

Offshore multi-purpose platforms for a Blue Growth: a technological, environmental and socio-economic review

Abhinav, K A^a, Collu, Maurizio^{a,*}, Benjamins, Steven^b, Cai, Huiwen^c,
Hughes, Adam^b, Jiang, Bo^d, Jude, Simon^h, Leithead, William^e, Lin, Cui^d,
Liu, Hongda^f, Recalde-Camacho, Luis^e, Serpetti, Natalia^b, Sun, Ke^g, Wilson,
Ben^b, Yue, Hong^e, Zhou, Bin-Zhen^g

^aNaval Architecture, Marine and Ocean Engineering, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK

^bScottish Association for Marine Science, Scottish Marine Institute, Oban, PA37 1QA, UK

^cZhejiang Ocean University, Changzhi Island, Zhoushan, Zhejiang, China

^dNational Ocean Technology Center, No. 219, West Jieyuan Road, Tianjin, China

^eElectronic and Electrical Engineering, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK

^fCollege of Automation, Harbin Engineering University, Harbin, China, 150001

^gCollege of Shipbuilding Engineering, Harbin Engineering University, Harbin, China, 150001

^hCranfield University, Bedford, UK

Abstract

“Blue Growth” and “Blue Economy” is defined by the World Bank as: “*the sustainable use of ocean resources for economic growth, improved livelihoods and jobs, while preserving the health of ocean ecosystem*”. Multi-purpose platforms (MPPs) can be defined as offshore platforms serving the needs of multiple offshore industries (energy and aquaculture), aim at exploiting the synergies and managing the tensions arising when closely co-locating systems from these industries.

Despite a number of previous projects aimed at assessing, from a multidisciplinary point of view, the feasibility of multipurpose platforms, it is here shown that the state-of-the-art has focused mainly on single-purpose devices, and adopting a single discipline (either economic, or social, or technological, or environmental) approaches. Therefore, the aim of the present study is to provide a multidisciplinary state of the art review on, whenever possible, multi-purpose platforms, complementing it with single-purpose and/or single discipline litera-

*Corresponding author

Email address: maurizio.collu@strath.ac.uk (Collu, Maurizio)

March 28, 2020

ture reviews when not possible. Synoptic tables are provided, giving an overview of the multi-purpose platform concepts investigated, the numerical approaches adopted, and a comprehensive snapshot classifying the references discussed by industry (offshore renewables, aquaculture, both) and by aspect (technological, environmental, socio-economic). The majority of the multi-purpose platform concepts proposed are integrating only multiple offshore renewable energy devices (e.g. hybrid wind-wave), with only few integrating also aquaculture systems. MPPs have significant potential in economizing CAPEX and operational costs for the offshore energy and aquaculture industry by means of concerted spatial planning and sharing of infrastructure.

Highlights

- A number of projects on multipurpose platforms, aiming to conduct multidisciplinary feasibility assessments, have been done.
- Despite them, there is a lack of multidisciplinary analyses for multipurpose platforms.
- This work therefore aims at reviewing state-of-the-art multidisciplinary analyses on MPPs, complementing them with the review of single-purpose, single discipline analyses when necessary.
- A review of technological, environmental, and socio-economic analyses of ORE devices and aquaculture systems is given.

Keywords: Multi purpose platform, multi use platform, marine renewable energy, offshore wind, wave, aquaculture, social science

2010 MSC: 00-01, 99-00

Word Count: 8369

1. Introduction

1.1. Context

The marine environment represents a vast source of renewable energy. Energy is available in multiple forms - wind, wave, tides, currents, and temperature and pressure gradients. The successful commercial exploitation of these energy sources is perceived as a key target to be able to tackle the energy trilemma [1]: to provide secure, sustainable, and affordable energy. However, targeted installed capacities for 2050 (460 GW for offshore wind [2] and 188 GW for tidal and wave [3]) can be achieved only by lowering the cost of the energy produced, possibly through the combined extraction of more than one marine resource. In this regard, offshore wind farms and aquaculture have been proposed as suitable candidates for co-location/multiple use, in the recent past [4, 5, 6].

Of the various offshore renewable energy (ORE) systems, bottom fixed offshore wind turbines can be considered as commercially mature. On the other hand, floating offshore wind turbines (FOWTs) have been slowly evolving from concepts to reality [7], in recent decades. This upswing in the demand for FOWTs has been brought about by a combination of several factors - stronger and less turbulent offshore winds, reduced visual pollution and multi-use conflicts, for instance. However, other offshore renewable energy (ORE) systems, such as wave energy converters, still need to be further developed, in order to be considered commercially competitive.

In parallel with the energy trilemma, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimates that, by 2030, the demand for seafood will exceed the supply by 40 million metric tonnes [8]. With constraints limiting the possibilities for the expansion of inland and near-shore fisheries, offshore aquaculture has emerged as a viable alternative for increasing the global seafood production. Aquaculture is classified as offshore, if it takes place in the open sea, exposed to significant met-ocean conditions [9]. Notwithstanding the challenges posed by the open ocean, offshore farming offers several advantages - increased possibilities for expansion, reduced exposure to pollution from human sources and the potential of co-

31 locating infrastructure with ORE systems to reduce competition for operational
32 space [10].

33 Thus, a proposed solution for a reliable energy extraction and aquaculture
34 development, while addressing the questions of CAPEX, space limitation and
35 operational safety could be the use of Multi-Purpose Platforms (MPPs). Ide-
36 ally, an MPP is an offshore structure able to exploit the synergies between ORE
37 systems and aquaculture systems, avoiding by design the conflicts arising from
38 the close co-location of these systems. MPPs are expected to bring about sig-
39 nificant cost reduction, by allowing multiple use of space and infrastructure,
40 through co-located and shared technologies [11, 12]. MPPs would also pro-
41 mote an optimization of the marine spatial planning, proposing an efficient,
42 integrated, sustainable, and ecological use of oceanic resources through shared
43 spaces and infrastructure [12, 13, 14].

44 Furthermore, for remote and island communities, not able to access the util-
45 ities grids, an MPP may constitute the only secure, sustainable, and affordable
46 source of energy [15, 16], food, and jobs.

47 1.2. Aim, objectives, and structure of the review

48 Despite a number of EU-funded projects aimed at assessing the feasibility of
49 multipurpose platforms, also highlighting the importance of a multidisciplinary
50 approach, it is here shown that the analyses available in the literature are (expect
51 for very few cases) mainly focused on single-purpose devices, or at best hybrid
52 wind-wave offshore renewable energy devices, and tackling the challenge only
53 from a single discipline (either technological and/or economic, or social and/or
54 economic, or environmental) point of view.

55 Therefore, the aim of the present study is to provide a state of the art review
56 on, multidisciplinary technological, economic, and socio-environmental reviews
57 on offshore multi-purpose platforms. This is to provide the ideal basement for a
58 truly multi-purpose, multi-discipline analysis framework, for current and future
59 projects looking at MPP systems. The scope of this review is limited to the
60 most developed ORE resources - wind and wave.

While the terms MPP and multi-use of ocean space (MUS) are often used interchangeably, the distinction between the two has to be clearly understood. While MPP refers to a structure capable of exploiting the synergies between different ORE systems or aquaculture, MUS has a more general definition - ‘the joint use of resources in close geographic proximity by either a single user or multiple users’ [17] *i.e.*, not necessarily a single platform.

