

# PERMAGOV

## STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP | 15 FEB 2024 EVENT SUMMARY

*The PERMAGOV Stakeholder Workshop served as an interactive forum to discuss marine governance within the marine life, marine plastic, marine energy, and maritime transport regime complexes, as well as to enrich the Multi-layered Collaborative Marine Governance Model with stakeholder expertise.*





This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both. Every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of information provided in this document, which reflects only the authors' views. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains. Information is provided "as is" without guarantee or warranty of any kind, express or implied, including but not limited to the fitness of the information for a particular purpose. People that use the information do so at their sole risk and liability. This deliverable is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.



**Funded by  
the European Union**



**UK Research  
and Innovation**

PERMAGOV has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme HORIZON-CL6-2022-GOVERNANCE-01-03 under grant agreement No 101086297, and by UK Research and Innovation under the UK government's Horizon Europe funding guarantee grant numbers 10045993, 10062097, 101086297.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	3
1.1. About PERMAGOV .....	4
1.2. PERMAGOV Stakeholder Workshop Approach.....	4
2. Governance Arrangements .....	4
3. Institutional Barriers .....	6
4. Collaboration Dynamics .....	8
5. E-Governance.....	9
6. The PERMAGOV Multi-layered Collaborative Marine Governance Model.....	11
7. Conclusion .....	12
Annex 1: Event Agenda .....	13

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Group photo and workshop activities.....	3
--	---

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. PERMAGOV Scope: Green Deal and Regional Sea Strategies and regulation. ....	5
Table 2. Typology of Institutional Barriers identified in the systematic literature review. ....	6
Table 3. High Impact / High Priority barriers per regime complex.....	7
Table 4. Summary of discussions on collaboration dynamics.....	8
Table 5. Assessment of e-governance tools.....	9
Table 6. Opportunities and challenges for marine e-governance.....	10



# 1. INTRODUCTION

The [PERMAGOV](#) (Improving the Performance of Marine Governance) Stakeholder Workshop took place in Brussels on Thursday, 15th February 2024 and provided an interactive platform to discuss, brainstorm, and shape the future of marine governance in the EU, Norway, and the United Kingdom (UK). The workshop brought together around 50 key individuals from research, policy making, industry and civil society as well as partners from the PERMAGOV project. Coming from across Europe and spanning multiple European Sea basins, participants engaged in discussions related to marine energy, biodiversity, transport, and plastics. Workshop sessions explored the PERMAGOV Multi-layered Collaborative Marine Governance Model, governance arrangements, institutional barriers, collaboration dynamics, and e-governance.

The specific objectives of the workshop were to:

- Provide an overview of European marine governance arrangements and engage in a critical discussion with stakeholders about the dimensions and linkages of said governance arrangements.
- Apply a diagnostic tool to identify institutional barriers to these governance arrangements.
- Offer an overview of e-governance approaches and co-assess their potential in terms of useability for stakeholders, potential to support the achievement of EU Green Deal objectives, and applicability to help overcome identified institutional barriers.
- Critically engage with PERMAGOV research on policy barriers identified to date and to review initial findings with a diverse group of experts.
- Introduce and further co-develop a Multi-layered Collaborative Marine Governance model by building on stakeholder insights and expertise.



**Figure 1. Group photo and workshop activities**  
(Photos by Pavel Kogut, 21C).

## 1.1. ABOUT PERMAGOV

The overarching aim of the PERMAGOV project is to help improve the implementation and performance of EU marine policies to reach the goals set out in the EU Green Deal (EGD). Key to this is identifying critical institutional barriers to effective policy implementation and proposing opportunities to enhance the design and implementation of EU marine policies. To achieve this, PERMAGOV developed a Multi-layered Collaborative Marine Governance model (MLCMG). This conceptual model brings together different components to help researchers, practitioners, and stakeholders to better identify and understand enabling and constraining governance conditions for the successful achievement of the EGD objectives. The components of the MLCMG include governance arrangements, institutional barriers, collaboration dynamics, actor capabilities, and e-governance. Decision making and implementation of marine policies is effectively a collaborative process that can be structured along these components. The MLCMG merges existing scientific theories and approaches and has been developed to be applied to the four PERMAGOV regime complexes (Maritime Transport, Marine Life, Marine Energy and Marine Plastics). In practical terms, the MLCMG model offers a means to help understand how marine governance arrangements change over time, by offering a framework to identify and categorize information to help highlight how specific components contribute to change. The PERMAGOV Stakeholder Workshop is an integral part of the PERMAGOV mission, for collecting real-world insights and expertise to advance the project's research goals and policy impacts.

