



TEXTS ADOPTED

P10_TA(2026)0181

The impact of the implementation of the Maritime Spatial Planning Directive 2014/89/EU on fisheries in selected fishing areas and sea basins

European Parliament resolution of 20 May 2026 on the impact of the implementation of Directive 2014/89/EU, the Maritime Spatial Planning Directive, on fisheries in selected fishing areas and sea basins (2024/2126(INI))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to Directive 2014/89/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2014 establishing a framework for maritime spatial planning¹ (Maritime Spatial Planning Directive or MSP Directive),
- having regard to Directive 2008/56/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 establishing a framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy (Marine Strategy Framework Directive)²,
- having regard to Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on the Common Fisheries Policy, amending Council Regulations (EC) No 1954/2003 and (EC) No 1224/2009 and repealing Council Regulations (EC) No 2371/2002 and (EC) No 639/2004 and Council Decision 2004/585/EC³ (Common Fisheries Policy Regulation),
- having regard to Regulation (EU) 2021/1139 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 July 2021 establishing the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund and amending

¹ OJ L 257, 28.8.2014, p. 135, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2014/89/oj>.

² OJ L 164, 25.6.2008, p. 19, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2008/56/oj>.

³ OJ L 354, 28.12.2013, p. 22, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2013/1380/oj>.

Regulation (EU) 2017/1004⁴,

- having regard to Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora⁵ (Habitats Directive),
- having regard to Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds⁶ (Birds Directive),
- having regard to the Commission report of 3 May 2022 outlining the progress made in implementing Directive 2014/89/EU establishing a framework for maritime spatial planning (COM(2022)0185),
- having regard to EU legislation on water quality and pollution control (the Water Framework Directive⁷, Directive 2008/105/EC⁸, Directive (EU) 2024/3019⁹, Council Directive 91/676/EEC¹⁰,

⁴ OJ L 247, 13.7.2021, p. 1, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2021/1139/oj>.

⁵ OJ L 206, 22.7.1992, p. 7, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/1992/43/oj>.

⁶ OJ L 20, 26.1.2010, p. 7, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2009/147/oj>.

⁷ Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy (OJ L 327, 22.12.2000, p. 1, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2000/60/oj>).

⁸ Directive 2008/105/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on environmental quality standards in the field of water policy, amending and subsequently repealing Council Directives 82/176/EEC, 83/513/EEC, 84/156/EEC, 84/491/EEC, 86/280/EEC and amending Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L 348, 24.12.2008, p. 84, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2008/105/oj>).

⁹ Directive (EU) 2024/3019 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 November 2024 concerning urban wastewater treatment (OJ L, 2024/3019, 12.12.2024, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2024/3019/oj>).

¹⁰ Council Directive 91/676/EEC of 12 December 1991 concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources (OJ L 375, 31.12.1991, p. 1, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/1991/676/oj>).

Directive 2005/35/EC¹¹ and Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006¹²),

- having regard to the Commission communication of 20 May 2020 entitled ‘EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030 – Bringing nature back into our lives’ (COM(2020)0380) and to Parliament’s resolution of 9 June 2021 thereon¹³,
- having regard to the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries of 1995 of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), in particular Article 10 thereof,
- having regard to the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication,
- having regard to the Commission communication of 5 June 2025 entitled ‘The European Ocean Pact’ (COM(2025)0281),
- having regard to its resolution of 7 July 2021 on the impact on the fishing sector of offshore wind farms and other renewable energy systems¹⁴,
- having regard to its resolution of 6 October 2022 entitled ‘Momentum for the ocean: strengthening ocean governance and biodiversity’¹⁵,
- having regard to its resolution of 9 May 2023 on co-management of fisheries in the EU and the contribution of the fisheries sector for the implementation of management measures¹⁶,
- having regard to its resolution of 18 January 2024 on the state of

¹¹ Directive 2005/35/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 September 2005 on ship-source pollution and on the introduction of penalties for infringements (OJ L 255, 30.9.2005, p. 11, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2005/35/oj>).

¹² Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), establishing a European Chemicals Agency, amending Directive 1999/45/EC and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 793/93 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 as well as Council Directive 76/769/EEC and Commission Directives 91/155/EEC, 93/67/EEC, 93/105/EC and 2000/21/EC (OJ L 396, 30.12.2006, p. 1, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2006/1907/oj>).

¹³ European Parliament resolution of 9 June 2021 on the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030: Bringing nature back into our lives (OJ C 67, 8.2.2022, p. 25).

¹⁴ OJ C 99, 1.3.2022, p. 88.

¹⁵ OJ C 132, 14.4.2023, p. 106.