1.3. Overview of previous projects

Combining different ORE systems onto the same platform structure offers several benefits: increased, more consistent power production, thanks to the different patterns of different renewable energy sources, lower CAPEX-to-rated power ratio, shared balance-of-plant operations and maintenance (O&M) costs, positive dynamics interactions (e.g. wave energy converters (WECs) as additional damping systems for the OWT with which are coupled, ensuring a lower response to waves), are some of the main technological advantages. Pérez-Collazo *et al.* [18] have also identified potential project and legislative synergies. During the past decade, several European projects have investigated the technical challenges of combined ORE extraction systems. The design concepts defined by these projects are explained in detail, in the following paragraphs.

The MARINA platform project [19] identified three designs of OWT-WEC combinations for further study - the spar torus combination (STC), the semi-submersible flap combination (SFC), and the ‘OWC’ array with a wind turbine. In the STC [19], the NREL 5-MW OWT [20] is supported on a spar, and the torus (an axisymmetric point absorber that operates mainly in heave) extracts wave energy by moving along the spar, by means of a hydraulic power take-off (PTO) system. The SFC [21] comprises a semi-submersible floater with four columns (one at the centre and three at the sides) connected by means of pontoons. The central column supports the turbine and rotating flaps hinged at the pontoons capture the wave energy, making use of a hydraulic PTO system to generate electricity. The OWC array consists of a large floater having multiple WECs and supporting a single wind turbine [22].

91 The ORECCA project [23] classified combined platforms into offshore hy-
92 brids and energy islands. The former refers to a combination of wind and wave
93 (or tide) energy devices, while the latter denotes large multi-purpose platforms
94 capable of utilizing multiple sources of ocean energy, possibly in combination
95 with an offshore harbour [24].

96 A modular approach for multi-purpose platforms, combining the attributes
97 of transport, energy, aquaculture and leisure (TEAL) was proposed by the TRO-
98 POS project [25]. Different TEAL modules can be accommodated around a
99 central unit to cater to the local socio-economic and environmental conditions,
100 thus affording flexibility to the concept.

101 The H2OCEAN [26] project proposed multi-purpose platforms aimed at the
102 production of hydrogen, perceived as the future energy vector. A farm of hybrid
103 floating wind-wave energy devices, coupling a 5MW H-type vertical axis wind
104 turbine (VAWT) with a WEC, provides electricity to a central platform, where
105 the energy is transformed into hydrogen, and to an aquaculture system.

106 The MERMAID project [27] explored the possibility of using innovative
107 multi-purpose platforms for combining food (aquaculture) and energy produc-
108 tion, on the basis of site-specific environmental challenges.

109 The W2Power concept supports two WT's on a triangular platform, with
110 WEC's attached in arrays along the 3 sides [28]. Each platform has been en-
111 visaged to reach a rated power around 10 MW. The WindWaveFloat intends
112 to equip the WindFloat (a semi-submersible type FOWT structure with three
113 columns) with different types of WECS, such as OWC's and point absorbers [29].
114 The addition of the WEC's were observed to have minimal influence on the mo-
115 tion of the support structure.

116 The Poseidon, developed by Floating Power Plant A/S, is a semi-submersible
117 platform for combined wind-wave energy extraction, which can support 10 float-
118 ing wave energy absorbers (3 kW) and 3 wind turbines (11 kW) [30]. The Wave
119 Dragon, a multi-MW overtopping WEC, has been a pioneer in the field of wave
120 energy generation [31]. The Wave Dragon is also capable of supporting two
121 2.3 MW wind turbines, with significant savings in the levelized cost of energy

(LCoE) [32].

1.3.1. MPP: comparison of functionality

The functionality of the MPP concepts discussed above are compared in Table 1. It is noticeable how the majority of the platforms are hybrid wind-wave energy devices, with only a few including aquaculture systems. Furthermore, it may be noted that majority of the concepts are publicly funded and subsidized, thus highlighting the novelty of the platforms. Also, the rated power varies from 10^2 to 10^4 W, reflecting the potential variety of applications and markets of the MPP concepts.

Table 1: MPP concepts - Comparison of functionality

No.	Platform	Wind	Wave	Aquaculture	Solar
1	Sea Star Spar [33]	✓		✓	
2	STC [19]	✓	✓		
3	W2Power [28]	✓	✓		
4	SFC [21]	✓	✓		
5	OWC Array [22]	✓	✓		
6	Poseidon [30]	✓	✓		
7	TROPOS [34]	✓		✓	✓
8	MERMAID [35]	✓	✓		
9	WT - feed barge[36]	✓		✓	✓
10	Ocean Farm1 [37]			✓	
11	Wave Dragon [31]	✓	✓		

Over 200 scientific articles have been accessed as part of the present review paper, with most of them ($\sim 70\%$) published during or after 2010. The methodology to organise this multidisciplinary review has been the following the selected papers were initially classified on the basis of the discipline they represent - technological (section 2), environmental (section 3) and socioeconomic (section 4). Further, the literature reviewed in each section has been subdivided with respect to the resource they exploit - ORE (wind, wave or combined) or aquaculture. As overarching topic, including aspects from different disciplines,

the studies related to MPPs and risk are reviewed in section 5. An overview and discussion of the literature reviewed is presented in section 6, with conclusions provided in section 7.

2. Technological aspects

2.1. ORE

The following subsections discuss the technological aspects of combined ORE systems, where the outcomes of the previous projects have been highlighted. While most concepts from these projects have been subjected to numerical modelling studies, a few of them have reached the stage of experimental testing as well. The approaches followed in numerical modelling and experimental testing have been mentioned in detail. Aquaculture systems (both standalone and integrated with ORE devices) have also been discussed. A review of the control aspects of MPPs is also presented in this section.

2.1.1. Model of dynamics: numerical and experimental methods

Several MPP systems described in Section 2.1 have been subjected to numerical modelling. The SFC and the STC have been numerically analyzed in the time domain [38, 39], by coupling the SIMO [40] and RIFLEX [41] software. SIMO is used to compute the hydrodynamic loads on rigid floating bodies. RIFLEX is a nonlinear program for modelling wave loads on slender structures, like mooring lines using the Morison equation, and aerodynamic loads on wind turbine blades using blade element momentum (BEM) theory. The models were a combination of flexible and rigid bodies, and potential theory was used to estimate the wave loads. The same approach was adopted to model the WindWEC [42], a hybrid combination of the Hywind SPAR [43] and the Wavestar [44] WEC buoy.

Soulard *et al.* [45] used a wave to wire representation based on linear potential theory to model the fluid-structure interaction of a 100 m diameter circular hybrid platform (C-HyP), supporting the NREL 5-MW OWT, and an array of

oscillating WECs. Aerodynamic loads were imposed at the nacelle, through a simplified procedure [46] which makes use of the relative wind speed with respect to the platform motion. The motion of a multi-use platform (MUP) developed for the MERMAID project [47] was studied in the time domain, using the open source boundary element method solver, NEMOH [48]. A coupled system of 21 DOF's were used to model the interactions between the platform, WECs and the air pressure inside the chambers. Quasi-static approaches were used to represent the influence of the wind loads on the turbine.

