Interreg South Baltic | Co-funded by the European Union | ECO MARINAS

SELF-LEARNING MODULE

Future-Proofing South Baltic Marinas

Challenges, Operational Realities & Proven Solutions

How to use this module

This document is designed for independent study. Work through each unit, engage with the data, reflect on the scenarios, and test yourself with the quiz. Estimated study time: 45–60 minutes. All statistics come from the D.2.1 ECOMARINAS Benchmarking Report — a survey of 62 marina stakeholders across Poland, Germany, Sweden, and Lithuania.

Learning Objectives	Module Contents
After completing this module you will be able to: • Describe the current state of Baltic marina sustainability based on real data • Identify the six key pressures facing modern marinas • Explain the most common operational blind spots • Evaluate nature-based, technological, and networked solutions • Build an immediate action plan for your marina	• Unit 1: The Strategic Context • Unit 2: What the Data Shows — Six Blind Spots • Unit 3: Barriers to Change • Unit 4: Three Proven Solutions • Unit 5: Global Models & Your Action Plan • Self-Assessment Quiz (10 questions) • Scenario Exercises • Key Terms Reference

Unit 1: The Strategic Context

This module is grounded in a real benchmarking study — the D.2.1 ECOMARINAS report — conducted across 62 marina stakeholders in Poland, Germany, Sweden, and Lithuania. Before exploring the data, it helps to understand the strategic context that makes this research urgent.

Operating in a Fragile Ecosystem

The Baltic Sea is not just the setting for marina operations. It is one of the most ecologically stressed water bodies in the world:

- 97% of the Baltic Sea is currently affected by eutrophication — the process where excess nutrients cause explosive algae growth, which then depletes oxygen and kills aquatic life. This is the worst rate of any regional sea on Earth.
- The Baltic is semi-enclosed, meaning pollutants introduced into it accumulate. There is no strong tidal flushing or current-driven exchange to dilute or remove pollution. What goes in, largely stays in.
- The Baltic's already elevated pollution load means that even small additional contributions from marinas — antifouling run-off, bilge discharges, stormwater from maintenance areas — matter more here than they would in open coastal waters.

> **The Marina's Dual Role**
> Marinas are described in the research as the 'critical interface between land and sea.' They are economically essential to Baltic coastal communities — but they are also potential hotspots for nutrient loading, chemical contamination, and the introduction of invasive species. The goal of this module is not to eliminate marinas but to equip their managers to be part of the solution.

The Research: Who Was Surveyed

The D.2.1 Benchmarking Report surveyed 62 stakeholders across four South Baltic countries. Key characteristics of the sample:

Countries	Poland, Germany, Sweden, Lithuania
Respondent roles	Marina owners, harbour masters, operational managers, and sustainability officers
Sustainability interest	Respondents scored an average of 3.8 out of 5 on interest in sustainability — high intent across the sector
Key insight	Operational managers are ready for change, but frequently lack owner buy-in to make investment decisions

Value of the data	This is the first systematic cross-border benchmark of South Baltic marina environmental performance — your peers' real-world situation, not theoretical standards

Reflection

Before reading the data findings in Unit 2, consider: what do you think the most common environmental shortcoming is in South Baltic marinas? Hold that assumption as you read — and see whether the data confirms or surprises you.

Unit 2: What the Data Shows — Six Operational Blind Spots

The benchmarking research identified six areas of significant environmental underperformance across the surveyed marina network. Each is presented below with the key statistic, an explanation of why it matters, and a reflection on what it means for your marina.

Blind Spot 1: Wastewater — The Pump-Out Gap

> **Key Statistic**
> Only 53% of surveyed marinas manage wastewater via pump-out stations.

This means nearly half of the surveyed marinas provide no legal pathway for visiting boats to discharge sewage. Under MARPOL Annex IV, vessels are prohibited from discharging untreated sewage within 3 nautical miles of the coast. If a marina does not provide a pump-out facility, boats with full holding tanks face a binary choice: hold it (and leave the marina with nowhere to go) or discharge illegally.

