



Stakeholder Workshop on Offshore Energy and MSP in the Baltic Sea

12-13 November 2013, Hotel Meridien Vilnius, Lithuania
Hosted by Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency (BSH)

Author of the report: Bettina Käppeler

Goals of the workshop:

Introduce

- MSP Principles
- Baltic Vision of the use of marine space

Get overview on

- Offshore Energy Activities on pan-Baltic scale,
- interests of offshore wind sector, objectives, priorities etc.
- perception of prospects/problems, synergies/conflicts with other interests/activities
- attitude of stakeholders towards MSP (“hopes, fears”) etc.,

Identify

- the scope/range of MSP tools potentially available

Discuss

- importance of addressing Offshore Energy Planning on a transnational level

Participants:

In total 21 persons participated in the workshop, representing following institutions and companies:

BSR:

Denmark	Green Center
Estonia	Nelja Energia AS
Germany	Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency (BSH); sustainable projects GmbH; 50Hertz transmission GmbH;
Latvia	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development; Baltic Environmental Forum Latvia (BEF)
Lithuania	Lithuanian Energy Institute; CORPI Klaipeda University; Lithuanian Energy Institute; LTD Atkulos Projektai;
Poland	Maritime Office Szczecin; Maritime Institute Gdansk; Polish Offshore Wind Energy Society;
Sweden	WPD Sweden; National Board of Housing, Building and Planning (Boverkett); Region Skane

Outside BSR:

Norway	Institute of Marine Research
United Kingdom	Marine Scotland – Scottish Government



Thereof

Offshore Energy Industry	5
Research	9
Administration	7
Other	3
	24
(Maritime Spatial Planner	6)

Brief information on what was presented at the workshop

(all presentations available as PDF-documents on PSP-website:

<http://www.partiseapate.eu/dialogue/workshop-offshore-wind-energy/>

1. **Angela Schultz-Zehden**, s.Pro / project management PartiSEApate, introduced the Baltic Vision on the Use of Marine Space , and Offshore Energy and Grid as a main common transnational concern and planning issue. She also informed on the outcomes of a study on Blue Growth, Maritime Policy and the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region, referring to Offshore Wind Energy as the Marine Economic Activity with the highest growth.
2. **Bettina Käppeler**, BSH, summarized the consideration of offshore energy within the EU strategy for the Baltic Sea Region, some results from the BASREC study assessing the conditions for deployment of Wind Power in the BSR – and activities of ENTSO-E with regard to the perspective of a Pan-Baltic Offshore Energy Grid.
3. **Bettina Käppeler** also gave an overview on Offshore Wind Energy in German Maritime Spatial Planning, the regulations and designations in the German MSPs for the EEZ and territorial sea, and the steering effects achieved therewith to date.
4. **Anna Hunke**, BSH, presented the newly introduced Offshore Grid Planning for the German EEZ – and a more detailed look into the German and Danish project Combined Grid Solution for the Kriegers Flak area.
5. **Mariusz Witonski**, Polish Offshore Wind Energy Society explained the prospects and development scenario for OWE in Poland, including the vision of a Baltic offshore grid concept.
6. **Cecilie Kvamme**, Marine Research Institute Bergen, illustrated the Norwegian approach to Strategic Environmental Assessment , interest conflicts and further feasibility criteria for potential Offshore wind power sites within the Havvind project.
7. **Nerijus Blazauskas**, CORPI, Klaipeda University, gave insight into the process of searching for suitable areas for OWE incl. grid connections to shore in the course of the Lithuanian MSP process, taking into account also regional and cross-border issues with neighbouring states
8. **Andronikos Kafas**, Marine Scotland, lay out the process of sectoral marine planning for renewable energy from offshore production - wind, wave and tidal – in Scotland, with additional focus on on-going research for closing knowledge gaps in decision making.
9. **Hans Ohlsson**, wpd Sweden, analysed the potentials of offshore wind energy production from the economical perspective, and gave insight into the project development for the Storgrundet OWF, and the related grid connection planning.
10. **Pia Bro Christensen**, Green Center Lolland, highlighted the potential combination of offshore activities – showing how e.g. algae cultivation could be linked to Offshore Wind Farms, which had been tested on a small scale in the Danish OWF Rødsand 2.