Li *et al.* [49] proposed the Hywind-Wavebob-NACA 638xx Combination (HWNC) by integrating the Hywind SPAR [43] OWT with the Wavebob point absorbers [19] and tidal turbines [50]. Hydrodynamic and aerodynamic considerations were included by means of linear potential flow and blade element momentum theories, respectively. A multi-body dynamics approach was adopted for simulating mechanical connections and the mooring lines were represented using a lumped-mass approach.

Table 2: Comparison of numerical models for MPPs

No.	Platform	Aerodynamics	Hydrodynamics	Structural dyn.
1	SFC [38]	BEM	potential flow	multibody
2	STC [39]	wind drag force	potential flow	multibody
3	WindWEC [42]	BEM	potential flow	rigid body/FEM
4	C-HyP [45]	relative wind speed	potential flow	lumped mass
5	MERMAID [47]	relative wind speed	potential flow	rigid body
6	HWNC [49]	BEM	potential flow	multibody

A summary of the numerical modelling approaches discussed is presented in Table 2. It can be observed that a variety of approaches have been adopted for representing the aerodynamics aspects, ranging from a simple static wind drag force (generated by a body that opposes the flow of wind), to the more accurate blade element momentum (BEM) theory (where the blades are divided into elements and the forces acting on them are summed up together). As far as the hydrodynamics is concerned, all the models adopt a wave diffrac-

tion based potential flow approach, which is ideal for large structures. The structural dynamics aspects are modelled with different approaches and level of fidelity/accuracy. In a rigid body approach, the whole body is considered rigid and therefore there is no elastic deformation, while in a multibody approach, the system is comprised of several bodies linked by joints that control their relative motion.

The SFC and the STC mentioned above have been tested experimentally, at a scale of 1 : 50. The SFC consists of a semisubmersible floating wind turbine and three fully submerged rotating flap-type WECs. The PTO configuration of each of the WECs were physically modelled with the use of a shaft, two pulleys, a timing belt, two tensioners and a linear mechanical rotary damper with constant damping level during the execution of the tests [39]. The wind turbine was modelled with a redesigned small-scale rotor that rotates during the experiments. The quasi-static excitation, motion decay, response under regular and irregular waves, without and with wind were tested for and a good agreement was observed with numerical predictions.

The STC model was tested in two different basins to account for experimental uncertainties. Two model tests were performed to investigate the performance of the STC under the two survival modes in extreme conditions: when the torus is fixed to the spar at the mean water level and when the torus is fixed to the spar at a submerged position. The focus of the model tests was wave-induced loads and responses, and wind was also included to model the mean wind thrust on the wind turbine rotor [51, 38, 52].

The above mentioned previous European projects investigated the performance of platforms suitable for large wind farms of the order of 0.5 to 1 GW. There, however, arises a need to study the response of small MPP's capable of catering to the power requirements of remote and island communities, which might be substantially different from those already investigated.

217 2.2. Aquaculture

218 Aquaculture refers to the cultivation of fish and other aquatic organisms
219 in a controlled manner, for human consumption. Marine aquaculture systems
220 employ a variety of designs, based on the type of seafood harvested. They can
221 be moored to the seabed, tied to a structure or towed by vessels [53]. Cage
222 type structures anchored to the sea floor are generally preferred for finfish [54].
223 Shellfish cultivation is done either by bottom farming or by making use of lines
224 suspended beneath floating bodies like buoys, rafts and longlines.

225 Aquaculture in more exposed, harsher conditions is perceived to be the next
226 step, with a number of projects looking at suitable concepts, and a full scale
227 pilot test facility represented by SalMar’s “Ocean Farm1” [37], already in op-
228 eration. The Ocean Farm 1 is a semi-submersible rigid cage of 110 m diameter,
229 capable of housing up to 1.5 million salmon. Vessel type rigid floating cages or
230 Havfarms [55], capable of withstanding 10 m significant wave heights are also
231 being planned for use in the near future.

232 2.3. Combined ORE and Aquaculture

233 The Sea Star Spar [33] proposed a combination of a spar floating wind tur-
234 bine and floating structures with sufficient buoyancy for the cultivation of fin-
235 fish, shellfish or algae. Goseberg *et al.* [56] investigated the interaction be-
236 tween OWT structures and aquaculture systems by experimentally analysing
237 the scaled model of a tripile supporting a 5 MW turbine, with a fish cage in-
238 stalled between its legs. Variations in flow velocities and additional loads on
239 the substructure, arising from the presence of the cages were detected. Under
240 the MARIBE project [57], different combinations of offshore wind, wave and
241 aquaculture systems were identified, considering multi-use of space (MUS) and
242 MPP criteria.

243 Viúdez *et al.* [58] proposed the use of a spar-type OWT to create an artificial
244 upwelling of the nutrient-laden waters from the deep to increase the surface
245 fish production. An experimental study on wave energy systems at Lysekil on
246 the Swedish coast concluded that structural modification of the foundations

(perforations, in this case) and other components could lead to enhancements in the fish population [59].

2.3.1. Control Strategies

Control systems form an integral part of any energy system. Coupling several ORE technologies and energy storage on a single MPP for aquaculture operations calls for a hybrid control system. This is due to the fact that while aquaculture requires a smooth, stable supply of power, ORE systems are highly dependent on their environmental source for power production. This can often result in periods of zero power production [60]. The existing scenario in control strategies for MPPs is reviewed in the following subsections.

2.3.1.1 Challenges of MPP control system

For an MPP combining ORE and aquaculture, while the latter can smooth the influence of waves and currents on the platform [61], it also has an impact on the layout of the power generation equipment [62]. Also, the interaction between the floating platform, wind turbine, WECs and energy storage (ES) devices, exists in many aspects such as the motion response, the dynamic loads and the control system, making the MPP a highly complex and coupled system.

The power supply of the MPP should be smooth and stable to meet the requirements of both the platform operations and the aquaculture system. The power transmission between land substation and the MPP also needs to be stable. As a result, power generation, ES and electrical equipment on the MPP need an overall power control and capacity management system. No comprehensive review of control technologies for MPPs currently exists. However, reviews on control of wind and wave devices [63], and control of energy storage (ES) systems [64], are useful for the present purpose.

Control systems for each ORE technology aims to operate the devices at their rated values by following an operating strategy, whilst maintaining safe operating conditions. The power generated by each technology depends on the renewable source cycle, leading to periods of zero power production. In an MPP,

the combination of wind, wave and ES technologies can minimize the time of zero power production if shared control objectives are attained by means of a platform-level controller. These objectives can be classified as maximization of energy capture (wind and wave), regulation of generated power (wind, wave, ES), mitigation of structural loads for MPPs with large power capacity (wind, wave, platform), and reduction of unwanted platform swings and motions. For some types of ORE, estimation of the input can be of further benefit to the attainment of the control objectives, especially incident wave estimation for WECs [63].

The size of the MPP thus plays an important role in the definition of the control objectives. Promising wind/wave hybrid concepts estimate that the total installed capacity of around 10 - 20 MW would include 20 - 25% of wave energy, since energy efficiency of the WEC is much less than that of the wind turbine [65].