Without pump-out infrastructure ✗	With accessible pump-out infrastructure ✓
Boats discharge sewage into the basin — intentionally or as last resort	Legal, convenient disposal pathway reduces illegal dumping significantly
Marina risks regulatory enforcement as facilitator of non-compliance	Marina demonstrates MARPOL compliance and qualifies for certification
No ECOMARINAS wastewater indicator achievement possible	Wastewater indicator achieved; documented in maintenance log

Blind Spot 2: Hazardous Liquids — The 'Not Necessary' Mindset

> **Key Statistic**
> 56% of marinas have NO systems to prevent hazardous liquid spills (oils, fuel, grease).

The survey asked managers who lacked spill prevention systems why. The most common answer was 'Not Necessary.' This represents a mindset problem — not just an infrastructure gap. Managers who have not experienced a visible, documented spill underestimate the probability and the consequence. Fuel and oil spills are the most common and most immediately damaging pollution events at marinas, forming a surface film that immediately affects water oxygen exchange and impacts wildlife.

- A spill kit costs less than €100. A secondary containment tray for a fuel tank costs a few hundred euros. The regulatory fine for an uncontained spill into the marina basin can run to tens of thousands.
- Beyond cost: a fuel spill is visible. It will be photographed by boaters and reported. It will reach regulators before the manager has had time to respond.

Self-Check

Go to your fuel dock mentally. Can you immediately locate: (1) a spill kit, (2) absorbent booms, (3) a written spill response procedure, (4) an emergency contact number? If any of these are missing or unclear, you have identified a priority improvement.

Blind Spot 3: Invasive Species — Underestimated Risk

Key Statistic

37% of respondents believe invasive species prevention measures are 'Not Necessary.'

Hull fouling — the accumulation of marine organisms on a vessel's hull — is the primary mechanism by which non-native species are transported between water bodies. The Baltic, with its unique brackish conditions, is particularly vulnerable: species that survive the journey on a hull from the North Sea or Atlantic may find the Baltic's low salinity actually hospitable, since they face less competition from native saltwater species.

- Currently, the Baltic has essentially 0% coordinated invasive species preparedness across the marina network. No Baltic country has implemented the kind of systematic 'Clean Hull' check-in protocol that New Zealand uses.
- The low-cost intervention: a simple visual hull inspection form at the berth registration desk. Staff do not need specialist training — they need a checklist and a protocol for what to do if fouling is detected.

Blind Spot 4: Water Quality Monitoring — No Data, No Action

Without baseline water quality data, marina managers cannot detect eutrophication spikes, identify pollution sources, or demonstrate improvement over time. The benchmarking research found that water quality monitoring is absent in the majority of surveyed marinas — meaning that the very information needed to justify and target environmental investments is missing.

- Basic monitoring does not require expensive laboratory analysis. Simple visual monitoring (water clarity, algae presence, surface films) and low-cost instruments for pH and turbidity provide meaningful baseline data.
- Data also protects managers: if an incident occurs near the marina, historical monitoring records can demonstrate whether the marina was a contributing source.

Blind Spot 5: Solid Waste — Collection Without Circularity

> **Key Statistics**
> Good news: most marinas have basic collection (sufficient trash cans, regular cleanups). Bad news: only 7 respondents confirmed having specific recycling facilities.

The gap between waste collection and waste management is the core finding here. Having bins is not the same as managing waste. True waste management requires separation at source, appropriate storage of hazardous fractions, and collection by licensed contractors with documented disposal pathways.

Country	Plastic Reduction Measures	Key Implication
Germany	73% have measures	*Strong regulatory environment and environmental culture drive performance*
Sweden	86% have measures	*Highest performer — combination of national policy, marina culture, and boater expectations*
Lithuania	71% have NO measures	*Significant gap — policy environment and funding access likely key factors*
Poland	Intermediate	*Variation within country suggests individual marina leadership matters*

Blind Spot 6: Microplastics — Awareness Without Infrastructure

Awareness of microplastic pollution is growing across the Baltic marina sector, and tools like Seabins (floating waste collectors) are increasingly known. However, actual deployment of microplastic collection infrastructure is still minimal. Awareness without action is the defining characteristic of this blind spot.