## 1.2. PERMAGOV STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP APPROACH

The PERMAGOV Stakeholder Workshop (see Agenda in Annex 1) aimed to create an interactive space and elicit feedback and discussion amongst all participants. The workshop first offered an introduction to the PERMAGOV project and an overview of the MLCMG, while following sessions focused on select components of the model, namely governance arrangements, institutional barriers, collaboration dynamics, and e-governance. A final session was then used to 'return' to the MLCMG and offer a comprehensive discussion, building on the specific previous sessions. Participants were divided into four main groups, based on the PERMAGOV Regime Complexes: Maritime Transport, Marine Energy, Marine Life and Marine Plastics. Each group included a diverse group of participants working on these topics, including project partners and invited guests. As outlined in this summary, the different sessions employed a variety of approaches to foster discussions across the session topics.

## 2. GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

The session on Governance Arrangements aimed to identify how the EGD is - through specific EU policies - changing the marine governance arrangements that govern Maritime Transport, Marine Energy, Marine Life and Marine Plastics. An introductory presentation was provided to give an overview of policies already identified to discuss how the EGD is affecting the governance arrangements governing the four areas of focus (Transport, Energy, Life and Plastics, see Table 1). This provided a concrete *scope* for the meeting and discussions of the workshop. The concept of governance arrangement was introduced, including the four dimensions of governance arrangements: *discourses* (the stories and viewpoints), the *actors and coalitions* they collaborate within, the *rules of the game* and the division and availability of *resources*.



**Table 1. PERMAGOV Scope: Green Deal and Regional Sea Strategies and regulation.**

Issue Area	EGD Strategy	Policies/Regulation
Maritime Transport	Fitfor55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EU Emission Trading Scheme Directive (integration of shipping)</li> <li>• Revision of the Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network (TEN-T regulation)</li> </ul>
Marine Energy	Offshore renewable energy strategy (and Fitfor55)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Deal Industrial Plan</li> <li>• RePowerEU</li> </ul>
Marine Life	Biodiversity Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common Fisheries Policy</li> <li>• Marine Action Plan</li> <li>• Marine Strategy Framework Directive's Seabed threshold values</li> <li>• HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan</li> </ul>
Marine Plastics	Plastics Strategy (and Circular Economy Action Plan)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single-Use Plastics Directive</li> <li>• HELCOM's Regional Action Plan on Marine Litter</li> <li>• UNEP/MAP Regional Plan on Marine Litter Management in the Mediterranean</li> </ul>

The participants, divided into four groups (each discussing one of the regime complexes), were asked to discuss the policies selected and current developments related to these policies. Participants were then asked to individually identify examples of discourses, actors, rules and resources that characterize the governance arrangement that develops and implements these policies. They were asked to add examples to a poster with a visual representation of a governance arrangement and its dimensions. The participants continued with discussing the different examples, changes and issues related to the further development and implementation of the selected policies to achieve the EGD objectives related to climate neutrality, reducing pollution, and protecting natural capital.

Some overall conclusions are as follows.

**Scope:**

- The selected policies were seen as essential to the issue areas, although for marine energy, national and local policies are equally relevant, and tension can exist between EU and national/local regulation.
- Some further policies were mentioned for some regime complexes to be relevant to include in the scope (e.g. nature restoration law for marine life and the MSFD and REACH for marine plastics).

**Discourses:**

- Discursive shifts are happening, e.g. the idea of energy security in the domain of marine energy, food security in marine life and from alternative materials to reducing plastic production and consumption for marine plastics.
- Some tensions between discourses are visible as well: e.g. between marine conservation and impact on fisheries or between discourses around reducing plastic production and consumption which are backed up by some actors, but not by all.
- In some regime complexes, new discourses have emerged, such as around the life cycle of renewable energy (maritime transport).

**Actors:**

- All regime complexes discussed the role of industry (in addition to governmental actors) to be important, sometimes in relation to producer responsibility. This included collaboration within industry, e.g. in the domain of marine energy. or maritime transport different industries are increasingly playing a role, e.g. financial, ship motor builders and ports.
- Some regime complexes discussed the relevance of communities for the governance arrangement (i.e. maritime transport in relation to ports and for marine life in relation to coastal communities).

