the project database includes 1,000 marine stakeholders
* By year 2 of the project the project database includes 2,000 marine stakeholders (**Means of Verification:** project contacts database contains 1,700 names)

**Problems/challenges**

We did not achieve the target of 3,000 stakeholders on the contacts database as predicted in earlier reports. This was due to the fact that we only added contact details for people who agreed to have them added to our database and because there was a turnover of contacts. The target of 3,000 was identified in order to be able to disseminate PISCES outputs to this number of contacts. Although we did not reach 3,000 contacts on the database we disseminated the PISCES outputs through other means (presentations at workshops and events) to more than 11,000 stakeholders.

**The Layman’s Report and AfterLIFE Communications Plan can be found on the PISCES website.**

1. Also referred to as ‘core stakeholders’ in PISCES documents. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)