¹⁶ OJ C, C/2023/1060, 15.12.2023, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/C/2023/1060/oj>.

play in the implementation of the Common Fisheries Policy and future perspectives¹⁷,

- having regard to the Commission communication of 12 May 2021 entitled 'Strategic guidelines for a more sustainable and competitive EU aquaculture for the period 2021 to 2030' (COM(2021)0236),
 - having regard to the Commission staff working document (SWD(2025)0003) accompanying the document entitled 'Report from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the Commission's assessment of the Member States' programmes of measures as updated under Article 17 of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (2008/56/EC)',
 - having regard to Special report 25/2023 by the European Court of Auditors entitled 'EU aquaculture policy – Stagnating production and unclear results despite increased EU funding',
 - having regard to the briefing entitled 'Fisheries in maritime spatial planning' published by its Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services in October 2025,
 - having regard to the study entitled 'Implementation of the Maritime Spatial Planning Directive: Impact on fisheries in selected fishing areas and sea basins' published by its Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services in December 2025,
 - having regard to the 2022 Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework,
 - having regard to the report of September 2019 by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change entitled 'Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate',
 - having regard to Rule 55 of its Rules of Procedure, as well as Article 1(1)(e) of, and Annex 3 to, the decision of the Conference of Presidents of 12 December 2002 on the procedure for granting authorisation to draw up own-initiative reports,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Fisheries (A10-0120/2026),
- A. whereas increased competition for access to maritime space from various activities and sectors, such as fisheries, aquaculture, maritime transport, shipping, offshore renewable energy, nature conservation, the conservation of marine cultural heritage, coastal tourism, recreational activities, operations to extract and dispose of sea floor sediments through dredging, the use of underwater cables

¹⁷ OJ C, C/2024/5734, 17.10.2024, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/C/2024/5734/oj>.

and pipelines, or defence, is resulting in increased cumulative pressure on marine ecosystems and increased conflict over the use of maritime space, which is amplified by institutional and administrative fragmentation;

- B. whereas fisheries and aquaculture are strategic sectors for the security and sovereignty of the EU, particularly in terms of food security and maritime sovereignty, and contribute to the competitiveness and resilience of coastal communities; whereas EU fishery products are healthy and often locally sourced, offering one of the best profiles in terms of low greenhouse gas emissions per unit of edible animal protein; whereas the strategic value of these sectors should therefore be duly recognised in maritime spatial planning (MSP);
- C. whereas in 2022, the EU's self-sufficiency in seafood declined to 37,5 % and around 80 % of seafood consumed in the EU was imported, which creates a structural dependence on outside sources and weakens the EU's food sovereignty; whereas at the same time, the EU's fishing fleet has experienced a significant reduction over the past decade, and is now more than 13 % smaller than in 2014; whereas this contraction, coupled with increasing competition for the use of maritime space, threatens the economic viability of the fisheries sector, generational renewal and the ability of the fleet to contribute to the EU's food security; whereas ensuring sufficient, balanced and predictable access to maritime space is therefore essential for developing competitive EU fisheries, as recognised by the European Ocean Pact;
- D. whereas a changing geopolitical context and growing tensions could lead to an increased military use of maritime space; whereas MSP must take into account defence and security-related activities and operations, such as the surveillance of exclusive economic zones, the protection of maritime trade, joint military exercises, the combating of illicit trafficking, mine clearance, the combating of piracy, and aerial and satellite surveillance, and their interactions with economic activities related to the sea and the marine environment;
- E. whereas the European Court of Auditors, in its Special report 22/2023 entitled 'Offshore renewable energy in the EU', pointed to the risk of job losses in the fisheries sector; whereas the report pointed to a lack of quantification of the key economic effects on fisheries resulting from offshore renewable energy development and stated that the potential negative consequences of offshore renewable energy development on the fisheries sector should be better identified and addressed; whereas it also noted that an improved fish population on a larger scale is uncertain but some fish density increases in offshore renewable energy areas have been observed, indicating potential benefits for fishers and fisheries;

- F. whereas the EU has set a legally binding target to put in place effective and area-based restoration measures in at least 20 % of its sea area by 2030;
- G. whereas the EU has committed to protecting at least 30 % of its sea area by 2030;
- H. whereas the MSP Directive establishes a common framework for the Member States to organise the use of their marine waters and aims to promote the sustainable development and sustainable growth of the blue economy and to reduce conflict between sectors, while not in itself introducing new sector-specific obligations; whereas the directive tends to favour the expansion of capital-intensive and spatially exclusive economic activities, which could marginalise traditional, mobile and collective uses of the sea, in particular fishing;
- I. whereas the EU has provided a framework for MSP, including mechanisms for cross-border cooperation; whereas coastal Member States are responsible for adopting plans under the framework, including designing and determining the format and content of such plans, in line with their administrative tradition, and distributing maritime space to different activities and uses respectively;
- J. whereas the MSP Directive contributes to environmental protection by promoting the sustainable use of maritime space and marine resources and requires Member States to apply an ecosystem-based approach; whereas it seeks to ensure an effective balance between environmental, social and economic objectives, without systematically subordinating traditional activities in relation to others;
- K. whereas the MSP Directive is closely linked to the implementation of other EU legislation, such as the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, the Common Fisheries Policy Regulation, the Habitats Directive, the Birds Directive and the Water Framework Directive; whereas it is also linked to legally and non-legally binding policy commitments, such as the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework;
- L. whereas following the adoption of the MSP Directive, the 22 Member States with a coastline were required to appoint competent authorities by 2016 and to adopt national maritime spatial plans for their marine waters by 31 March 2021; whereas eight Member States did not comply with that deadline;
- M. whereas 20 out of the 22 Member States with a coastline have adopted maritime spatial plans so far, and many are now in the process of revising them;
- N. whereas when developing maritime spatial plans, Member States

must consider environmental, economic, social and safety aspects, land-sea interactions and cross-border cooperation, and must ensure the early, continuous and effective involvement of all relevant stakeholders, including fishers and shellfish gatherers and their representative organisations, and communities in the outermost regions, through a bottom-up approach and throughout the decision-making process, ensuring that this involvement is appropriate, meaningful and not limited to a merely consultative role;