Session 1: Offshore Energy from a Pan-Baltic Perspective

Guiding Question:

- Pan-Baltic Comprehensive Offshore Energy Planning – A Vision that may become reality?

Session 2: Planning for Offshore Energy and Energy Grids – Experience from national and trans-boundary Approaches

Guiding questions:

- How can MSP activities support and steer the spatial development of offshore wind energy in the Baltic Sea Region ?
- How could the sector get more involved in maritime spatial planning in the BSR ?
- Which kind of increased co-operation and communication may be needed and useful ?
- Do we need new platforms or fora ?

Session 3: Spatial Criteria and Requirements for Offshore Energy and the Role of Maritime Spatial Planning

Guiding questions:

- Which spatial interests and priorities does the Offshore Energy Sector have in the Baltic Sea Region ?
- Which are the main impacts, conflicts and synergies with other activities within the Baltic Sea Region ?
- Which might be common criteria for assessment of suitability of space for offshore energy ?

Discussion after session 1:

Discussion on the vision of a Pan-Baltic Offshore Energy Planning focused mainly on obstacles that would hinder such a joint approach for cooperation and identifying / developing best suited areas for production of offshore energy. Participants mentioned that countries are not ready for Pan-Baltic energy planning, since national interests still prevail, with singular national policies, targets and regulatory systems, e.g. in Germany or Poland. The historic development of energy production and regional markets, the lack of connectivity of regional markets but also of infrastructure (grids) makes it presently unlikely that there will be short term agreement on a more comprehensive Baltic offshore energy strategy. The energy markets, and also the policy how offshore energy is being subsidised, thus giving incentives for its development, are set up very differently. E.g. whereas in Germany the consumers have to pay for higher feed-in-tariffs, it is the tax payer in Denmark. Thus the question is how to overcome these obstacles, how to develop a real Pan-Baltic energy market, with equal / coordinated prices systems, overcoming different economic systems, trade energy multidirectional, and meet economic and technical conditions needed. A potential mismatch between negative impacts and benefits from offshore energy should be avoided. Technical aspects as well as investors' interests have to be taken into account.

A Baltic offshore grid was mentioned as a potential "backbone to spatial planning", and the intergovernmental approach of the North Sea Countries Grid Initiative (NSCOGI) was seen as a role model for developing such a grid for the Baltic Sea. High level co-operation on this issue should be supported, a budget for co-operation was considered indispensable, and EU financial support for the development of the grid claimed.



Part-financed by the European Union
(European Regional Development Fund)



Discussion after session 2:

Strengthening of co-operation and communication was called for on various levels (national, transnational) and between various groups of stakeholders. Whereas policy should set priorities for the sector, including the EU level, a stronger co-operation in the Baltic was asked for from existing associations such as ENTSO-E and with regard to the Baltic Sea TYNDP. MSP in general was acknowledged by participants as an important instrument to prepare ground, identify problems and gaps, set priorities, and support the co-existence of activities, as well as facilitate communication between different groups of stakeholders. The HELCOM/Vasab MSP WG could be a platform to communicate the interests of the sector on a Pan-Baltic level.

The participants stressed communication should be very direct and as low level and .individual as needed – “people meeting people”. They proposed transnational meetings, round table discussions, but also cross-sectoral meetings, and ad-hoc working groups addressing concrete tasks. Visualisation of interests would be very helpful to push politics and influence policies. MSP was seen as a means to prepare ground for a more comprehensive offshore energy development in the Baltic Sea. Thus transmission system operators (TSO) and Offshore Wind-Investors should participate in MSP processes.