**Rules of the game:**

- The multi-layered nature of governance arrangements was discussed e.g. the connections and misfits between EU, regional and national/local rules.
- Coherence between rules, also between EU regulations, was discussed, e.g. when it comes to the MSFD, MSPD and CFP.

**Resources:**

- Changes in resources (especially financial) are not necessarily linked to the EGD policies, but also to the Ukraine war and high levels of inflation.
- There is a lack of resources to e.g. support fast development of marine and renewable energy or MPA management and nature conservation.

### 3. INSTITUTIONAL BARRIERS

The institutional barrier session began by briefly introducing participants to the work conducted by PERMAGOV on this topic. The final output of the systematic literature review was presented, and a brief explanation was provided about how PERMAGOV will use the barriers identified in the review in the rest of the project. The session task focused on first ranking the 11 types of institutional barriers (Table 2) on an Impact Vs Priority Matrix. Participants were limited to placing three barriers in the High Impact / High Priority quadrant. The second part of the task focused on these three barriers, with participants asked to identify links to other barriers. The question posed of the second task was: would addressing these three barriers have a positive impact on addressing any other of the 11 barriers? The goal here was to test our hypothesis that there will be a hierarchy of barriers in our case studies and that resolving some barriers will make it easier to resolve others. At the end of the session, each table was asked to share their three high-impact / high-priority barriers (Table 3).

**Table 2. Typology of Institutional Barriers identified in the systematic literature review.**

Institutional Barriers	
1	Inappropriate rules for determining who participates in governance actions.
2	Inappropriate rules for regulating the roles and responsibilities of governance actors.
3	Inappropriate rules for establishing the control that actors have over governance outcomes.
4	Inappropriate mechanisms for holding governance actors to account.
5	Inappropriate structures to connect actors within and across multiple tiers of governance.
6	Inappropriate rules for regulating, preventing or resolving conflicts among actors.



<b>7</b>	Knowledge is produced, used, or communicated in inappropriate ways.
<b>8</b>	A mismatch between the scale of an issue and the scale of the governance arrangements.
<b>9</b>	Rules and procedures are rigid and inflexible due to formal structures and practices.
<b>10</b>	The extent to which rules and procedures are embedded into written laws, plans, and documents.
<b>11</b>	The provision of incentives for actors to participate in governance actions is inappropriate.

**Table 3. High Impact / High Priority barriers per regime complex.**

<b>Regime Complex</b>	<b>High Impact – High Priority Barriers</b>		
<b>Maritime Transport</b>	Actor accountability	Institutional incentives	Actor control
<b>Marine Energy</b>	Actor Connectivity	Development & Use of Knowledge	Scale of Institutions
<b>Marine Litter</b>	Development & Use of Knowledge	Institutional incentives	Actor control
<b>Marine Life</b>	Development & Use of Knowledge	Institutional incentives	Actor accountability

The workshop session was very useful in terms of helping the project further refine the institutional barrier diagnostic tool:

- The language used to describe institutional barriers needs to be further simplified.
- A key point noted by participants was that these barriers (including the high impact and priority barriers listed above) were overlapping and addressing one problem could trickle down too many other barriers being addressed.
- There is a need to further emphasize that barriers may only impact certain groups within a governance regime and that these barriers may be seen as positives by others.
- There is a need to reflect on the transboundary nature of many sectors and how barriers may be specific to individual jurisdictions.
- The highly interrelated nature of the barriers means both ranking and mapping unidirectional relationships can be difficult. However, overall, the participants agreed that some prioritization of barriers per case/regime would be useful when PERMAGOV begins working on solutions.

Overall, the session confirmed the applicability of the PERMAGOV diagnostic approach but highlighted that further simplification would be very beneficial.



## 4. COLLABORATION DYNAMICS

A short (30 min) exercise was used to explore collaboration within marine governance. Collaboration relates to how public and private actors work together (such as within a governance arrangement) e.g., towards a goal that requires collective decision-making processes and structures. Participants were separated into four groups: Marine Life, Marine Plastics, Marine Energy and Maritime Transport and groups were facilitated by project partners. The session aimed to collect responses from participants about three main questions:

1. What types/characteristics of communication support collaboration within your field of work?
2. What types/characteristics of relationships support collaboration within your field of work?
3. What opportunities for improving collaboration in your field exist?