- O. whereas the degree of implementation of the MSP Directive varies considerably from one Member State to another, owing to differences in administrative and governance structures, ranging from localised to more centralised systems; whereas the effects of MSP vary greatly depending on the sea basins and territories concerned, with some coastal regions facing a higher concentration of spatial restrictions and competing uses, thereby exacerbating territorial imbalances within the EU;
- P. whereas Member States must coordinate their plans with other relevant Member States and cooperate with the authorities in non-EU countries in the marine region concerned; whereas given the differences between various marine regions or sub-regions and coastal zones, a one-size-fits-all approach is not seen as appropriate for such cooperation;
- Q. whereas the maritime spatial plans vary greatly in nature and content, as the MSP Directive does not give detailed binding criteria for the plans and allows Member States considerable flexibility regarding the implementation and detailed design of the plans;
- R. whereas there is a strong need for MSP in areas with a high concentration of activity and limited maritime space, such as the Channel, the Baltic Sea and the Mediterranean Sea;
- S. whereas MSP should contribute to the territorial cohesion of the EU, in accordance with Article 174 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union; whereas fishing and aquaculture are not only economic activities but play a fundamental social role in providing livelihoods, maintaining employment and preserving the social and cultural fabric of coastal and island communities, particularly in peripheral and the outermost regions;
- T. whereas the fisheries and aquaculture sectors are facing several challenges, such as pressure from the declining state of marine ecosystems and the uneven deployment of marine conservation measures and pressure from emerging blue economy sectors such as offshore renewable energy;
- U. whereas well-managed and effectively protected networks of ecologically connected marine protected areas are an essential tool for conserving marine biodiversity and can contribute to long-term

gains through stock recovery, spillover to adjacent areas, and resilience for coastal economies, but their effectiveness and social acceptability depend on how they are designed, managed and coordinated with sustainable fishing activities, in particular through differentiated approaches based on scientific data and the participation of all stakeholders, including fishers and coastal communities;

- V. whereas offshore renewable energy will only be sustainable if it has no negative impact on the environment and on economic, social and territorial cohesion, especially in fisheries-dependent regions;
- W. whereas it remains the competence of the Member States to decide on their national energy mix and technologies;
- X. whereas the increasing loss of fishing grounds is leading to the displacement of fishing activities, increased pressure on fishing and competition between fleets, and the disappearance of certain segments that cannot relocate their activities, particularly in small-scale fisheries, including fishers on foot, such as shellfish gatherers; whereas this also affects social cohesion, employment and the handing down of maritime traditions;
- Y. whereas in accordance with the common fisheries policy, Member States are authorised to restrict fishing access, within a zone of 12 nautical miles from their coastline, and for the outermost regions within 100 nautical miles, to fishing vessels that traditionally fish in those waters from ports on the adjacent coast;
- Z. whereas maritime and coastal areas are suffering the consequences of climate change and pollution, particularly from chemical pollutants and marine or land-based litter, which also affect activities related to the sea, marine biodiversity and fishery and aquaculture resources;
- AA. whereas the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the EU and the consequences of Brexit have profoundly altered the spatial, economic and fisheries balance in several sea basins, in particular the Channel, the North Sea and western waters, leading to an increased concentration of EU fishing activities in more restricted sea areas;
- AB. whereas maritime professionals, such as fishers, may face certain risks or dangers related to vessel safety or exposure to certain types of trafficking via maritime routes, such as drug trafficking;
- AC. whereas workers in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors should enjoy safe, fair and decent working conditions and adequate social protection; whereas MSP decisions can have a direct impact on the safety, income and working conditions of those professionals;
- AD. whereas many of the maritime spatial plans only cover marine

spaces and do not include land-sea interactions and in particular the effects of land-based pollution on marine ecosystems;

- AE. whereas the implementation of an ecosystem-based approach is insufficient or lacking, as many Member States are struggling to apply it in practice and to align the requirements of the MSP Directive with those of other legislation such as the Common Fisheries Policy Regulation or the Marine Strategy Framework Directive;
- AF. whereas Member States have not yet reached the 2020 target of 'Good Environmental Status' for Europe's seas, as required by the Marine Strategy Framework Directive;
- AG. whereas the collection, transparency, accessibility, harmonisation and reasonably expeditious processing of data are key to determining how fisheries and aquaculture are included in MSP; whereas there is a lack of comprehensive data on exclusive economic zones and there are difficulties integrating data across different sectors and obtaining data from national authorities; whereas the allocation of funding to those kinds of data collection activities could be improved;

Implementation of the MSP Directive and its impact on fisheries and aquaculture

1. Highlights the fact that, while the MSP Directive provides a relevant cross-sectoral framework for cooperation, it has been implemented unevenly by the Member States;
2. Welcomes the fact that some Member States are well advanced in implementing the MSP Directive, with integrated national strategies, dedicated bodies and sea-basin action plans;
3. Notes that maritime spatial plans are legally binding in some Member States and non-binding and more advisory in others; emphasises that the implementation in Member States is often hindered by institutional segmentation, fragmented governance and inadequate legal mechanisms or insufficient financial and human resources dedicated to those mechanisms and access to them, particularly through the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund for fisheries and aquaculture local action groups;
4. Highlights the fact that spatial planning of marine areas should include the identification of problems and opportunities, collection of planning data, decision-making and implementation, and that, as part of such planning, special attention should be paid to fisheries and aquaculture;

