

# Wadden Sea Board

**WSB 18  
3 November 2016  
Wilhelmshaven**



---

**Agenda Item:** 6.1  
**Subject:** PCDG 2 Minutes  
**Document No.** WSB 18/6.1/1  
**Date:** 7 October 2016  
**Submitted by:** Secretariat

---

**Proposal:** The meeting is invited to take note of the minutes.

## Summary record of the PCDG 2 meeting, 15 September 2016 Hamburg

### Present

Bernard Baerends, Hubertus Hebbelmann, Anne Husum Marboe, Peter Saabye Simonsen, Margrita Sobottka, Rüdiger Stempel, Anja Szczesinski (WWF in behalf of Hans-Ulrich Rösner and Herman Verheij), Jouke van Dijk, Kees van Es

### Summary

Rüdiger Stempel opens the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the PC drafting group.

Three documents were tabled for this meeting reflecting three different suggested approaches to setting up the PC:

- The PH model based on the discussions of the first meeting of the PCDG;
- The sustainable Development Steering Group model developed by Denmark;
- The CWSS 2.0 model elaborated by WWF.

Anne and Peter explained the main reasons for the sustainable Development Steering Group model developed by Denmark.

Apart from support for the OUV

- Private entrepreneurs would like to be involved in the WSWF-strategy, but the main focus for them is what is the added value for their business on a local level. If you wish them to join, it needs to have an added value.
- The private sector has to be in the lead, not the (public) representatives of the recreation-sector (they are represented in the TG-STG). Invite them to ask what are their goals in regarding the World Heritage status, what can be the added value for their business, and, by extension, what is then the task of the PC.

In reflection Jouke asks if there are 'key-persons' that can bridge the gap between the trilateral cooperation and the private entrepreneurs. Because it is also important to define with the sector the goals for the long term.

Anja explains the reasons behind the adjustments on the paper and the CWSS2.0-model.

The WWF sees the role of the CWSS as providing support and facilitating so that the sectors can initiate the process with their organizations/entrepreneurs with regard to the World Heritage strategy. The bottom-up process will not come automatically out of the sectors. That's why it is important to enlarge the CWSS to initiate/facilitate initiatives out of the sector. Another option could be to finance this facilitators temporarily

It's important to ask the sectors what they expect from the cooperation.

In reflection Rüdiger concludes that it looks like the WWF approach is a variant of the partnership-hub model. In both models the facilitators act as interfaces between the cooperation and the sectors, but in the CWSS 2.0 model they are working and financed within the cooperation.

In reflection Bernard notes that when the facilitators are working within the (public)cooperation, it will not work. We need to emphasize that the facilitators are also part of the sectors they represent. Part of their work has to be for their benefit. It has to be also in their own value. A temporary support of the trilateral cooperation may be conceivable, but in the end it has to be the sector themselves who benefit from their involvement in the PC.

Anja mentions that the question is: who needs the cooperation for their own value and what do they see as the added value of the PC/cooperation? Maybe as a starting point initial financing as a startup is needed, but that need can also differ from sector to sector.

Jouke brings up the idea of designating ambassadors that champion Wadden Sea-wide cooperation for their sectors (in addition to the facilitators in the PC) and this idea meets with general support.

Rüdiger concludes that in general the idea of the PC is supported, including the idea of the facilitators (which is another role than that of the ambassadors), but this also needs to be funded. At this moment there are doubts if the sectors would be in a position to commit resources. Some government-financing will probably be needed. If this is not possible, we have to look for other ways. In that regard Margrita mentions the PROWAD-LINK application. Rüdiger also suggests that it seems contradictory to initiate a bottom-up process aimed at involving stakeholders in a purely top-down approach and that it would make sense to determine what incentives could induce these stakeholders to participate by asking the stakeholders themselves.

The meeting agrees that a short survey is needed to ask the sectors what is needed for them to reach an added value, how the PC can support that and in what role, and in which way the sectors can contribute to the new concept. This can be done by a few low-key focus-group meetings or some interviews.

### **Questions for the focus-groups/interviews**

The following questions were formulated for the interviews/focus-groups:

1. In what way (if any) do you currently deal with WSWH?
2. How do you benefit from this?
3. How can the WSWH be (further) activated for you?
4. How do you feel you could benefit from the WSWH in future?
5. How do you feel the WSWH could benefit from your involvement?
6. What can a potential PC deliver to make the WSWH a success and to offer ?additional value?
7. In what way could you envision contributing to the PC?
8. How do you see your position in the governance of the PC?

Before we ask the questions it is wise to frame the background of the group meetings and the interviews. In the format for the interviews/focus-group we need to introduce the idea behind the PC. Also we need to temper unrealistic expectations.

### **Who does what?**

The meeting agreed on the following approach:

- Anja organizes (via Hans Ullrich and Herman Verheij) a meeting with the green NGO's/Waddensea Team.
- Pending approval from WSB 18 Anja will discuss the positions of the education sector regarding the PC with the IWSS-partners
- Peter organizes a meeting with Danish (private) tourism entrepreneurs
- Jouke coordinates trilaterally the science institutes by drafting a document which reflects their position regarding the PC
- Kees interviews the representatives of the recreation-sector in the Netherlands and some (private) tourism entrepreneurs
- Hubertus and Margrita coordinate the interviews with the recreations entrepreneurs/representatives in Germany.

### **Planning**

The short survey should be finalized and a summary report produced by the end of 2016. Depending on the outcome of the meetings/interviews a trilateral, cross-sectoral workshop or general focus-group in the first quarter of 2017 is envisioned, to reflect on the results, but also try to involve the sectors already.

### **Other actions**

The meeting also agrees that Rüdiger will inform and ask for endorsement of this approach to the HLG asap, because waiting for the next WSB will take too much time.

The meeting also agreed, cf. the WSB request, to inform the WSF about the progress and the next steps and invite them to submit any names of key-persons to be involved in the process steps as described above.