The group discussions highlighted several key findings, important for the further development of the PERMAGOV MLCMG (Table 4).

**Table 4. Summary of discussions on collaboration dynamics.**

Communication	Relationships	Opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance of inclusive communication, using a common language, and local languages for broader inclusivity;</li> <li>• Positive communication, discussing issues generally before moving to specifics;</li> <li>• Science-based dialogue and respect for diverse knowledge and opinions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding that not all decisions will result in common benefits; compromise is key;</li> <li>• Trust and transparency are important for fostering cooperation;</li> <li>• Ownership and commitment from all actors; equal and lasting partnerships;</li> <li>• Competitive collaboration can also create opportunities for cooperation;</li> <li>• Establishing common platforms for research and shared goals;</li> <li>• Respectful relationships that understand the need to compromise for the greater good.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilizing multiple platforms for communication;</li> <li>• Engaging with research bodies;</li> <li>• Creating multi-stakeholder forums, and promoting participatory processes;</li> <li>• Recognizing informal best practices and leveraging initiatives like the EGD to drive collaborative efforts.</li> </ul>



## 5. E-GOVERNANCE

PERMAGOV understands marine e-governance as the application of digital processes or technologies aimed at improving the management of marine activities and resources, including within and across sectors and governance levels. The workshop presented an opportunity to ask experts in the field about their a) experience with existing tools, b) perceptions of limitations in existing tools, and c) desires for new tools that could be developed to improve marine governance. Based on these considerations, session-specific questions were developed:

1. **Important existing tools.** What are the most important digital tools and how do they support governance performance?
2. **Tools with unrealized potential.** Which tools are not used to their full potential? How could they be used better and by whom?
3. **Solutions to be created.** What tools or e-governance functions do not yet exist but would be important to support governance performance?

During the group work, participants at each table had to answer these questions for their regime complex (Table 5).

**Table 5. Assessment of e-governance tools.**

Important existing tools	Tools with unrealized potential	Solutions to be created
<b>Marine Transport</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vessel trackers (DNV, S&amp;P, VesselFinder, Vesseltracker, SafeSeanet)</li> <li>• Database (Clackson research)</li> <li>• Single windows (Portbase)</li> <li>• Ship 3D Models (NAPA Designer)</li> <li>• Customs clearance software (Blockchain based Naviporta)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate Trace</li> <li>• Shipping weather app</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tools to trace how fuel is produced and used/consumed (full chain)</li> <li>• Fuel life cycle tools</li> <li>• Tools for risk analysis</li> <li>• Interoperability between tools: how tools link and support each other</li> </ul>
<b>Marine Life</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping tools enables fishermen to document where they fish</li> <li>• Biodiversity: Obis and EMODnet - updated data to prioritise efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity: Obis and EMODnet: lots of data missing, so there is a need for more data in them.</li> <li>• All tools suffer from overlaps, misalignment, and incompatibilities. So, need for coordination and alignment</li> <li>• Some tools are complex to use and it can be difficult to interpret outcomes</li> <li>• Good local/regional tools could be 'globalised'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An e-governance tool to explore laws/rules applicable to a certain area/topic. EU beta-version on the way?</li> <li>• More powerful and accurate scenario generators, but important to be aware of quality assumptions, and to perform reality-checks</li> </ul>

<b>Marine Energy</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Global Wind Tool</li> <li>• (For case 5) The Crown Estate (UK) Data Exchange – a repository for data used in leasing processes</li> <li>• DK: Environmental mapping tool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise data owned and controlled by developers (commercial data) and not used for monitoring</li> <li>• High resolution wind resource data is privately owned</li> <li>• GDPR constrains on the use of e-gov tools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GIS system to map ongoing initiatives; publicly funded data needs to be incorporated immediately. Invest in interoperability</li> <li>• Integrative data tool can hold all data and be accessible/available to policy makers, academics, citizens etc.</li> <li>• Need for standardised digital vocabulary (ISO 15926)</li> <li>• Digital competence development</li> </ul>
<b>Marine Litter</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMAP infosystem</li> <li>• EMODnet Chemistry</li> <li>• Marine litter watch App</li> <li>• Floating marine litter portal by JRC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EMODnet Chemistry (due to high administrative barriers and data harmonisation requirements)</li> <li>• Citizen science not fully adopted due to high diversification of apps and data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitate access to models and simulations</li> </ul>

In addition to these regime-specific results, the session identified general opportunities and challenges for marine e-governance (Table 6).