Since this development would be in need of drivers MSP could facilitate discussion, provide information on what is going on from others stakeholders input, reveal gaps and problems, and try to integrate and find consensus between different sectors’ interests. By trying to avoid or solve spatial conflicts MSP should contribute to find and secure cheapest, safest and best efficient location for wind farms, cables but also pipelines, taking into consideration also the inland grid system and coastal integration in general.

Discussion after session 3:

Main criterion for Offshore Energy production and related infrastructure – such as the transmission grid - was safety, and the mitigation of conflicts, along with securing connectivity to projects onshore. Where at the moment individual interests of investors might prevail, there should be long term achievements such as a an integrated grid, a joint Baltic market – which might support a more open search for location opportunities with regard to available space, costs, supra-national infrastructure etc. Site decisions should always be based on factual data and inventories, with industry consulted, with planning and investigations conducted in a coordinated manner, and common conclusions regarding effects. A pragmatic flexible approach should safeguard that technology developments are being accounted for, since they “will affect the choices of places in ways we cannot define today” (Hans Ohlsson).

Main conflicts were seen with interests of maritime transport, aggregates extraction (incl. future perspectives of extraction of shale gas, e.g. in Polish waters), but also military training areas, the extent and use of which sometimes are not known in sufficient detail. Other than navigation fishery was not acknowledged as a major competing industry – since there has been some experience with agreements on financial compensation in case of exclusion of fishery within offshore wind farm areas. Nature protection issues were also not seen as a major field of conflict, there seems to be more and more knowledge about valuable areas and the sector complying with general restrictions such as exclusion of offshore wind farm development in territorial waters.



Synergies were mainly named from a coastal economic perspective: local tourism could be stimulated, e.g. by offering boat trips to OWF, though the issue of potential visual impact was also raised. Energy intensive industry close to shore could benefit, along with ship building industries. Offshore energy developments potentially contributing to coastal protection was a new aspect, which could be challenged. Other potential synergies, such as biomass production within wind farms was assessed as a future solution, and not as something to be implemented on large scale short term.

As one concrete claim when it comes to MSP spatial designations, safety buffers on both sides of cables and pipelines to prevent damage from not complying activities were named.

Overall Conclusions / Key findings:

Status Quo:

- A real Pan-Baltic cooperation – between political as well as economic sectors - with regard to coordinated offshore energy and grid development is not in place
- Missing national targets and strategies, different national interests, regulatory systems etc. are hindering a more integrated transboundary/transnational approach
- In many cases national MSP developments are being driven by offshore energy, supported by national targets and regulative systems

Conflicts and Synergies

- Main conflicts identified as military sea use, navigation routes, extraction of mineral resources (incl. e.g. shale gas), necessary buffers towards cables, pipelines etc.
- Minor conflicts: protected areas, fisheries (if compensation schemes are in place), negative visual impacts.
- Main synergies identified: offshore: biomass production, coastal development (local tourism, coastal protection), industrial development (nearby energy-intensive industry , ship-building industry resp. supply chain in general).

Perspective / Recommendations

- Multi-level co-operation on national and on a regional / Pan-Baltic scale is needed to develop common goals, objectives and best solutions for common interest issues such as development of a Baltic offshore grid etc.
- Communication and a range of suitable discussion and working bodies are vital for coming to terms with other stakeholders from the same sector and from other sectors.
- MSP can serve as a tool / process to prepare ground and accelerate Offshore Energy development.
- A Pan-Baltic offshore grid could serve as backbone to more refined MSP regulations



Part-financed by the European Union
(European Regional Development Fund)



- The North Sea Countries Grid Initiative (NSCOGI) is seen as role model for high level cooperation on the issue
- MSP should aim at achieving integrated procedures with terrestrial/territorial planning with regard to planning for grid connections etc.
- MSP / project planning should be based on very good factual data and inventories, environmental information as long as take into account technical development and potential solutions