Unit 3: Why Change is Difficult — Barriers to Action

The benchmarking research did not just measure what marinas are failing to do. It asked why. Understanding the barriers to change is essential for developing realistic pathways forward. The research identified three primary structural hurdles:

Barrier	What This Means in Practice
Funding	Environmental infrastructure upgrades — pump-out stations, waste segregation systems, shore power, spill containment — require capital investment that marina budgets rarely accommodate. Grant programmes exist (ECOMARINAS, LIFE, national environmental funds) but application processes are burdensome for small teams.
Regulatory clarity	Managers report receiving contradictory guidance from different authorities about what is actually required, at what standard, and by what deadline. Compliance becomes difficult when the goalposts are unclear. Consistent, proportionate, and plain-language regulatory guidance would significantly improve voluntary compliance rates.
Owner buy-in	The benchmarking report's most practically important finding: operational managers are ready for change, but often lack the authority to make investment decisions. Marina owners and boards, who control capital budgets, are one step removed from daily operations and do not experience the environmental pressures directly. Closing the buy-in gap requires presenting compliance as a business case, not just an obligation.

> **Key Insight**
> Acknowledging barriers honestly is not defeatism — it is the starting point for realistic strategy. The solutions in Unit 4 are selected precisely because they address these barriers: they are low-cost, visible, and scalable without major capital decisions.

Unit 4: Three Proven Solutions

The lecture presents three categories of proven solutions, drawn from real implementations across the Baltic and globally. Each solution addresses at least one of the six blind spots and at least one of the three barriers.

Solution 1: Nature-Based Solutions

Floating Wetlands — Case Study from Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, Germany

Artificial floating wetland islands are platforms made from natural materials, planted with selected macrophytes (water plants) and moored within the marina basin.

- How they work: Macrophytes absorb nitrogen and phosphorus directly from the water column through their root systems. These are the primary nutrients driving eutrophication. By removing them at source within the marina, the technology directly addresses the most serious ecological problem in the Baltic.
- Additional benefit: The installation is visible and often accompanied by an information board explaining its purpose. This creates an environmental education function — boaters and visitors understand why the installation is there and what it is doing.
- Cost and practicality: Floating wetlands are significantly cheaper than engineered filtration systems, require minimal maintenance (seasonal planting/trimming), and can be scaled from small pilot installations to full marina coverage over time.
- Barrier addressed: This solution requires modest capital investment — manageable for most marinas — and produces a visible, photogenic result that supports the business case for further investment.

Solution 2: Technological Interventions

Two specific technologies are highlighted in the benchmarking research as particularly relevant to Baltic marina conditions:

BATSECO-BOAT Pump-Out Network (Finland, Sweden, Estonia)

- Context: 50% of boats in the study area were discharging sewage prior to the intervention.
- Action: 20 pump-out stations were upgraded and made more accessible across the three-country network.
- Result: Improved accessibility directly reduced illegal dumping — the lesson being that boats that can easily and affordably discharge sewage legally will do so.
- Design insight: Accessibility means easy boat approach (appropriate dock design), clear signage, working equipment at the start of every season, and user-friendly operation. A pump-out station that requires a dinghy to reach, or that breaks down every other week, will not be used.

Seabin & PortBin Floating Waste Collectors

- Function: Floating devices that skim surface debris, oils, and microplastics from the water surface.
- Performance: Collect up to 1.5 kg of waste per day under normal marina conditions.
- Deployment: Successfully used in Kołobrzeg, Poland, among other Baltic locations.
- Value beyond waste collection: Seabins are visible. Boaters see them working. They communicate environmental commitment in a tangible, memorable way and are frequently photographed by marina visitors.

Solution 3: The Power of the Network

The benchmarking research identified isolation as a systemic problem in the Baltic marina sector. Individual marinas independently discover (or fail to discover) solutions that other marinas have already tested and implemented. This 'reinventing the wheel' dynamic slows the entire sector's progress.

> **The Network Solution**
> The Sustainable Sailing Infrastructure Forum in Gdansk (2027) and cross-border study visits — both ECOMARINAS initiatives — are designed to break this isolation. Knowledge-sharing across national borders accelerates adoption of proven solutions and reduces the cost of innovation for individual marinas.