5. Emphasises that the implementation and effectiveness of MSP vary greatly across EU maritime regions, with some regions, such as the Baltic Sea or the North Sea, being largely covered by maritime spatial plans, while others, such as the Mediterranean Sea, have significantly less planning coverage;
6. Welcomes the Greater North Sea Basin Initiative, which brings together Member States and non-EU countries with the aim of achieving greater alignment and coordination on maritime spatial plans;
7. Highlights the fact that cross-border initiatives remain limited and effective coordination is lacking, hampering efforts to address shared challenges across interconnected marine regions; deplores the difficulties of cooperation on MSP between Member States and non-EU countries, in particular neighbouring coastal states;
8. Emphasises the effects of Brexit on maritime planning, in particular the development of marine protected areas and offshore renewable energy, but also other activities such as dense maritime transport and coastal tourism; highlights the fact that those changes have led to the exclusion of the EU fishing fleet from many fishing areas in British waters, and to a shift in fishing effort and high fishing pressure in the North Sea and Channel areas, to the detriment of EU fisheries; calls for MSP in these areas to systematically incorporate these elements;
9. Stresses the need for coordination between Member States and the United Kingdom in order to achieve effective and equitable management of the maritime basin and thus reduce the numerous conflicts of use, taking into account the economic, social and environmental dimensions of each activity; recalls, in this regard, the obligation under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, in particular under Articles 7 and 8, to cooperate across borders; calls, in particular, for genuine consultation with the United Kingdom and the Channel Islands on management measures in marine protected areas that take into account the socio-economic consequences borne by EU fishers;
10. Stresses that the Mediterranean basin is particularly affected by the proliferation of offshore energy platforms and other infrastructure of this kind, which is significantly reducing the amount of space available for fisheries, limiting access to traditional fishing grounds and contributing to the fragmentation of maritime space; notes that, while the Member States are responsible for determining the use of infrastructure in these areas, their decisions have a direct impact on the use of traditional fishing grounds and therefore need to be integrated within MSP processes in a coherent way; notes that the development of maritime tourism also has an effect on fisheries operations in the sea basin;

11. Highlights the specific characteristics of the Adriatic Sea as a semi-enclosed and highly sensitive marine basin, subject to cumulative pressures from fisheries, aquaculture, maritime transport, tourism and coastal development; stresses that these pressures require a reinforced sea-basin and cross-border approach to MSP; calls on the Commission and the Member States concerned, in cooperation with neighbouring non-EU coastal countries, to strengthen coordination, data sharing and joint governance mechanisms in the Adriatic Sea; underlines the importance of small-scale and coastal fisheries for the sea basin and the importance of their integration into MSP, in order to safeguard their economic viability and cultural heritage;
12. Emphasises that the Baltic Sea is characterised by a number of unique features, including its status as a semi-enclosed sea basin, its high concentration of different types of economic activity, including fisheries, maritime transport and the expansion of marine renewable energy, and the vulnerability of its ecosystem; calls, in this regard, for an approach to MSP that is sustainable and adjusted to those regional conditions; commends the ongoing work of the joint HELCOM-VASAB Maritime Spatial Planning Working Group, which is providing a firm foundation for sea-basin level coordination in the Baltic Sea;
13. Stresses that the maritime basins of the outermost regions must also be included in the implementation of the MSP Directive, taking their specific characteristics fully into account, including in interactions with non-EU countries;

Benefits of MSP for fisheries and aquaculture

14. Regrets the fact that the current MSP legal framework has not satisfactorily delivered the expected benefits for fisheries; notes that MSP has not substantially contributed to improving predictability and stability for fisheries activities; emphasises the lack of minimum targets and measurable environmental, social and economic indicators for fisheries in MSP, especially for small-scale operators; stresses the need for a coherent and effective implementation of EU maritime policy;
15. Highlights, for the purpose of implementation of the MSP framework, the importance of performing a comprehensive socio-economic analysis, which incorporates the viewpoints of small businesses and coastal communities; recalls the importance of fisheries and aquaculture in food sovereignty and in preserving related know-how for the EU and recognises that it is in the public interest that greater account be taken of their importance in MSP;
16. Stresses that MSP must better integrate fisheries and aquaculture and actively address the spatial challenges affecting fisheries, including the cumulative effects of offshore energy, marine protected

areas, shipping and defence zones, and avoid the progressive marginalisation of fishing activities; stresses that offshore windfarms should, whenever possible, be placed in zones that are less suitable for fishing, in order to minimise negative impacts on fisheries operations;

