

MSP-OR POLICY BRIEF – Useful References

- Alleway, H. K., Gillies, C. L., Bishop, M. J., Gentry, R. R., Theuerkauf, S. J., & Jones, R. (2019). The ecosystem services of marine aquaculture: valuing benefits to people and nature. *BioScience*, 69(1), 59-68.
- Arroyo, M., Dietz, M., Hodges, T., Gallegos, D. (2021). Identification and Profiling of Surf Ecosystems for Inclusion in Azorean Marine Protected Areas. Save the Waves Coalition. <https://www.savethewaves.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Azores-Regional-Profile-Save-The-Waves-2021-compressed.pdf>.
- Barbier, E. B. (2017). Marine ecosystem services. *Current Biology*, 27(11), R507-R510.
- Broome, G., Valentine, P. (1995). Principles of Social Impact Assessment and its Application to Managing the Great Barrier Reef. CRC Reef Research Technical Report No. 2. Queensland, Australia. <https://rrrc.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Technical-Report-02.pdf>
- Brown, C., Reyers, B., Ingwall-King, L., Mapendembe, A., Nel, J., O'Farrell, P., Dixon, M. & Bowles-Newark, N. J. (2014). Measuring ecosystem services: Guidance on developing ecosystem service indicators. UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge, UK. [https://nicholasinstitute.duke.edu/sites/default/files/6.6.a-Brown et al 2014.pdf](https://nicholasinstitute.duke.edu/sites/default/files/6.6.a-Brown%20et%20al%202014.pdf).
- Burdge, R. J. (2015). The Concepts, Process and Methods of Social Impact Assessment. University Press of Colorado. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv29g2h29>
- Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (2019). Good Practice in Social Impact Assessment. Ontario, Canada. <https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/iaac-acei/documents/research/>
- Clay, P.M., Colburn, L.L. (2020). A Practitioner's Handbook for Fisheries Social Impact Assessment. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-F/SPO-212. <https://spo.nmfs.noaa.gov/sites/default/files/TMSPO212.pdf>
- Custodio, M., Moulart, I., Asselman, J., Van der Biest, K., van de Pol, L., Drouillon, M., & Everaert, G. (2022). Prioritizing ecosystem services for marine management through stakeholder engagement. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 225, 106228.
- Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration & National Marine Fisheries Service (2007). NOAA/NMFS Council Operational Guidelines—Fishery Management Process: Guidelines for the Assessment of the Social Impact of Fishery Management Actions. NMFSI 01-111-02 effective date Dec. 24 2007. <https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/01-111-02.pdf>
- Direção Regional de Políticas Marítimas, Secretaria Regional do Mar e das Pescas, Governo Regional dos Açores (2023). Plano de Situação do Ordenamento do Espaço Marítimo Nacional – Subdivisão dos Açores (PSOEM-Açores) – Versão para Discussão Pública. Volume III-A - Espacialização de Serviços, Usos e Atividades da Subdivisão dos Açores, <https://oema.mar.azores.gov.pt/>.

- European Commission, Executive Agency for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises, Lukic, I., Nigohosyan, D., Vet, J. et al. (2018). Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) for blue growth – Final technical study, Publications Office, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2826/04538>.
- European Commission, Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Joint Research Centre, Addamo, A., Calvo Santos, A., Carvalho, N. et al. (2021). The EU blue economy report 2021, Publications Office of the European Union, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2771/8217>.
- European Commission, European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (2022). Toolbox for monitoring, evaluation and revision of MSP: final report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 84 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2926/974797>
- European Commission (2024). EU Blue Economy Observatory. [ONLINE] <https://blue-economy-observatory.ec.europa.eu/>.
- Grimmel, H., Calado, H., Fonseca, C., Suárez de Vivero, J.L. (2019). Integration of the social dimension into marine spatial planning – Theoretical aspects and recommendations. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 173: 139-147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2019.02.013>
- Haines-Young, R. (2023). Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services (CICES) V5.2 - Guidance on the Application of the Revised Structure. https://cices.eu/content/uploads/sites/8/2023/08/CICES_V5.2_Guidance_24072023.pdf.
- HELCOM/Pan Baltic Scope 2019. Assessing economic, social, cultural and ecosystem services impacts in maritime spatial planning (MSP) in the Baltic Sea region. http://www.panbalticscope.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Economic_and_Social_analysis_report.pdf.
- Henriette Grimmel, Helena Calado, Catarina Fonseca, Juan Luis Suárez de Vivero. Integration of the social dimension into marine spatial planning – Theoretical aspects and recommendations. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, Volume 173, 2019, Pages 139-147, ISSN 0964-5691, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2019.02.013>.
- International Union for Conservation of Nature (2016). Social Impact Assessment (SIA): Environmental & Social Management System (ESMS) guidance note. ESMS Manual. <https://www.iucn.org/sites/default/files/2022-05/esms-social-impact-assessment-sia-guidance-note.pdf>
- Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, Directorate General for Fisheries and Maritime Affairs (2022). Updated Joint Roadmap to accelerate Marine/Maritime Spatial Planning processes worldwide - MSProadmap (2022-2027). IOC. Technical series, IOC/2022/TS/182. Paris: IOC-UNESCO, <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000385718>.
- Jarvis, R.M., Breen, B.B., Krägeloh, C.U., Billington, D.R. (2015). Citizen science and the power of public participation in marine spatial planning. *Marine Policy*, 57: 21-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2015.03.011>
- Kannen, A. (2017). Including social and cultural aspects in regulatory standards for SDG 14 and marine planning. *Technical Standards for Sustainable Development Goals and*