- Collective benefits: Shared procurement of waste services or technology can reduce costs for individual marinas. Shared monitoring data builds a regional picture of environmental performance.
- For marina managers specifically: Attending cross-border events and bringing back documented evidence of what works elsewhere is one of the most effective ways to build the business case for owner investment.

Unit 5: Global Models & Your Action Plan

What the World Teaches the Baltic

Three international models from the benchmarking research offer direct lessons for Baltic marina managers:

Model	Baltic Lesson
USA: Clean Vessel Act	Dedicated federal grant programme for pump-out station construction. Within a decade, pump-out infrastructure became widely accessible and no-discharge zone violations declined sharply. Lesson: The 47% pump-out gap in the Baltic is solvable — but it requires dedicated public funding, not just regulatory enforcement.
USA (Ohio): Green Infrastructure at Holiday Harbor Marina	Permeable pavements and bioswale drainage channels filter phosphorus from stormwater run-off before it reaches the marina basin. Lesson: Land-based interventions — not just water-surface technologies — can significantly reduce a marina's nutrient contribution.
New Zealand: Biofouling 'Clean Hull' Rules	Mandatory hull inspection before arrival at New Zealand ports, driven by invasive species biosecurity. Lesson: The Baltic's 37% 'Not Necessary' attitude to invasive species mirrors pre-regulation New Zealand. A voluntary check-in protocol is the first step; the technology and evidence base now exist to make it mandatory.

Your 90-Day Action Plan

The benchmarking report proposes a three-category action plan for immediate implementation. Use the checklist below to identify your starting point:

Category	Immediate Action	Done?
Infrastructure	Install differentiated bins: hazardous, plastic, and organic waste — clearly labelled and multilingual	☐
Infrastructure	Invest in pump-out station accessibility: approach design, signage, and start-of-season serviceability check	☐
Monitoring	Start basic water quality records — visual monitoring, simple turbidity and pH measurements, logged weekly	☐
Monitoring	Implement hull 'Check-in' protocol: visual biofouling inspection form at berth registration	☐

Operations	Review waste fee structure: incentivise delivery, do not penalise it	☐
Operations	Train all staff on spill response procedure — produce laminated cards for fuel dock and maintenance area	☐
Operations	Document one environmental improvement made this season with before/after evidence for ECOMARINAS certification	☐

Self-Assessment Quiz

Test your understanding of the module content. Read each question, select your answer, then reveal the answer and explanation below. Aim for 7 or more correct.

Question 1

What percentage of the Baltic Sea is currently affected by eutrophication?

a) Approximately 40%
b) Approximately 65%
c) Approximately 97%
d) Less than 20% — it is improving

✓ Correct Answer: c) 97%

The Baltic Sea has the highest rate of eutrophication of any regional sea in the world. Its shallow depth, semi-enclosed nature, and slow water exchange mean that nutrients accumulate rather than being diluted. This is the ecological context for all marina environmental obligations.

Question 2

What proportion of surveyed South Baltic marinas manage wastewater via pump-out stations?

a) Almost all — pump-out is standard practice
b) About 53% — just over half
c) About 80%
d) Less than 20%

✓ Correct Answer: b) About 53% — just over half

The 53% pump-out figure means nearly half of the surveyed network provides no legal sewage disposal pathway. This is the benchmarking report's most significant infrastructure finding — a systemic gap, not an individual compliance failure.

Question 3

The benchmarking report found that 56% of marinas lack systems to prevent hazardous liquid spills. What was the most common reason given?

a) Cost — they could not afford the equipment
b) Lack of awareness — they did not know such systems existed
c) 'Not Necessary' — a mindset that it is not a real risk
d) Regulatory uncertainty — they were unsure what was required

✓ Correct Answer: c) 'Not Necessary' — a mindset assessment

The 'Not Necessary' response reveals a cultural challenge as much as an operational one. Managers who have not experienced a documented spill tend to underestimate probability and consequence. This mindset is the primary obstacle to spill prevention investment.