2.3.1.2 *Management of power network and ES system*

The control of the electrical system is often treated separately from the control of the mechanical systems. The MPP grid is different from a conventional grid as the former depends basically on a collection of inverters and synchronous and/or asynchronous generators. Each generator will have a control system to provide voltage and frequency regulation. A power network management strategy is therefore required to provide the operating states to the local electrical control systems and also to control power sharing and achieve network stabilization. The power network management is developed based on the MPP size and type of interconnection (*i.e.*, grid connected or isolated) [66]. Network stabilization and reactive power compensation can be further improved by the use of FACTS (flexible AC transmission systems) devices [67].

A detailed local electrical network (*i.e.*, including loads, cabling network, protection, switchgear, transformers and a power network management, operation and control system) definition/identification is still required; as its opti-

mal sizing to meet load requirements with minimum investment and operating costs [68]. Conventional methods for resynchronizing the local network to the main grid and power flow control between the two grids can be used [69].

An ES device can be used to suppress fluctuations of ORE [70]. Cao *et al.* [71] proposed a battery energy management system (BEMS) strategy, and the point estimate method is used to solve the volatility of ORE generation. Osório *et al.* [72] studied battery pack modelling and health feature extraction methods for an ocean power station to reduce the number of battery charging and discharging cycles and dump load, and to improve the life of ES devices. Methods of multi-scale energy management have been proposed based on power generation/load forecasting, in which the multi-time scale energy management model is combined with daily scheduling [70] and real-time scheduling [73]. Further, physical constraints also need to be addressed for ES system.

2.3.1.3 Island/sea power integration

The integration of island/sea area ORE power is mainly based on micro-grid technology including AC, DC and AC-DC hybrid micro-grids. The DC micro-grid avoids many problems such as the loop-current between multi-inverter, protection strategies of AC grids, which conforms better to systems with source diversity and load diversity [74, 75]. According to the availability of grid support, micro-grid can be divided into the grid-connected island power supply system and the remote isolated power supply system. With the remote isolated power supply, several demonstration projects have been completed and put into operation, such as the Dongfushan and Nanji islands in China [76, 77].

2.3.1.4 Island/marine micro-grid control and management

The micro-grid control system can be designed with different structures, *i.e.* the centralized control, the decentralized control and the hierarchical control. In the land-based and shore-based micro-grid demonstration projects, the centralized control is used more in Asia and the decentralized control mainly in Europe. The

333 hierarchical model combines advantages of centralized and decentralized control,
334 allowing better flexibility and scalability [78]. For the MPP control system, the
335 use of hierarchical model is likely to be a better choice [79]. One recent successful
336 example is the three-tier hierarchical management model applied in the marine
337 micro-grid of China's Zhai Ruo mountain [80].

338 Grid planning has evolved from the realization of the grid-connected/off-
339 grid function and the smooth transition process in early time (through classical
340 control and various intelligent control theories) to the economical, reliable, high-
341 quality, environmentally power supply. The planning and design of the island
342 micro grid can be realized from single-objective optimization to multi-objective
343 optimization. Life cycle cost, power supply reliability, power supply quality and
344 other indicators have been considered in the optimization [76, 81, 82, 83].

345 **3. Environmental Aspects**

346 *3.1. Environmental Impact Assessment*

347 *3.1.1. ORE*

348 Boehlert and Gill [84] have highlighted the major ecological and environ-
349 mental concerns accompanying the development of various ORE systems. The
350 different forms of ORE extraction were considered in isolation and impacts were
351 studied on the basis of a stressor-receptor framework. Here, the former refers to
352 environmental features susceptible to change from ORE development and the
353 latter stands for elements of the ecosystem that may respond to the stressor.
354 Among the potential hazards were habitat loss, bird hits (from moving turbine
355 components), acoustic and electromagnetic emissions. Best practice measures
356 for the mitigation of the effect of WTs on birds have also been mentioned [85].
357 Some WTs were recently dismantled in China due to the severe impact on the
358 bird migration [86], indicating the importance of site selection assessment for
359 the construction of wind farms.

360 Several environmental impact assessment studies have been carried out on
361 individual wind and wave energy concepts. The main concern for acoustically-

sensitive species such as marine mammals to date has been the construction phase of bottom fixed OWTs due to the widespread use of pile driving, with comparatively limited focus on sounds emitted by operational OWTs, let alone floating ones [87, 88, 89, 90]. Nonetheless, the ability of species such as harbour seals and porpoises to detect and react to the sound emitted by operational OWTs has been identified as a potential concern [91]. Marine fish and invertebrates may be similarly hampered in terms of communication masking and disturbance [92, 93], although there is presently no evidence of noise emitted by operational OWTs causing physiological damage in fish [94]. Offshore WECs might present a collision risk for diving species and can potentially change local oceanographic processes by extracting large amounts of incident wave energy [95].

In addition to the adverse impacts, the potential benefits of ORE systems to biodiversity have also been suggested [96]. These include the potential for ORE structures to act as secondary artificial reefs to aid in the enhancement of fisheries and rehabilitation of marine habitats [97, 98, 99]. Floating ORE installations also have the capacity to act as local fish aggregation devices [97, 100]. As fishing around ORE installations is often prohibited, such areas can serve as miniature impromptu Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) [101]. Potential effects on wild species, as well as associated commercial/recreational fisheries, of this inadvertent protection presently remain poorly understood.

3.1.2. Aquaculture

At-sea aquaculture, particularly those involving finfish, can have multiple impacts on the surrounding marine environment (summarized by Tett *et al.* [102] focusing on Atlantic salmon). These include, in no particular order:

- impacts on wild fish stocks through increased parasite and pathogen densities [103, 104, 105, 106], competition between wild and escaped fish for resources [107, 108, 109], and genetic dilution of local wild fish stocks through interbreeding with escaped fish (an acute problem for salmonids [110, 111])

- 392 • degradation of surrounding seafloor communities through deposition of
393 organic waste [112, 113], reduction in dissolved oxygen [114], eutrophica-
394 tion [115, 116, 117] and dispersal of various chemicals [118, 119]
- 395 • direct and indirect impacts on large mobile species such as marine mam-
396 mals and seabirds, including shooting and exposure to loud underwater
397 noises (to prevent depredation of cultured fish [120, 121]), accidental en-
398 tanglement in nets and moorings [122], and displacement from potentially
399 important habitats due to fish farm-associated activities [123, 124]

400 Some positive impacts on particular species include provision of food and
401 shelter for wild fish, and foraging and resting opportunities for marine mam-
402 mals and seabirds (although this increases the risk of further negative inter-
403 actions outlined above). Some of these impacts are indirectly driven by the
404 inshore, sheltered nature of the sites where finfish aquaculture has developed
405 to date. There is pressure to expand the sector into more exposed, offshore lo-
406 cations, which may reduce or modify some of the aforementioned impacts (*e.g.*
407 eutrophication, attraction of wild fish) due to greater exposure and stronger
408 water movements; however, the nature of these changes, if any, remains poorly
409 understood and difficult to predict at present [125].

410 As for the considerable amount of biogenic waste such as organic wastes and
411 inorganic nutrients that are generated in the fish farming process, trash fish
412 (small fish of low commercial value) feeding showed more severe cumulative im-
413 pact to the aquatic and sediment environment than pellet feed [126, 127, 128].
414 Trash fish is still a popular traditional feed for marine carnivorous fish in China
415 and many Asian countries, and this practice is likely to persist for some time
416 despite farmers are encouraged to use pelleted feed to minimize the environ-
417 mental impact. Field monitoring, lab tank experiment and bioenergetics mod-
418 els were both applied to quantify the wastes generations and the environmental
419 impact [128, 129, 130, 131, 132].