**Table 6. Opportunities and challenges for marine e-governance.**

<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Challenges</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interoperability of tools</li> <li>• Tools facilitate communication between organizations</li> <li>• One-stop shop for marine affairs.</li> <li>• Harmonization of data collection methods</li> <li>• Better education in the EU on digital tools</li> <li>• Knowledge mapped legislation. Help to understand laws</li> <li>• Help with evaluation and assessment of measures/policies.</li> <li>• Help with decision making. Forward looking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can create more barriers (e.g. data sharing and access). Ethical issues in sharing personal data etc.</li> <li>• Institutional structures limit knowledge/data sharing</li> <li>• Lack of resources and incentives to create and use e-governance tools (training and education)</li> <li>• Unknown or inaccessible digital tools</li> <li>• Tools are location specific in terms of objectives, methods and use</li> <li>• Difficulties with creating harmonized data because data has specific methods which are not comparable for the same issue</li> <li>• High diversity of citizen science</li> <li>• Standardizing e-governance tools to address socio-cultural and political contexts is often challenging</li> </ul>



## 6. THE PERMAGOV MULTI-LAYERED COLLABORATIVE MARINE GOVERNANCE MODEL

The stakeholder workshop provided a crucial moment to co-develop the multi-layered collaborative marine governance model (MLCMG). A focus group method was applied to verify the components of the model and the relationship between the components. The focus groups were held with consortium end-user partners, selected representatives of the four regime complexes (Marine Life, Maritime Transport, Marine Energy and Marine Plastics) and government actors. Stakeholders' insights and experiences regarding the EGD were solicited to verify the most important aspects of each of the components.

Regarding this session, the space was controlled by a presentation and a set of tasks for the participants. First, we introduced the model and clarified the goals of the session. We structured the questions based on the components of the multi-layered collaborative marine governance model. For instance:

- Collaboration can help overcome institutional barriers. Why, why not?
- Marine e-governance tools help the implementation of the EGD and other green policies. Why, why not?
- Based on your experience, what are ways to improve the implementation of the EGD and other policies regarding sustainable economies?

We asked the focus groups to discuss these questions with other participants at the same table. To enhance engagement and ensure data collection, we asked the participants to write their ideas on a printed A3 map of the MLCMG model. A table facilitator ensured that all the participants were engaged with the activity and felt comfortable expressing their insights. A designated notetaker captured all ideas and conversations in writing. At the end of this session, we asked all the focus groups (5 tables) to share their main findings. Some conclusions are as follows.

The link between collaboration and institutional barriers:

- Collaboration could help overcome institutional barriers but may also create further problems. This could result from factors such as the different and competing interests of actors and the asymmetric power relation existing between different actors.
- Collaboration is important to manage multiple institutional barriers including actor accountability (building social alliances), actor control (power distribution), development and use of knowledge (co-produce knowledge), and institutionalized incentives (collaboration as a pre-condition for overcoming institutional barriers, but not a guarantee for success).
- Finding consensus amongst multiple actors takes time and resources. While collaboration is generally considered positive, ultimately a final decision needs to be made. This can be challenging if there is an unclear division of roles and responsibilities and not everyone will be satisfied.

The link between marine e-governance and the implementation of the EGD:

- e-governance tools have many benefits including ensuring efficient transfer of information.

- At the same time, all-encompassing e-governance tools are not possible, there is a need for specific digital tools.
- A lack of e-governance tools is not what is hindering the implementation of the EGD and so their importance is uncertain.
- Digital tools might not take stock of specific cultural and political data, which in turn, could distort their implementation in governance.
- Not all e-tools are e-governance tools. Lots of digital tools are used for monitoring, but that does not constitute e-governance.
- Some e-governance tools may be inappropriate for delivering a particular solution or exacerbate existing tensions.