17. Emphasises the essential role of small-scale fishing, such as in local employment, social cohesion and the preservation of traditional skills; calls for MSP to take this segment fully into account, particularly in terms of access to space, proximity to fishing grounds and the safety of activities;
18. Notes that offshore windfarms can have an impact on fisheries by changing the spatial distribution and abundance of commercially fished marine species and by imposing restrictions on access, for safety reasons, or on fishing methods; notes that, while some potential benefits for fishers have been observed, these are only relevant if fishers are practically and feasibly able to operate in these areas;
19. Stresses that, while the MSP legal framework brings marginal benefits to aquaculture, improvements are needed in the designation of maritime space, further recognition of the role of aquaculture within the framework, cross-border coherence, legal certainty and the timeline and impact of licensing procedures; emphasises, in particular, the need for better incorporation of aquaculture in MSP and the consideration of other actions, such as the development of a possible common aquaculture policy, in order to take into account more effectively this key sector for EU food security;
20. Emphasises that the objective of minimising conflict between the various sectors and users of the sea has not been substantially fulfilled, particularly with regard to fisheries and aquaculture, including shellfish farming and emerging sectors such as seaweed farming, which have seen a reduction in the spaces available to them, affecting their competitiveness and the possibilities for the development of their activities;
21. Stresses that the nature of conflict over the use of maritime space varies according to the type of fisheries and aquaculture activities concerned, and that such activities may also compete with one another for maritime space; emphasises that the main conflicts affecting fisheries are the loss of fishing grounds due to the exclusion of maritime zones, access restrictions, competition for access, spatial fragmentation and the declining state of several marine ecosystems, while the main conflicts affecting aquaculture are zoning overlaps, environmental concerns such as pollution and eutrophication, and capture competition;
22. Recalls that fisheries and aquaculture are dependent on the

geographical location of marine resources and the healthy state of marine ecosystems, and that they are strongly linked to the seafood value chain and employment in coastal regions and therefore not suited for relocation;

23. Emphasises that fisheries do not benefit from priority or dedicated areas and often have to operate in unallocated maritime spaces and are increasingly being squeezed out by other activities; notes that, while aquaculture, including seaweed farming, is in principle more suitable for reserved areas, approaches vary greatly between and even within Member States, and licensing procedures are often burdensome;
24. Highlights the fact that, while some Member States have established multi-use zones, they mainly take a project-based approach; emphasises that a multi-use approach is proving very difficult to implement for certain activities, particularly when combining fisheries, biodiversity protection and marine renewable energy; notes that a multi-use approach also raises insurance and security concerns for fishers and aquaculture professionals; emphasises that, while multi-use zones could hold potential in addressing the cumulative impacts of human activities, more research is needed to assess their feasibility and impact; points out that the designation of such zones should be based on an assessment of the economic, social and environmental impact of the different activities undertaken therein, which needs to be undertaken with the proper involvement, throughout the process, of operators from all the relevant sectors as well as other relevant stakeholders;
25. Welcomes successful examples of co-location of activities, such as fixed or floating offshore wind infrastructure that can also be used to develop aquaculture, shellfish and algae farming and for the protection of habitats for marine fauna and flora or regenerative activities and for fisheries activities such as passive and low-impact fisheries; highlights, in that regard, the need for increased exchange of good practices and for more research, especially in relation to ecological impact and economic potential;
26. Urges the Member States to take into account the impact of offshore renewable energy on the marine ecosystem and fisheries when determining their energy mix;
27. Emphasises that land-sea coordination remains a critical weakness in the implementation of MSP, with particular reference to the failure to take into account the effects of land-based pollution on marine ecosystems when implementing measures to protect biodiversity;
28. Points out the importance of fisheries and port infrastructure and related facilities and the need to ensure that MSP is coherent in relation to such infrastructure investments, in line with the EU ports

strategy, while taking into account the dependence of all maritime activities on effective land-sea coordination;

Stakeholder involvement and data collection

29. Emphasises that stakeholder and coastal community involvement in the MSP process has increased but remains constrained; regrets the fact that this involvement often lacks early and formal engagement and consultation, offering limited opportunity for genuine influence on planning decisions; welcomes, in this regard, the Commission's initiative to hold an implementation dialogue on MSP;
30. Notes good examples of stakeholder participation in some Member States, such as national consultations and participatory processes; regrets, however, the lack of binding provisions for Member States on stakeholder participation; notes that this hinders the participation of relevant stakeholders, such as fishers, aquaculture professionals, interest groups and members of the public who are affected, in consultation and decision-making processes, particularly regarding the location of offshore renewable energy projects;
31. Emphasises that fisheries and aquaculture are often overshadowed by other, more powerful or economically important sectors, such as offshore energy; takes note of reports of structural power imbalances between maritime sectors; deplores the fact that certain sectors and operators often bypass consultation processes, at the expense of less organised actors, such as small-scale fishers, including fishers on foot, such as shellfish gatherers; calls for comprehensive, accessible and inclusive consultation processes with all stakeholders and the creation of corrective governance mechanisms, including transparent guidelines aimed at ensuring balanced and transparent decision-making, alleviating the potential for conflict and creating a level playing field between fisheries and other sectors;
32. Deplores the lack of harmonised and comparable data on the state of the ocean and seas, fishery resources and the impact of climate change, as well as the lack of appropriate social and economic data, including the assessment of impacts of MSP on coastal communities; emphasises the lack of harmonisation of Member States' data collection systems;
33. Highlights the fact that data misalignment, such as incompatible geospatial baselines, and temporal mismatch, such as different revision cycles for maritime spatial plans, hinder the implementation of coherent MSP and an ecosystem-based approach; recalls that modelling, mapping and spatial analysis tools are decision-making aids and cannot replace democratic debate or political compromise;

Recommendations

34. Stresses the need for a more holistic approach and better

coordination of relevant EU legislation, in particular of the MSP Directive, the Common Fisheries Policy Regulation and the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, in order to ensure consistent and effective implementation of MSP, including the ecosystem-based approach, with the aim of contributing to the achievement of Good Environmental Status; underlines too that MSP must fully respect the common fisheries policy as the exclusive EU legislative framework for fisheries management and should therefore not be used to indirectly introduce fisheries management measures, especially if incompatible with the ambition to strengthen the role for fisheries activities in MSP;