420 3.1.3. Combined ORE and Aquaculture

421 While ORE and aquaculture have matured as separate industries, the en-
422 vironmental impacts when these sectors are combined within a single site are
423 very poorly understood and almost entirely based on theoretical projection of
424 the single industry impacts on to a multi-use site. Much of this understand-
425 ing has come from the European funded projects mentioned in section 1.3 and
426 through application of cumulative effects assessment methods [133, 134].

427 The TROPOS project made use of an impact assessment approach to study
428 the effects of combining the two industries, as opposed to a single use sce-
429 nario [135]. To allow a direct comparison, a semi-quantitative scale was used
430 for each impact category. This methodology used the difference between the
431 impacts of a single use platform compared to those of a multi-use platform, and
432 combined the impacts either on an additive value or through the use of which
433 ever value was highest, and this was conducted for both negative or positive
434 attributes. It was concluded that while the impacts are similar for the single
435 and multi-use approaches, the latter had the advantage of integrating diverse
436 activities in a common location.

437 The H2OCEAN project was recognized that the impacts of different sectors
438 may combine, and that the cumulative effects may reach thresholds of impacts,
439 therefore recommending a comprehensive cumulative impact assessment [136].
440 Understanding of the impacts from multiple sectors of the system was limited
441 to recommendations on the location of the living quarters, and their outfalls, to
442 prevent potential conflicts [137].

443 Within the framework of an expert opinion approach, the MERMAID project
444 identified a number of scenarios involving different combinations of aquaculture
445 and ORE systems. Common environmental benefits, such as structures provid-
446 ing a refuge for wild fisheries species and operational constraints like increased
447 bio-fouling, were also listed. A framework for risk analysis was also defined,
448 including internal environmental interactions between the biota and different
449 types of foundation and material [61].

450 3.2. Ecological Modelling

451 Modelling the effect of the installation of an MPP system in a marine ecosys-
452 tem is challenging. On a large spatial scale, deployment of offshore structures
453 for ORE generation will lead to exclusion zones, limiting the access to the area
454 for several users such as shipping, fishing and tourism [138, 139, 140, 141].
455 Such infrastructure can also underpin development of ‘artificial reefs’, supply-
456 ing nursery areas and feeding grounds for fish species [142, 97]. Species larvae
457 and juveniles can disperse to the surrounding areas leading to a ‘spill-over ef-
458 fect’, enhancing local production [143, 144, 145]. These infrastructures can
459 also create new substrates for benthic organisms [146, 99, 147]. The creation
460 of new benthic habitats can lead to either displacement or attraction of ben-
461 thic species in the local area, resulting in changes to local food-web dynamics
462 with both positive and negative impacts on species distribution and abundances
463 [148, 149, 150, 151].

464 Aquaculture associated with the MPP structure can increase the productiv-
465 ity in the water column and on the surrounding sediment (detritus enrichment):
466 depending on the characteristics of the surrounding environment, this increased
467 productivity can lead to large-scale impact, attracting top-predators species
468 [152], and small-scale impact, affecting benthic faunal communities, important
469 food source for many species including those of commercial importance [83].

470 ‘Exclusion zones effect’ and ‘artificial reef effect’ can therefore lead to both
471 synergies and conflicts with other marine users, notably the fishing industry
472 [153, 154, 155]. Modelling small-scale impacts will require a high resolution of
473 the model spatial grid with associated high computing power [141, 83].

474 Ecosystem-based approaches are necessary to investigate the cumulative ef-
475 fects of human impacts on marine ecosystems [156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161,
476 144, 162, 145, 163]. Ecosystem models have proved to be a powerful tool for
477 monitoring natural variability, assessing impacts of natural and anthropogenic
478 environmental changes and advising management measures [164, 165, 161, 166].

479 The Ecopath with Ecosim and Ecospace (EwE) modelling approach has been

considered one of the most suitable tools for evaluating the direct and indirect effects of anthropogenic pressures on large spatial scale ecosystem dynamics [167, 168, 161, 169]. EwE models have been successfully used to evaluate how these pressures cascade through the food-web. For example, changing in the spatial distribution of top predators (cetaceans, large fish and seabirds) will affect the entire marine ecosystem through top-down control pathways [170, 152]. Similarly, changing of primary productivity can cascade through the food-web by means of bottom-up controls [144, 145] as well as environmental drivers [144, 171]. The use of Ecospace to assess cumulative impacts of these effects have been exponentially increased since the later development of this software [172, 169, 144, 173], with new capabilities of coupling the spatial model with external spatial data (e.g. spatial habitats and hydrodynamic drivers). The EwE model has also been applied in the Bohai Sea, the Yellow Sea and the East China Sea to describe the energy transformation between trophic levels [174], to demonstrate the fishery resources declining due to overfishing [175] and the predominant fish species variation in the past decades [176, 177, 178].

4. Socio-economic aspects

Socio-economic is a term that defines the effect of a project - its development, operation and decommissioning, on the local population, or the society. There have been numerous studies on the socio-economic impacts of ORE and aquaculture, mostly undertaken on the basis of stakeholder interviews and surveys. The main inferences are listed below.

4.1. ORE

4.1.1. Offshore wind

Despite the advantages that offshore wind offers, several socio-economic drawbacks have been identified. A particularly problematic factor hampering the development of onshore wind farms, is public opposition arising from social concerns, such as visual pollution and the impact of noise [179].

508 Even as offshore wind farms are considered to be less intrusive than those
509 onshore [180], public perception of the visual impact, notably shadow flicker
510 and the impact on seascapes, remains an important concern [181].

511 In addition, whilst the underwater noise caused by the operation of wind
512 farms has recently been shown to be of very low level and probably insufficient
513 to cause any significant environmental effects [182], the noise which is created
514 by the impact piling required for the foundation installation of OWTs has been
515 found to be of extremely high level [183, 184, 89]. Such issues represent a
516 challenge for the industry, planners and regulators as they can influence public
517 opinion, which studies have observed to be dependent on demographics [185],
518 with for instance, older people being more concerned with visual pollution [186].

519 Opposition also arises from concern over the fate of the local fishery industry
520 [187, 188]. On the other hand, support for OWT projects arise from the under-
521 standing that they provide a non-polluting energy source, capable of generating
522 jobs and contributing to the economy [189, 190].

523 4.1.2. *Wave energy*

524 The emergent nature of WECs, and the lack of commercial-scale deploy-
525 ments, results in uncertainties surrounding their potential positive and negative
526 socio-economic effects and impacts. However, studies have highlighted a range
527 of socio-economic impacts associated with WEC developments typically includ-
528 ing demography, employment and regional income; sea and land use; aesthetics;
529 infrastructure; socio-cultural systems and implications for other maritime ac-
530 tivities such as fisheries, tourism and recreation [191, 192, 193, 194].