Opportunities to improve the implementation of the EGD:

- Set realistic targets for offshore renewable energy so that policy makers can be held accountable.
- Decision-makers need to place more emphasis on a just transition, in line with the original ambition of the EGD.
- EU needs to do more research to ensure that help/support is provided to the right people/the right sectors to deliver the EGD.
- Capacity building of actors on the various regulatory requirements and standards of the EGD was considered crucial.
- Local and global collaborations were considered necessary to achieve progress towards the EU vision and targets.
- The EU and its member states need to develop better incentives for the delivery of the EGD.
- Progress towards the EGD targets needs to be inclusive and with a positive outlook for all citizens.

Overall, the session showed that the model captured significant dimensions enabling and constraining the implementation of the EGD. Specifically, by soliciting stakeholders' experiences, we made sure that the model was more than an academic exercise. The MLCMG model offered valuable insights into the enabling and constraining conditions of the implementation of the EGD.

## 7. CONCLUSION

The PERMAGOV Stakeholder Workshop explored the Multi-layered Collaborative Marine Governance Model and some selected model components, i.e. governance arrangements, institutional barriers, collaboration dynamics, and e-governance. The sessions offered a first opportunity for the PERMAGOV project to engage with experts, stakeholders, and practitioners and share research findings outside of the project. The sessions highlighted key lessons relevant to MLCMG and the PERMAGOV research program to be further explored in future project activities.



# ANNEX 1: EVENT AGENDA

## AGENDA

### PERMAGOV Stakeholder Workshop

Thursday 15th February 2024

---

<b>Place</b>	<b>Thon Hotel Bristol Stephanie</b> <b>Avenue Louise 91-93, 1050 Brussels, BE</b>
<b>Start</b>	<b>Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> February 2024, 09:00</b>
<b>End</b>	<b>Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> February 2024, 17:30</b>

---

Time	Item
9:00 - 9:15	<b>Arrival and registration</b>
9:15 – 9:45	<b>Welcome and introduction to PERMAGOV</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Objective of the workshop</li><li>➤ Introducing PERMAGOV</li><li>➤ Understanding the key components of the PERMAGOV approach</li></ul> Judith van Leeuwen, PERMAGOV Coordinator, Wageningen University Carolijn van Noort, WP4 coordinator, Aalborg University
9:45 - 10:00	<b>Icebreaker to foster collaboration and interaction</b> Pavel Kogut, 21C Consultancy
10:00 – 11:00	<b>Session 1 – Multi-Layered Marine Governance Arrangements</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Understanding and mapping Marine Governance Arrangements</li><li>➤ Exploring EU Green Deal influence on Marine Governance</li><li>➤ Interactive exercise</li></ul> Judith van Leeuwen, PERMAGOV Coordinator, Wageningen University

	<p>Jan van Tatenhove, Wageningen University</p> <p>Ben Boteler, WP2 coordinator, Research Institute For Sustainability – Helmholtz Centre Potsdam</p>
<b>11:00 - 11:30</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>
<b>11:30 - 12:45</b>	<p><b>Session 2 – Institutional barriers in marine governance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Understanding institutional barriers in marine governance</li> <li>➤ Developing a diagnostic tool</li> <li>➤ Interactive session</li> </ul> <p>Wesley Flannery, WP3 coordinator, Queen’s University Belfast</p>
<b>12:45 - 13:45</b>	<b>Lunch break</b>
<b>13:45 - 14:15</b>	<p><b>Session 3 – Collaboration dynamics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Brief exercise on collaboration dynamics in marine governance</li> </ul> <p>Ben Boteler, WP2 coordinator, Research Institute For Sustainability – Helmholtz Centre Potsdam</p>
<b>14:15 – 15:30</b>	<p><b>Session 4 – Marine e-governance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Understanding marine e-governance</li> <li>➤ Interactive session</li> </ul> <p>Pavel Kogut, WP7 coordinator, 21CConsultancy</p>
<b>15:30 - 16:00</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>
<b>16:00 - 17:15</b>	<p><b>Session 5 – The Multi-Layered Collaborative Marine Governance model</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Bringing the pieces together</li> <li>➤ Reviewing the MLCMG model</li> <li>➤ Interactive session</li> </ul> <p>Carolijn van Noort, WP4 coordinator, Aalborg University</p>
<b>17:15 - 17:30</b>	<p><b>Close of workshop</b></p> <p>Judith van Leeuwen, PERMAGOV Coordinator, Wageningen University</p>

