

Wadden Sea Board

WSB 2
7 October 2010
Wilhelmshaven



| | |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| Agenda Item: | 8 |
| Subject: | Evaluation WSF |
| Document No. | WSB 2/8/1 |
| Date: | 15 September 2010 |
| Submitted by: | Germany |

Attached is the outcome of the evaluation of the questionnaires for the Wadden Sea Forum evaluation by Germany, also on behalf of the Danish delegation.

Proposal

The meeting is **proposed** to discuss the document.

Results of the

Evaluation Questionnaire

The Memorandum of Understanding
between
the Wadden Sea Forum and the Trilateral Wadden Sea Cooperation

Summary and Evaluation for WSB II (October 7th, 2010)

The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Wadden Sea Forum (WSF) and the Trilateral Wadden Sea Cooperation (TWSC) is valid for the period 2008-10. The MoU is a working arrangement between the two partners including a work programme covering the main issues of collaboration and fields of activity of the WSF, such as sustainability indicators, ICZM, shipping, fisheries, tourism. For the purpose of the MoU, the WSF should e.g. serve as an independent trilateral advisory and consultation body to the TWSC. The MoU formulates mutual responsibilities regarding two-way representation in the respective fora and bodies as well as facilitation and financing. It is also stated that the MoU 2008-10 and the corresponding arrangements are to be evaluated by the end of the period. (The MoU is published under www.waddensea-forum.org/foundations.html). The answers to this questionnaire are the basis for an internal evaluation between the two cooperations and the basis for the draft of new Memorandum of Understanding between WSF and TWSC.

Overall statistics:

Final deadline for answers was September 5th, 2010.

Answers received: eight, of which the BMU-answer combines five, the WSF-answer combines eight answers. In total 19 positions are reflected in the answers and suggestions:

- BMU (Joint answer by Elsa Nickel, Christiane Paulus, Stefanie Hedtkamp, Cornelia Neukirchen, Edward Ragusch)
- WSF (Synthesis of answers by E. Hinrichs (Landwirtschaftskammer NI), A. Lübcke (Insel-und Hallig-Konferenz), HU Rösner (WWF-Wattenmeerbüro), Landrat Harrsen (Kreis Nordfriesland), Landrat Theuerkauf (Kreis Aurich), G. Töpken (Power Plant Group), H. Verheij (Waddenvereniging), P. Friis-Hauge (DK Municipalities))
- H. Hebbelmann, UM Niedersachsen
- H. Litmeyer WSD Northwest
- C. Schneider WSD Nord
- B. Baerends, NL
- J. Frederiksen, DK
- Anonymous

Please note: The synthesis of the answers given to the questions is marked in blue colour, suggestions (by Denmark and Germany) for discussion concluded from these answers are marked in red.

1. **Did the Memorandum of Understanding between the Wadden Sea Forum and the Trilateral Wadden Sea Cooperation fulfil your expectations (please explain or argue)?**

Overall: Yes, setting of overall frame is seen positive, but needs to be more concrete and “down to earth”. Establishment of the WSF secretariat and better representation are valued.

Annexed Work Programme was not feasible and too theoretical, needs to be more flexible to bring more concrete substantial results.

- 2. Did the TWSC meet the obligations according to the MoU?**
- 3. Did the TWSC provide proper support to the WSF? If not, what was missing?**

Fomal obligations yes (especially indirectly through CWSS), active involvement and support of WSF with regards to contents need to be improved. (Might improve now with the new Board structure.)

Suggestion: Aim for more active and earlier involvement of WSF in TWSC matters and processes.

- 4. Did the WSF meet the obligations according to the MoU?**

Yes and no. Several projects were conducted, a report was elaborated for the Sylt MC. There was little active involvement, though. The advisory component was not used to the full extent and positions did not necessarily reflect the positions of all members. Results of projects and also the report “Without Frontiers” were not made visible in an active way. Many of the tasks formulated in the work programme were not fulfilled. The WSF did serve as a platform for information exchange in the Region (although the communication from the WSF members towards their organizations should probably be improved), but that was not asked for in the MoU (also relevant for questions 5 and 7).

Suggestion: Lead a very clear discussion – also within the WSF – on the function and claim of the WSF.

- 5. What are the main issues where the WSF made a significant and usable contribution to the trilateral policies and management of the Wadden Sea and how were the results incorporated in the work of the TWSC?**

Goose Management

Support of the World Heritage nomination

Sustainable Energy production – should be further elaborated

Input in the consultation process of MD and WSP, report “Without Frontiers”

- 6. Are the communication, networking and exchange of experience and knowledge between WSF and TWSC sufficient? If not, what could be improved?**

So far this was mainly done by the two secretariats. With the new WSB structure this exchange should improve and reach further in the fora and members of WSF and TWSC.