531 In addition to the benefit of providing a new source of electricity from a local,
532 low carbon energy source, WEC developments will potentially bring economic
533 benefits including the creation of jobs, the development of new supply chains and
534 investment in infrastructure required to support such developments [194, 195].
535 However, uncertainties regarding the delivery of such benefits, and the potential
536 displacement of jobs in different sectors have been identified as concerns [194].
537 Notably, WECs, like any other marine development activity, inevitably cause

538 a change in the use of the ocean space at the deployment site that is likely to
539 disrupt or displace the activities of other users of the area. Of increasing concern
540 are potential restrictions on the accessibility and use of the surrounding marine
541 space, introducing the risk of conflicts with other marine resource users and
542 stakeholders [194, 196, 197, 198].

543 As with environmental concerns, the socio-economic effects and impacts of
544 WEC will vary with the stage (construction, operation and decommissioning)
545 and scale of the project and will depend on the location, communities, econ-
546 omy and environment in that area. For example, concerns regarding the ability
547 of communities to adapt to changing demand for new services, skills through-
548 out the WEC project lifecycle are emerging [194]. Furthermore, whilst some
549 studies have argued that unlike wind energy, WEC developments do not cause
550 visual pollution, as they are often located at great distances from the coasts
551 and have mostly submerged configurations, this may not be true with differ-
552 ing WEC designs, deployment sites and community perceptions of the marine
553 environment [199].

554 A further concern is that WECs may also provide non-market benefits, such
555 as providing coastal protection benefits, they may negatively impact upon the
556 ecosystems services and provisioning services, such as fisheries and the cultural
557 services provided by the marine and coastal environment [194, 200]. Such issues
558 are of particular concern because WEC developments are proposed in rural
559 coastal locations and islands, where strong cultural ties to the marine and coastal
560 environment exist and may result in community opposition [194].

561 Indeed, emergent research investigating such issues has identified divergent
562 views on the socio-economic benefits and appropriateness of wave energy de-
563 velopment [194]. For example, studies have attributed public support to wave
564 energy being perceived as a renewable source and its capability to boost the
565 local economy, without affecting established activities like fishing [201, 191].
566 Elsewhere, perceptions and support for WEC and ORE have been associated
567 with place attachment, community pride and the ‘symbolic fit’ of place and
568 technology [194, 202]. For example, Alexander *et al.* [141, 203] found broad

569 support for WEC amongst Scottish fishers. However, the nascent nature of
570 WEC technologies and deployment means that many are yet to form their views
571 and opinions [191].

572 With community buy-in and support being vital to WEC deployment, there
573 is clearly a need to maximize community benefits [194]. For example, some com-
574 munities have questioned the potential benefits of WEC developments, which
575 may result in increased electricity prices or taxes if subsidized. Thus, calls
576 for wealth distribution and community benefit schemes, similar to those as-
577 sociated with other industries, have been made [194, 204]. These may range
578 from community payments, to new forms of business models, including shared
579 or community owned schemes [194]. The embryonic nature of WECs and the
580 lack of commercial deployments also mean that there is a paucity of empirical
581 research investigating their real world socio-economic impacts.

582 *4.2. Aquaculture*

583 Based on the available literature, Krause and Mikkelsen [205] have attempted
584 to capture the socio-economic aspects of aquaculture, in a multi-use perspective.
585 Socio-economic analysis have always taken the back seat, with regard to the de-
586 velopment of aquaculture activities, the focus being on technical and biological
587 issues [206]. Further, exiting studies concentrated on the influence of salmon,
588 shrimp and seaweed farming [207]. Socio-economic studies for aquaculture have
589 to be tailored to suit the local economic and geo-political settings and the out-
590 comes cannot be generalized. For instance, in a study on risk perception and
591 management in Norwegian aquaculture, fish farmers were more concerned about
592 the future prices of their stock and potential disease outbreaks. On the other
593 hand, they were least bothered about aesthetic considerations and repugnance
594 to the public [208].

595 While food and jobs are the main direct socio-economic benefits from aqua-
596 culture, it has to be noted that in many Asian countries like Vietnam and
597 Bangladesh [209, 210], the fishermen community is struggling to survive with
598 the generated income. Further, the negative effects of aquaculture have been

difficult to quantify, mainly due to the lack of knowledge and awareness among the consumers [211]. The recent decades have witnessed large degradation of the coastal marine environment and its resources in many areas, at least partly due to an unprecedented growth of the aquaculture industry, coupled with the absence of proper national and international regulations, policies and management strategies [212, 213].

There are several studies on the sustainable development of offshore aquaculture, wherein the society, economics and environment are given due consideration [214, 215]. Proposed aquaculture developments have been known to cause concern among local fishing communities [216]. Often, the concerns involve potential risks pertaining to the aquaculture development [217].

5. MPPs and Risk

The offshore environment is associated with high technical risks arising from the mechanical forces, corrosion, biofouling, extreme conditions and unreliable moorings [13].

Research investigating such risks is emerging, with the MARIBE project considering the technical and non-technical challenges associated with MPP including risk perceptions of new technologies and their combinations [14].

A simple methodology for assessing the risks associated with MPPs, considering operation, economic, environmental, socio-economic, financial, political and health and safety risks across the different phases of a project was presented [14].

The MERMAID project utilized the Policy, Economic, Social, Technical, Environmental and Legal (PESTEL) approach (also known as PESTLE), along with stakeholder analysis to gain a clearer understanding of external factors affecting future MPP developments [11]. This identified legal and policy, social, environmental, technical and economic issues as presenting key obstacles to MPP.

Legal and policy obstacles identified included complicated bureaucracy, poor

628 dialogue between public institutions and difficulties identifying responsibilities
629 for permits, and a lack of codes and standards [11]. Social obstacles refer to
630 potential conflict with near-shore and offshore fisheries, tourism and shipping
631 routes.

632 Further, activities that change the marine landscape were deemed socially
633 unacceptable by stakeholders. However, some perceived social obstacles (*e.g.*
634 anchoring issues) stem from a current lack of experience and understanding of
635 ORE installations.

636 Other concerns are about insurance (costs may increase once the potential
637 types of accidents insurers will have to cover become clearer) and the financial
638 feasibility of combining some activities (*e.g.* mussel and seaweed farming with
639 offshore wind farm (OWF)), due to the reluctance of OWF operators to share
640 space due to potential risks arising from multiple uses.

641 While new jobs and revenue streams are obvious socio-economic benefits of
642 MPP projects, there was also evidence of potential conflict with fishing com-
643 munities and between wave energy production and energy suppliers, equipment
644 and machinery, and marine transport. In particular, the offshore wind industry
645 is concerned about potential risks (*e.g.* collision and corrosion) arising from
646 MPP developments [218].

647 Such findings highlight the need for further research, investigating the po-
648 tential socio-environmental-policy-technological risks, opportunities (*e.g.* new
649 business models), challenges (*e.g.*, barriers, and enabling mechanisms), trade-
650 offs associated with MPPs, and their governance. Given the complex and mul-
651 tifaceted emergent properties, and trade-offs associated with the multiple ac-
652 tivities that MPPs comprise, new trans-disciplinary methods, adopting systems
653 approaches resilience-thinking, will be vital to overcome the limitations associ-
654 ated with traditional single discipline approaches [194, 219].