35. Believes that maritime spatial plans should better reflect spatial, environmental and socio-economic needs, as well as the specific characteristics of each sea basin, including connected exclusive economic zones; stresses that the Member States should strengthen coordination between land-use and marine authorities when designing and implementing maritime spatial plans and when incorporating into the plans assessments of the impact of land-based activities on coastal waters; believes that Member States should take into account regional specificities, including the characteristics of island regions and the outermost regions, and should respect the administrative traditions in each Member State;
36. Stresses the need for Member States to strengthen coordination both between and within Member States, in particular between national and regional authorities, as well as cross-sectoral coordination among authorities responsible for environmental, fisheries, energy and transport policies, among other policies, when designing and implementing maritime spatial plans, in order to ensure a coherent, ecosystem-based and integrated approach;
37. Calls for the implementation of a bottom-up, balanced, multi-use approach to MSP that would aim to avoid adverse effects on marine resources and biodiversity, and therefore on fisheries and aquaculture, and would ensure that these activities are not excluded from the maritime space; considers that the development of certain activities related to the blue economy must not be at the expense of sustainable and resilient seafood production, food sovereignty and the preservation of marine biodiversity; believes, in this regard, that the strategic importance of food security should be better anchored in the forthcoming revision of the MSP Directive; calls, therefore, for fishing and aquaculture to be recognised as strategic sectors of major public interest which provide essential contributions to EU food sovereignty and food security and to strategic autonomy and coastal employment, and that priority consideration should be given to them in MSP, particularly for segments that cannot be relocated;
38. Calls for an evidence-based approach to multi-use zones, recognising that coexistence between fisheries and offshore energy remains

limited in practice and should not be used to justify the exclusion of fisheries from maritime space; stresses that the multi-use approach should be pursued on the basis of technical and scientific criteria, reflecting the reality of how fishing and aquaculture actually operate; stresses that the designation of multi-use zones should be based on a cumulative impact assessment of the different activities undertaken therein and a rigorous analysis of navigability and safety; calls for all relevant sectors to be directly and properly involved throughout this process;

39. Considers that MSP must adopt a dynamic and adaptive approach, taking into account changes in the marine environment and marine resources, using regularly updated scientific and socio-economic data and indicators, particularly when establishing areas that could exclude fisheries activities such as offshore wind farms and designating certain marine protected areas; emphasises that the planning process should reflect the dynamic nature of fishing, with fleets often moving around depending on seasonal availability and stock movements, and certain types of fishing gear requiring considerable room in which to operate;
40. Calls for inclusive governance mechanisms that ensure the direct and structured involvement of relevant stakeholders such as fishers, including small-scale fishers, and regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs), where relevant, in the decision-making, monitoring and review processes for plans;
41. Emphasises the need to strengthen support for and systematically consider fisheries within MSP; supports the establishment of clear spatial zoning and priority zones for fisheries, taking into account the movement and development of fishery resources, the recognition of traditional fishing and aquaculture zones, the need for preservation and protection of the environment and the improvement of the state of fish stocks; emphasises that the zoning should be tailored to different fleet segments, as well as sea basins, and based on robust scientific and socio-economic assessments and indicators, in order to bring greater visibility and predictability to the fisheries sector; calls for mandatory assessment of the cumulative socio-economic impacts of fishing displacement, including the effects on the competitiveness of the EU fleet, its profitability, safety at sea and generational renewal;
42. Emphasises the need, in particular, for an increase in reserved areas dedicated to small-scale low impact inshore fishing within the 12 nautical mile zone and underpinned by co-management regimes;
43. Stresses the need to strengthen research into mapping and modelling fishing areas and fishery resources; considers that the delimitation of priority zones for fisheries and the planning of fishing activities must adopt a dynamic approach in order to adapt to the

phenomena of change and migration of fish stocks affecting historical distribution areas;

44. Calls on the Commission to propose a mechanism of compensatory measures or insurance schemes for the fisheries sector when its activities are displaced by alternative uses of the sea, including financial compensation measures, and to prioritise new compatible uses and support for the redesign of fishing routes, or technological investments;
45. Highlights the potential negative consequences of far-reaching restrictions on marine activities such as fisheries for coastal communities, not least in the island and outermost regions; calls for the development, implementation and review of maritime spatial plans to be accompanied in all cases by social and territorial impact assessments, focusing in particular on employment, working conditions, the safety of fishers and the sustainability of coastal communities, and to assess the biological and socio-economic effectiveness of fisheries restrictions and measures;
46. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to recognise fisheries as a strategic and priority user of maritime space, essential to EU food sovereignty and food security, coastal employment and strategic autonomy, and to reflect this status explicitly in maritime spatial plans and in the forthcoming revision of the MSP Directive;
47. Calls, in this respect, for a differentiated approach to the management of small-scale fisheries that includes preferential access within the 12 nautical mile zone for small-scale fisheries, low-impact activities and conservation projects;
48. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to further integrate aquaculture and shellfish farming, and fishing on foot, including shellfish gathering, into MSP and to recognise the ecosystem services provided by low-trophic and low-carbon aquaculture; calls on the Commission to consider further actions such as the development of a possible common aquaculture policy as a tool to facilitate this integration; calls for the designation in MSP of dedicated maritime spaces for sustainable aquaculture development zones, such as for low-carbon and low-trophic aquaculture; calls for licensing procedures to be facilitated and for regulatory barriers to the development of these activities to be reduced; stresses that licensing procedures need to be expedited and underpinned by clear environmental requirements with a view to maximising socio-economic benefits; calls for the provision of incentives to boost the sustainable development of aquaculture, especially low-trophic aquaculture, including diversification to non-feed species such as seaweed cultivation;
49. Emphasises the need for transparent, multi-stakeholder governance