- Targets – UNECE – GRM.
https://unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trade/wp6/documents/2017/GRMF2F/2017_02_21_1130_Kannen_Culturally_Significant_Area.pdf
- Kaplan-Hallam, M., Bennett, N.J. (2018). Adaptive social impact management for conservation and environmental management. *Conserv Biol.*, 32(2): 304-314. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12985>
 - Lavalie, G., Boussarie, G., Kopp, D., Morfin, M., Mouchet, M.A. (2023). Mapping marine ecosystem services in a multifunctional seascape: the case of Grande Vasière (Bay of Biscay). *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 10. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmars.2023.1110299>.
 - Longato, D., Cortinovis, C., Albert, C., & Geneletti, D. (2021). Practical applications of ecosystem services in spatial planning: Lessons learned from a systematic literature review. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 119, 72-84.
 - Mabon, L., Kita, J., Xue, Z. (2017). Challenges for social impact assessment in coastal regions: A case study of the Tomakomai CCS Demonstration Project. *Marine Policy*, 83: 243-251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.06.015>
 - McKinley, E., Acott, T., Stojanovic, T. (2019). Socio-cultural Dimensions of Marine Spatial Planning. In: Zaucha, J., Gee, K. (eds) *Maritime Spatial Planning*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-98696-8_7
 - Michael Gilek, Aurelija Armoskaite, Kira Gee, Fred Saunders, Ralph Tafon, Jacek Zaucha, In search of social sustainability in marine spatial planning: A review of scientific literature published 2005–2020, *Ocean & Coastal Management*, Volume 208, 2021, 105618, ISSN 0964-5691, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2021.105618>. (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0964569121001034>)
 - Noble, M.M., Harasti, D., Pittcock, J., Doran, B. (2019). Understanding the spatial diversity of social uses, dynamics, and conflicts in marine spatial planning. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 246: 929-940. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.06.048>
 - NSW Department of Planning and Environment (2023). *Social Impact Assessment Guideline for State Significant Projects*. New South Wales, Australia. <https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2023/GD1944%20SIA%20Guideline%20NEW%20VI%2014%2002%2023.pdf>
 - O’Hagan, A.M. (2020). Ecosystem-Based Management (EBM) and Ecosystem Services in EU Law, Policy and Governance. In: O’Higgins, T., Lago, M., DeWitt, T. (eds) *Ecosystem-Based Management, Ecosystem Services and Aquatic Biodiversity*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45843-0_18.
 - Portugal. Artigo 10.º do Decreto-Lei n.º 38/2015, que desenvolve a [Lei n.º 17/2014](#), de 10 de abril, que estabelece as Bases da Política de Ordenamento e de Gestão do Espaço Marítimo Nacional
 - Ressurreição, A., Giacomello, E. (2013). Quantifying the direct use value of Condor seamount. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 98 (A): 209-217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2013.08.005>.

- Ressurreição, A., Cardigos, F., Giacomello, E., Leite, N., Oliveira, F., Kaiser, M.J., Gonçalves, J., Serrão Santos, R. (2022). The value of marine ecotourism for an European outermost region. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 222: 106129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2022.106129>.
- Santos, C.F., Domingos, T., Ferreira, M. A., Orbach, M., Andrade, F. (2014). How sustainable is sustainable marine spatial planning? Part II–The Portuguese experience. *Marine Policy*, 49: 48-58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.04.005>
- Schröter et al., 2020 (DOI: 10.1080/26395916.2019.1703039)
- Seijo, C., Calado, H., McClintock, W.J., Gil, A., Fonseca, C. (2021). Mapping recreational ecosystem services from stakeholders' perspective in the Azores. *One Ecosystem* 6: e65751. <https://doi.org/10.3897/oneeco.6.e65751>.
- SFG-UCSB (2019). Economic Valuation of Marine Ecosystem Services in the Azores. Sustainable Fisheries Group - University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Simões, J. M. (2022). Monitorização da ocupação privativa do espaço marítimo nacional (Doctoral dissertation).
- Taylor, C.N., Mackay, M. (2022). Social Impact Assessment: Guidelines for Thriving Communities and Regions. Building Better Homes Towns and Cities, Wellington, New Zealand. https://pnea.sprep.org/sites/default/files/2022-08/Taylor_Mackay_2022_social_impact_assessment_guidelines.pdf
- Trine Skovgaard Kirkfeldt. 2019. An ocean of concepts: Why choosing between ecosystem-based management, ecosystem-based approach and ecosystem approach makes a difference. *Marine Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2019.103541>
- UNESCO-IOC/European Commission. 2021. MSPglobal International Guide on Marine/Maritime Spatial Planning. IOC Manuals and Guides no. 89. IOC/2021/MG/89. Paris: UNESCO, <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379196>.
- ValueES (2017). Methods for integrating ecosystem services into policy, planning and practice - ValuES Methods Navigator. http://aboutvalues.net/method_navigator/.
- Vanclay, F. (2003). International Principles For Social Impact Assessment. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 21(1): 5-12. <https://doi.org/10.3152/147154603781766491>
- Vanclay, F., Esteves, A.M., Aucamp, I., Franks, D. (2015). *Social Impact Assessment: Guidance for assessing and managing the social impacts of projects*. Fargo ND: International Association for Impact Assessment.
- Voyer, M., Gladstone, W., Goodall, H. (2012). Methods of social assessment in Marine Protected Area planning: Is public participation enough? *Marine Policy*, 36 (2): 432-439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2011.08.002>
- Wilson, E. (2017). What is Social Impact Assessment? Indigenous Peoples And Resource Extraction In The Arctic: Evaluating Ethical Guidelines. ISBN 978-82-7943-061-2. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Emma_Wilson18/publication/315550573_What_is_Social_Impact_Assessment/links/58d40fe245851533784fd2d7/What-is-Social-Impact-Assessment.pdf