655 This will require consideration of critical systems functions, interactions and
656 inter-dependencies, and their uncertainties, together with levels of robustness
657 and resilience of the MPP and its component systems, across its life-cycle, under
658 a range of conditions including low-frequency high consequence extreme events

659 (e.g. typhoons and storm surges) [219]. Furthermore, greater consideration of
660 cumulative effects, requiring new approaches to overcome recognized limitations
661 in CEA practice are required [133, 134]. Such studies will support the identi-
662 fication of priority risks and monitoring, management and mitigation measures
663 to reduce MPP risks and vulnerabilities.

664 In parallel research assessing the socio-environmental impacts and benefits
665 of MPP is urgently required. Critically this should include consideration of
666 societal acceptability and values, potentially affecting MPP development, and
667 strategies for optimizing their benefits and reducing the risk of conflict. For
668 example, siting MPP further offshore may avoid nearshore conflicts with sectors
669 such as tourism and navigation [12]. This in turn will requires exploration of
670 the governance challenges associated with MPP.

671 Here, it is argued that MPPs and co-location of activities could result in the
672 development of a common regulatory framework, resulting in more co-ordinated
673 marine spatial planning and simplified licensing procedures [13]. In parallel,
674 with research highlighting a wide range of potential legal issues surrounding
675 ORE [220], studies exploring the legal implications of MPP, notably liabilities
676 and the potential need for new forms of business model, will be of importance
677 to the sector.

678 **6. Overview and discussion**

679 As previously stated, due to the scarcity of references analyzing MPP sys-
680 tems, the scope of the review has been expanded also to research works analyzing
681 single energy source systems/single aquaculture systems.

682 In the synoptic Table 3, the references cited have been classified against the
683 type of system analysed:

684 A ORE systems extracting energy only from one type of energy source (single
685 purpose);

686 B Aquaculture (only) systems;

Table 3: System classification of references

System → Aspect ↓	A. ORE systems – single energy source	B. Aqua- -culture systems	C. MPP without aquaculture	D. MPP with aquaculture
Techno- -logical	[221, 222, 20, 63] [223, 224, 225]	[53, 54, 37]	[16, 12, 18] [19, 23, 25] [26, 27, 221] [222, 21, 24] [28, 29, 30] [38, 39, 42] [45, 47, 49] [227, 228, 67] [68, 225] [229, 230]	[13] [56, 58] [59, 33] [218] [10, 25] [27] Detailed [11, 57] [226, 61]
Environ- -mental	[84, 85, 91] [94, 95, 96] [97, 98, 99]	[53, 231] [232, 233, 234] [235, 236]	[135]	[135, 136] [137]
Socio- -economic	[15] (Wind) [7, 179] [180, 181, 185, 186] [190, 187, 188, 189] (Wave) [199] [201, 191] (Policy) [2, 3]	[9, 205, 206] [207, 208, 209] [210, 211] (Policy) [238]	[13, 135]	[12, 13] [237, 100] [135] (Policy) [239]

687 C MPP coupling offshore systems extracting renewable energy from two or more
688 sources, but not coupled with aquaculture system/s;

689 D MPP coupling offshore systems extracting renewable energy from two or more
690 sources, including aquaculture system/s;

691 and against the aspect/s considered, i.e. if mainly concentrating on the
692 technological (engineering) aspects, the environmental impact aspects, the socio-

693 economic aspects, or all of them.

694 6.1. Main considerations on the literature reviewed

695 Most of the research has been focused on the technological aspects of the
696 MPP systems, followed by the socio-economic aspects, and then the environ-
697 mental impact aspects. This can be explained by the Technology Readiness
698 Level (TRL) of the research conducted in this area, which in most cases can be
699 assessed as between TRL 2 and TRL 6, if the TRL scale used by Horizon 2020
700 EU funding scheme is adopted, reported in Table 4. As it can be seen, even if it
701 is not the only aspect, from TRL 1 to TRL 6 the focus is on the technological
702 aspects.

Table 4: Technology Readiness Level [240]

TRL 1	Basic principle observed
TRL 2	Technology concept formulated
TRL 3	Experimental proof of concept
TRL 4	Technology validated in lab
TRL 5	Technology validated in relevant environment
TRL 6	Technology demonstrated in relevant environment
TRL 7	System prototype demonstration in operational environment
TRL 8	System complete and qualified
TRL 9	Actual system proven in operational environment

703 An important first consideration following up from this one is indeed that,
704 despite the substantial advantages obtained if both the environmental and the
705 socio-economic aspects are considered from the early stage of the technology
706 development, the need to adopt a multidisciplinary approach is still not com-
707 mon practice even for commercially mature systems, with only few noticeable
708 examples [11, 14, 57, 61, 226].

709 The second consideration is that the research done on MPP has been much
710 more focused on the so called ‘hybrid’ ORE systems, i.e. coupling wind, wave,
711 and tidal systems, but considering the direct coupling or the close co-location of

712 aquaculture systems in very few cases, especially when considering the techno-
713 logical aspects. The Blue Growth EU-funded projects have started to address
714 this gap in knowledge, and MERMAID [27]), but have also highlighted the
715 several multidisciplinary challenges to be tackled.

716 The third observation is that these European projects had been focusing
717 on large commercial scale installations, MPP farms, consisting in installed ca-
718 pacities of the order of hundreds of MW to GW, connected to the grid and,
719 whenever considered, aquaculture systems of commercial scale. Nonetheless,
720 as demonstrated by some pilot projects in China (Daguan [221], Dawanshan
721 [222], and Sehngshan [222]), there is a strong potential for small scale MPP
722 to serve remote, isolated communities, providing not only a sustainable, safe,
723 affordable source of energy, but also socio-economic benefits such as food and
724 jobs.

725 Furthermore, also in the EU there is a growing research interest in coupling
726 sustainable source of energy to offshore aquaculture facilities [36, 241]. The
727 research on small scale MPP can certainly learn and build upon the ones done for
728 large scale MPP farms, but it is likely that there will be some specific challenges.
729 For example, the scale of the environmental impact is completely different, the
730 metocean conditions will have a higher impact on the dynamic response of the
731 MPP, and the dynamics of the different systems (wind, wave, solar, aquaculture)
732 may be more strongly coupled. There is certainly a need for further research.

733 7. Conclusion

734 An emerging interest in the development of multi-purpose platforms, exploit-
735 ing the synergies among ORE and aquaculture industries, has been observed
736 over the past decade.

737 Based on this analysis, the following main points can be derived, which also
738 constitute a statement of the current gaps in knowledge:

- 739 • In general, there is a scarcity of literature specifically on MPP systems,
740 probably due to this technology's low TRL level, and the lack of full scale,

but also small scale outdoor prototypes;

- Therefore, at the moment, this area of research has to rely on single-purpose, single discipline studies to develop a multidisciplinary analysis framework for MPP systems: the present article aims at providing an overview of the available material to develop such framework;
- If the number of sources on MPP can be considered proportional to the research effort, most of the effort so far has been allocated to the technological aspects (again, probably due to the low TRL level), while the socio-economic and environmental aspects have been investigated to a lower extent;
- The adoption of a multidisciplinary approach is still not common practice even for more mature, single-purpose offshore systems, with only few noticeable examples;
- The majority of the literature focuses on a small subset of MPP, coupling only different ORE devices, but not integrating or co-locating aquaculture systems, with only relatively few recent EU-funded projects that started to address this gap in knowledge;

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council UK (EPSRC) and the Natural Environment Research Council UK (NERC), through grant EP/R007497/1, and the Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) through grant 51761135013. The authors are also thankful to Walid M. H. Nassar, Ph.D student at the University of Strathclyde, for reviewing the section on ‘Control of MPP’s.’