- in MSP; calls on Member States to ensure the early, systematic, meaningful and continuous participation of the relevant stakeholders, including Advisory Councils and fishers, aquaculture farmers and shellfish farmers, at all stages of MSP design, processes, implementation, final outcomes and revision, and for the inclusion of transparent feedback on how stakeholder input is used in decision-making; calls for fair treatment of all stakeholders and coastal and island communities, regardless of their financial, administrative or organisational means, through transparent consultation formats;
50. Believes that co-management should be the model for governance and decision-making in MSP; emphasises the benefits of this model, which allows for the direct involvement of stakeholders, better management of fishery resources, the sharing of best practice and an approach tailored to local realities, particularly when it builds on existing and proven structures and on the practical knowledge of local fishing communities and other structures such as RFMOs; stresses that co-management can also help promote generational renewal in the sector and strengthen the economic resilience of small-scale and coastal fleets;
 51. Stresses the benefits of bottom-up structures for local MSP implementation, such as community-led local development and local action groups, local and regional authorities, fishers' and gatherers' organisations, women's organisations in fisheries and other organisations at local and regional levels;
 52. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to support the capacity building of stakeholders, particularly small-scale fishers, including fishers on foot, such as shellfish gatherers and their organisations, and coastal and island communities, including in the outermost regions, so that they are better equipped to actively and effectively participate in public consultations and decision-making processes relating to MSP; stresses the importance, in this regard, of supporting generational renewal and calls on Member States to ensure that spatial planning decisions do not create additional barriers for young people entering fisheries;
 53. Stresses that the designation of areas dedicated to offshore renewable energy or to the protection of marine ecosystems must take into account the impact on fisheries and aquaculture, including historical and traditional fishing grounds; insists on the need to systematically conduct assessments of the cumulative environmental and socio-economic impact prior to zone demarcation, and to ensure that the professionals affected, particularly fishers in the case of offshore wind farm projects, are informed in advance and involved on a mandatory basis in consultations before decisions are taken; calls, in this regard, for assessments of the impact on the state of fishery resources and for the quantification of the key social and economic effects on fisheries resulting from offshore wind farms;

54. Stresses that measures to protect marine ecosystems must be based on sound scientific and socio-economic assessments and must be tailored to the protection needs of each area; emphasises that the establishment and management of different categories of marine protected areas, where compatible with conservation objectives, and the best available scientific advice, should allow for coexistence with sustainable fishing activities, including through appropriate, differentiated management measures and avoiding automatic exclusion; highlights also the potential of 'other effective area-based conservation measures';
55. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to systematically and scientifically assess the potential for co-use of maritime zones, including marine protected areas or offshore renewable energy, and to avoid treating different maritime zones as mutually exclusive; emphasises that the active involvement of all stakeholders and especially fishers in the design, management and evaluation of marine protected areas contributes to greater environmental effectiveness, greater acceptance of conservation measures and better integration of these areas into MSP; stresses that climate change and shifting fish stock distributions must be taken more fully into account, to ensure a flexible approach to zoning that reflects the dynamic nature of fisheries;
56. Calls on the Commission to support a more cross-border and sea-basin-based approach to MSP by promoting existing initiatives, such as the Greater North Sea Basin Initiative; calls on the Commission and Member States, together with coastal neighbouring states, to engage in joint management regional platforms, drawing on the example of the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (also known as the Helsinki Commission or HELCOM), including with a view to identifying shared fisheries corridors;
57. Calls on Member States to complement national plans with plans focused more on sea basins and to develop, where relevant, macro-regional planning strategies, including joint maritime spatial plans; urges Member States and non-EU countries, particularly neighbouring coastal states, to deepen their cooperation on MSP, particularly in the basins adjacent to the United Kingdom, the Mediterranean and the Baltic Sea; supports a stronger sea-basin approach to MSP, ensuring that fisheries are fully integrated into cross-border planning frameworks and not disadvantaged by fragmented national decisions;
58. Calls for enhanced cooperation on MSP between the EU, its Member States and non-EU countries; stresses the need for better coordination between the coastal states in the Channel; highlights specifically the case of the Channel regions, where cooperation with the United Kingdom and the Channel Islands must be improved, particularly with regard to the designation of marine protected

areas; believes that cooperation in this regard must include obligatory and transparent stakeholder consultation processes; calls for the EU, the UK and other relevant parties to establish a regional management plan for the Channel and the North Sea in order to ensure sustainable exploitation of resources and multi-annual management of fisheries;