Question 4

Floating wetlands (nature-based solution) reduce eutrophication in marina basins primarily through which mechanism?

a) They physically block algae from entering the marina
b) Macrophyte root systems absorb nitrogen and phosphorus directly from the water column
c) They increase water circulation and oxygenation
d) They filter sediment from the basin floor

✓ Correct Answer: b) Macrophyte roots absorb nitrogen and phosphorus

Macrophytes (aquatic plants) take up nutrients directly from the water through their root systems. By removing nitrogen and phosphorus — the primary drivers of eutrophication — at source within the marina basin, floating wetlands address the problem biologically rather than through engineering.

Question 5

What was the outcome of upgrading 20 pump-out stations across Finland, Sweden, and Estonia under the BATSECO-BOAT model?

a) Regulatory compliance increased but boater behaviour did not change
b) Improved accessibility led directly to reduced illegal sewage dumping
c) The stations were underused because boaters preferred other disposal methods
d) The project was discontinued due to maintenance costs

✓ Correct Answer: b) Improved accessibility led to reduced illegal dumping

The BATSECO-BOAT model demonstrates a key principle: when pump-out is accessible, convenient, and affordable, boats use it. The accessibility of infrastructure — not just its existence — is the critical variable. A pump-out station that is hard to reach will not reduce illegal dumping.

Question 6

According to the benchmarking data, what percentage of Lithuanian marina respondents have NO specific plastic reduction measures?

a) About 30%
b) About 50%
c) 71%
d) Almost none — Lithuania performs well on plastics

✓ Correct Answer: c) 71%

71% of Lithuanian respondents reported no specific plastic reduction measures, compared to 73% of German and 86% of Swedish marinas that DO have such measures. This national variation reflects differences in policy environment, funding access, and cultural norms around environmental management.

Question 7

What is identified as the primary mechanism by which invasive species are introduced to the Baltic Sea?

a) Ballast water discharge from commercial shipping
b) Hull fouling — organisms attached to vessel hulls that are transported between water bodies
c) Release of aquarium species by recreational boaters
d) Drift from other water bodies through connecting rivers

✓ Correct Answer: b) Hull fouling

While ballast water is a significant issue for commercial shipping, hull fouling is the primary vector for leisure marina contexts. Organisms attached to a boat hull in the North Sea can survive the journey to the Baltic, where the relatively low salinity compared to the open ocean is actually hospitable to some invasive species.

Question 8

The benchmarking report identifies 'owner buy-in' as a key barrier. What does this mean practically?

a) Marina owners are generally opposed to environmental improvements
b) Operational managers support change but cannot make capital investment decisions without owner approval
c) Owners lack awareness of environmental regulations
d) Owner resistance is primarily driven by cost concerns

✓ Correct Answer: b) Operational managers support change but lack capital decision authority

The report specifically notes that operational managers score high on sustainability interest (3.8/5 average) but frequently cannot implement improvements because capital decisions rest with owners who are less directly exposed to operational and regulatory pressures. This is the key structural barrier — not individual will, but organisational structure.

Question 9

What did New Zealand's biofouling 'Clean Hull' regulations demonstrate that is relevant to the Baltic?

a) That mandatory hull cleaning reduces tourism revenue from visiting yachts
b) That voluntary compliance with biosecurity rules is sufficient if awareness is high enough

c) That systematic hull inspection protocols can be implemented and enforced at port entry
d) That invasive species problems resolve themselves over time without intervention

✓ Correct Answer: c) Systematic hull inspection at port entry is feasible

New Zealand introduced mandatory 'Clean Hull' inspection requirements before vessel arrival. This demonstrates that biosecurity-focused hull inspection is operationally viable at port/marina level. With 37% of Baltic marina managers believing invasive species measures are 'Not Necessary,' New Zealand's experience offers both a model and a warning about the cost of inaction.

Question 10

According to the action plan, what is the recommended approach to marina waste fees?

a) Charge separately for each waste type to recover disposal costs fully
b) Eliminate waste fees entirely to encourage use
c) Incentivise delivery — structure fees so that proper disposal is cheaper than avoidance
d) Apply a flat environmental surcharge to all berth fees

✓ Correct Answer: c) Incentivise delivery, do not penalise it

A waste fee structure that charges boats separately for disposing of sewage, oil, or hazardous waste creates a financial incentive to avoid the charge — by dumping at sea. Integrating waste disposal into berth fees or using incentive structures (e.g., discounts for documented proper disposal) removes this perverse incentive.