- 7. Does the WSF fulfil its function of the “round table” of the Wadden Sea Region? Are the positions of the different stakeholders within the WSF coordinated sufficiently?**

The WSF did serve as a platform for information exchange in the Region, although the communication from the WSF members towards their organizations should probably be improved. The round table function might clearly be the main achievement of the WSF. More stakeholder organizations should be included, positions should be made clear. WSF might also take on function as mediator in certain conflicts (as indicated in Sylt

Declaration). Internationally WSF claims to be seen as a best practice example. It seems to be necessary to “advertise” the WSF and its function in the Wadden Sea Region.

Suggestion: Active promotion of the WSF as “THE” round table of the Wadden Sea Region, further development towards a mediator forum. Clear definition of topics might help and make WSF more attractive.

8. Are there additional stakeholders you would like to see represented within the WSF?

Administrative as well as NGO representation in the following sectors:

Ship owners, harbour industry

Fishery

Tourism Sector

(Renewable) Energy production

Euregio?

Cultural Aspects?

Suggestion: Clarify the nomination/appointment procedure for the membership in the WSF.

9. Is the visibility of the WSF in the fora of the TWSC but also in public sufficient?

On the regional level the promotion of the work of the WSF should be improved, also the exchange into the relevant member organisations.

Visibility of WSF at the Sylt Conference was not good (maybe also due to the structure), the visibility within the TWSC in general will hopefully improve with the new WSB structure.

Is it necessary to be visible in wider public? Depends on the elaborated “self-image” of the WSF.

Suggestion: Clarify the question whether visibility in public is useful/necessary, enhance visibility in the region also for promotion reasons.

10. Do you have suggestions for a legal status of the WSF as well as the future administration of funding and staff?

Naturally the answers to this questions differ very strongly. Most agree on the arrangement, that WSF secretariat and CWSS are located in the same building, thus guaranteeing a close exchange and cooperation. WSF suggests to stay with the current financing and facilitation system. The German government is not able to continue the funding on an institutional basis, also the costs for personnel administration, IT administration, etc. cannot be covered free of charge in the future. Details must be clarified (preferably in the MoU 2011-2013).

Clarification of legal status (association/club (Verein)) might lead to higher level of commitment and would open up new ways of funding, plus it would make it clear that the WSF is an independent organisation, but bears the risk of not being able to acquire enough paying members.

Interesting aspect: Once DK will have joined the WH, the WSF could take the role of the overall sound board of the stakeholders.

Suggestion: Start a discussion process with the aim to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of a legal status like an association. Process should have clear time frame (2011).

11. Do you have suggestions for topics and issues that the WSF should embrace in the next three-year-period?

Adaptability to climate change, CO2-neutral Wadden Sea Region

Sustainable fisheries

Follow up Goose Management

Shipping and Ship Safety, container handling

Offshore wind energy including cable plans, energy development in general

Sustainable Tourism

Landscape and Culture (e.g. check Lancewad Plan with respect to feasibility)

Further development of sustainability indicator tool

Strengthening the identification of the WSF members and stakeholders with the trilateral aspect and the work for the World Heritage.

Suggestion: There is a large overlap with the discusses Task Group structure of the TWSC. It needs to be clarified how the exchange and participation will be guaranteed and organized. And: the wide range and number of topics calls for a prioritization process within the WSF.

12. Do you feel there is a need for a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between WSF and TWSC for the period 2011 – 2013? If yes, what would you like to see included in this next MoU?

Yes, almost all the answers indicate the wish for a new MoU, few wish for a simple continuation, most wish for a more concrete MoU, clarifying the legal/administrative/financial aspects and giving a clear list of issues where cooperation between TWSC and WSF is useful preferably with a clear time frame and leading to concrete results. The improvement of the mutual information exchange and participation in processes should be included as well as the function of WSF as THE platform in the Wadden Sea Region.

Stricly speaking it would make sense to first clarify whether the WSF will be able to continue its work in the existing form under the given framework and whether or not a new legal status is anticipated. Then a new MoU covering specific topics of cooperation can be established. It should also be possible to cover both aspects in one MoU, if the partners wish to do so.

Suggestion: Discuss the option of first clarifying fundamental aspects or/ and give a clear signal to draft MoU in time for WSB II and WSF meeting with the aim to have it signed before the beginning of 2011.