59. Emphasises that such cooperation with non-EU countries must ensure a level playing field and avoid displacement of fishing effort to the detriment of EU fleets and fishing communities; calls on the Commission, therefore, to pursue a structured approach to dialogue and cooperation with neighbouring coastal countries in an effort to promote similar environmental, management and social standards and to be ready to take any measures necessary to protect EU interests;
60. Calls for the integration into MSP of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures and other relevant environmental measures, in order to tackle issues affecting fisheries and aquaculture, such as coastal erosion, rising water temperatures, invasive species, ocean acidification, pollution from both land-based and marine sources, and cumulative impacts; stresses that these solutions must be proportionate, adapted to local conditions and assessed in advance in terms of cost-effectiveness, avoiding one-size-fits-all approaches that do not take into account the realities of each sea basin; underlines that fishers can play a key role in monitoring, early detection and conservation efforts, provided that they are properly involved, trained and supported;
61. Emphasises the effects of coastal erosion and shoreline retreat on coastlines, especially on areas where aquaculture activities are established and developed; calls, in this regard, for an EU plan for coastal resilience, incorporating integrated coastal zone management, climate change mitigation and adaptation, land-sea interactions, marine and land pollution, coastal adaptation measures and targeted support for aquaculture; believes that Member States play an important role in this regard and that these effects must be taken into account in Member States' maritime spatial plans;
62. Is deeply concerned about the reform proposed by the Commission of the various structural funds and the new multiannual financial framework, which will significantly reduce the resources allocated to fisheries and thus jeopardise improvements in the implementation of the MSP Directive;
63. Stresses the need to allocate significant resources to data collection and scientific research, as well as to enhancing data sharing and coordination between Member States; believes that more standardised and harmonised data and methodologies will help to secure the place of fisheries and aquaculture in MSP; emphasises, in

this regard, the need to develop and update scientific data on the impact of climate change on marine aquatic resources, particularly in terms of changes in the geographical distribution of fish stocks, spawning grounds or the displacement of fish stocks;

64. Calls for improved and harmonised data collection and the systematic mapping of fishing activities as a precondition for fair and evidence-based MSP; calls on the Commission and Member States to use the best available and updated data and information;
65. Considers that the future European Ocean Observation Initiative, 'Ocean Eye', should strengthen and harmonise marine data collection, thereby contributing to improved MSP; calls, furthermore, for the potential of the European Digital Twin Ocean to be used to better understand and anticipate the effects of climate change on the state of the seas and marine resources, and to develop appropriate maritime planning strategies;
66. Stresses the need to dovetail MSP with the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund and Horizon Europe, including under the future multiannual financial framework, in order to foster research and innovation, including in areas specifically designated for sustainable and innovative uses; believes that the Commission and Member States should encourage the use of digital technologies such as European artificial intelligence tools to support MSP;
67. Calls on the Commission to rigorously monitor the implementation of the MSP Directive; considers that the next MSP Directive evaluation report should focus on the spatial implications for fisheries and aquaculture, stakeholder involvement and cross-border cooperation, and provide recommendations on how the MSP Directive could deliver better results in terms of environmental, social and economic sustainability; considers that MSP should be assessed in terms of spatial equity, understood as the equitable distribution of benefits and constraints among stakeholders, territories and generations, and not solely in terms of its economic or administrative efficiency;
68. Calls on the Commission to consolidate the European Maritime Spatial Planning Platform by providing examples of MSP projects, mapping tools and good practices; urges Member States to make greater use of this platform when developing their maritime spatial plans in order to facilitate transparent policy decisions without ruling out genuine consultation in the resolution of conflicts of use and interest;
69. Supports the revision of the MSP Directive as part of the 'Ocean Act' expected in late 2026; notes that the MSP Directive is being revised in parallel with the Marine Strategy Framework Directive; considers that this revision should establish a coherent framework to improve coordination between the existing legislation and regulatory

framework, by streamlining overlapping regulations, aligning objectives, streamlining existing targets and introducing minimum targets to be reached in maritime spatial plans, improving coherence between marine and terrestrial spatial planning, and establishing shared governance tools; believes that this revision should, in particular, make the provisions on the participation of stakeholders, especially fishers and coastal communities, legally binding, with more harmonised application by all Member States; believes that the proposed act should create synergy among the different regulations and sectors in a genuinely holistic coordination of policy, without imposing new sector-specific obligations; believes, furthermore, that minimum standards for securing space for fisheries and aquaculture must be introduced in order to contribute to food sovereignty strategic autonomy and the sustainability and competitiveness of the blue economy;

70. Considers that the revision of the MSP Directive should also strengthen the cross-border, multi-use approach to mitigate cumulative impacts and to improve the involvement of stakeholders; considers it also important to use the revision to reduce fragmentation and uncertainty for the EU fishing fleet;
71. Considers that the Ocean Act should involve all EU territories and take into account their specific characteristics, particularly in the case of the outermost and island regions; stresses the importance of the involvement of Parliament's Committee on Fisheries in the elaboration of the upcoming proposal, especially in relation to food sovereignty, the strategic role of fisheries and aquaculture and the effective implementation of the common fisheries policy;
72. Considers that the forthcoming review of the MSP Directive should be closely linked to the implementation of the Ocean Pact, to the provision of sufficient financial resources, particularly within the next multiannual financial framework, and to concrete actions, in order to ensure its effective implementation and avoid negative impacts on Member States and stakeholders; stresses that such resources must be sufficient, predictable and easily accessible, and that their use must prioritise measures with a tangible impact;
73. Calls on the Commission to fully integrate MSP into the development of its Vision 2040 for fisheries and aquaculture and to link these initiatives to the outcome of the evaluation of the common fisheries policy;

◦

◦ ◦

74. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and the Commission, and to the governments and parliaments of the

Member States.