Scenario Exercises

Apply what you have learned to these realistic scenarios. There is no single correct answer — the goal is to think through the decision using the frameworks from this module.

Scenario 1: Presenting to Your Board

You are a harbour master at a mid-sized Lithuanian marina. You have attended the ECOMARINAS training and you are convinced that your marina needs, as a minimum: (1) a pump-out station, (2) differentiated waste bins with hazardous waste storage, and (3) a spill kit with posted procedure. Your estimates suggest a total cost of around €12,000. Your marina owner's primary concern is revenue, and you have a 20-minute slot at next month's board meeting. How do you structure your case? What data from the benchmarking report do you use, and what commercial argument do you make?

Consider:

- Which benchmarking statistics are most persuasive to a commercially-focused owner?
- How do you frame compliance as a revenue driver, not just a cost?
- What happens to the marina's competitive position if ECOMARINAS certification becomes an expectation of visiting international yachts?

Scenario 2: The Spill

It is a Saturday morning in July — peak season. A boat owner accidentally punctures a 20-litre engine oil container while unloading equipment onto the dock. Approximately 10 litres of oil spills onto the dock surface and begins flowing toward a drain that connects to the marina basin. You have a staff member on duty but no written spill procedure posted and no spill kit immediately visible. What do you do in the next 5 minutes — and what do you change before next weekend?

Consider:

- What immediate physical actions limit the environmental damage?
- What are your reporting obligations to harbour authorities?
- What would a complete, laminated spill response card at the dock contain?

Scenario 3: The Visiting Yacht

A Swedish sailing yacht arrives at your Polish marina. The skipper asks: 'Where is your pump-out station? We have a full holding tank.' Your marina does not have a pump-out facility. The skipper — who has visited many Baltic marinas — is clearly frustrated and mentions that this is the third marina in a row without one. She asks whether you know of any in the area. How do you handle this interaction — and what does it tell you about the commercial case for pump-out infrastructure?

Consider:

- What is the immediate customer service response?
- What network resources exist (ECOMARINAS, local harbour authority) to help locate nearby facilities?
- How do you document this interaction as evidence for your next business case to the board?

Key Terms Reference

Term	Plain-Language Definition
Eutrophication	Nutrient overload in water (mainly nitrogen and phosphorus) causing explosive algae growth, oxygen depletion, and death of fish and other aquatic life. Currently affects 97% of the Baltic Sea.
Benchmarking Report (D.2.1)	The ECOMARINAS research document surveying 62 marina stakeholders across Poland, Germany, Sweden, and Lithuania. The primary evidence base for this module.
Pump-out station	Shore-based equipment removing sewage from a vessel's holding tank for legal treatment and disposal. Required under MARPOL Annex IV.
Hull fouling	Accumulation of marine organisms (algae, barnacles, invertebrates) on a vessel's hull. The primary mechanism for introducing invasive species between water bodies.
Macrophytes	Aquatic plants used in floating wetland installations. Their root systems absorb nitrogen and phosphorus directly from the water, reducing eutrophication.
Seabin	Floating waste collection device that skims surface debris, oils, and microplastics from marina water. Collects up to 1.5 kg of waste per day.
Secondary containment	Physical barrier (bund wall, drip tray) around fuel or chemical storage to contain spills before they reach the water.
Bioswale	Planted drainage channel that filters nutrients and pollutants from stormwater run-off before it enters a water body. Used at Holiday Harbor Marina (Ohio) case study.
Clean Hull protocol	Systematic procedure for inspecting vessel hulls for fouling at marina check-in, to prevent invasive species transfer. Modelled on New Zealand's mandatory biosecurity regime.
BATSECO-BOAT	Project upgrading 20 pump-out stations across Finland, Sweden, and Estonia, demonstrating that accessibility improvements directly reduce illegal sewage discharge.
Owner buy-in	The process of gaining capital investment approval from marina owners/boards for environmental improvements. Identified as the key structural barrier in the benchmarking research.

Module Complete

If you scored 7 or more in the quiz, you have a solid grasp of the benchmarking findings and are ready for the lecture discussion.