References

- [1] World Energy Council, World Energy Trilemma - 2016 (accessed April 23, 2018).

- 768 URL [https://www.worldenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/](https://www.worldenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/World-Energy-Trilemma_full-report_2016_web.pdf)
769 [World-Energy-Trilemma_full-report_2016_web.pdf](https://www.worldenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/World-Energy-Trilemma_full-report_2016_web.pdf)
- 770 [2] H. Jeffrey, J. Sedgwick, ORECCA European offshore renewable energy
771 roadmap, Edinburgh: Offshore Renewable Energy Conversion Platform
772 Coordination Action Project (2011).
- 773 [3] EOEa, Oceans of energy: European Ocean Energy Roadmap 2010-2050,
774 European Ocean Energy Association (2010).
- 775 [4] L. Mee, Complementary benefits of alternative energy: Suitability of off-
776 shore wind farms as aquaculture sites, Tech. Rep. SEAFISH – Project
777 Ref: 10517, University of Plymouth (2006).
- 778 [5] T. Michler-Cieluch, G. Krause, Perceived concerns and possible manage-
779 ment strategies for governing ‘wind farm–mariculture integration’, Ma-
780 rine Policy 32 (6) (2008) 1013–1022. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2008.02.008)
781 [marpol.2008.02.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2008.02.008).
- 782 [6] T. Michler-Cieluch, G. Krause, B. H. Buck, Reflections on integrating
783 operation and maintenance activities of offshore wind farms and maricul-
784 ture, Ocean & Coastal Management 52 (1) (2009) 57–68. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2008.09.008)
785 [ocecoaman.2008.09.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2008.09.008).
- 786 [7] S. Rodrigues, C. Restrepo, E. Kontos, R. T. Pinto, P. Bauer, Trends
787 of offshore wind projects, Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews
788 49 (2015) 1114–1135. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.04.092)
789 [rser.2015.04.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.04.092)
790 092.
- 790 [8] FAO, State of World Aquaculture, Food & Agriculture Organization,
791 2006.
- 792 [9] A. Drumm, Evaluation of the promotion of offshore aquaculture through
793 a technology platform (OATP), Marine Institute, Galway, 2010.

- 794 [10] P. Holm, B. H. Buck, R. Langan, Introduction: New approaches to
795 sustainable offshore food production and the development of offshore
796 platforms, in: *Aquaculture Perspective of Multi-Use Sites in the Open*
797 *Ocean*, Springer, 2017, pp. 1–20. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51159-7_1)
798 [978-3-319-51159-7_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51159-7_1).
- 799 [11] M. Stuiver, K. Soma, P. Koundouri, S. van den Burg, A. Gerritsen,
800 T. Harkamp, N. Dalsgaard, F. Zagonari, R. Guanche, J.-J. Schouten,
801 S. Hommes, A. Giannouli, T. Söderqvist, L. Rosen, R. Garção, J. Nor-
802 rman, C. Röckmann, M. de Bel, B. Zanuttigh, O. Petersen, F. Møhlenberg,
803 The governance of multi-use platforms at sea for energy production and
804 aquaculture: Challenges for policy makers in European Seas, *Sustainabil-*
805 *ity* 8 (4) (2016) 333. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/su8040333>.
- 806 [12] A. Stefanakou, I. Dagkinis, T. Lilas, A. Maglara, A. Vatistas, Development
807 of a floating wind-desalination multi-use platform (MUP) in the context of
808 optimal use of maritime space, in: *Offshore energy and storage symposium*
809 *(OSES)*, University of Malta, 2016.
- 810 [13] B. Zanuttigh, E. Angelelli, G. Bellotti, A. Romano, Y. Krontira,
811 D. Troianos, R. Suffredini, G. Franceschi, M. Cantù, L. Airoidi, F. Zago-
812 nari, A. Taramelli, F. Filipponi, C. Jimenez, M. Evriviadou, S. Broszeit,
813 Boosting blue growth in a mild sea: Analysis of the synergies produced
814 by a multi-purpose offshore installation in the Northern Adriatic, Italy,
815 *Sustainability* 7 (6) (2015) 6804–6853. doi:[https://doi.org/10.3390/](https://doi.org/10.3390/su7066804)
816 [su7066804](https://doi.org/10.3390/su7066804).
- 817 [14] H. E. Williams, I. Masters, D. Pletsas, C. F. Grunewald, R. Callaway,
818 M. Blanch, G. Dalton, A risk assessment methodology for combining ma-
819 rine renewables with other blue economy activities via multi-use of spaces
820 and platforms, in: *12th European Wave and Tidal Energy Conference,*
821 *EWTEC*, 2017, pp. 817–1 — 817–9.
- 822 [15] J. P. Praene, M. David, F. Sinama, D. Morau, O. Marc, Renewable energy:

- 823 Progressing towards a net zero energy island, the case of Reunion Island,
824 Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 16 (1) (2012) 426–442. doi:
825 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2011.08.007>.
- 826 [16] M. Veigas, G. Iglesias, Potentials of a hybrid offshore farm for the island
827 of Fuerteventura, Energy Conversion and Management 86 (2014) 300–308.
828 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2014.05.032>.
- 829 [17] M. F. Schupp, M. Bocci, D. Depellegrin, A. Kafas, Z. Kyriazi, I. Lu-
830 kic, A. Schultz-Zehden, G. Krause, V. Onyango, B. H. Buck, Towards a
831 common understanding of ocean multi-use, Frontiers in Marine Science 6
832 (2019) 165. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00165>.
- 833 [18] C. Pérez-Collazo, D. Greaves, G. Iglesias, A review of combined wave
834 and offshore wind energy, Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 42
835 (2015) 141–153. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.09.032>.
- 836 [19] M. J. Muliawan, M. Karimirad, T. Moan, Dynamic response and power
837 performance of a combined spar-type floating wind turbine and coaxial
838 floating wave energy converter, Renewable Energy 50 (2013) 47–57. doi:
839 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2012.05.025>.
- 840 [20] J. M. Jonkman, S. Butterfield, W. Musial, G. Scott, Definition of a 5-
841 MW reference wind turbine for offshore system development, Tech. Rep.
842 NREL/TP-500-38060, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden,
843 Colorado (2009).
- 844 [21] C. Michailides, C. Luan, Z. Gao, T. Moan, Effect of flap type wave en-
845 ergy converters on the response of a semi-submersible wind turbine in
846 operational conditions, in: ASME 2014 33rd International Conference on
847 Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering, American Society of Mechanical
848 Engineers, 2014. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1115/OMAE2014-24065>.
- 849 [22] K. O’Sullivan, J. Murphy, Techno-economic optimisation of an oscillating
850 water column array wave energy converter, in: 10th European Wave and

- 851 Tidal Energy Conference (EWTEC), Vol. 1, European Wave and Tidal
852 Energy Committees, Aalborg, Denmark, 2013, pp. 1–8.
- 853 [23] C. Casale, L. R. Serri, N. E. Stolk, I. Yildiz, C. M. E. I. e Innovazione,
854 Synergies, innovative designs and concepts for multipurpose use of con-
855 version platforms, Tech. rep., Results of ORECCA Project–WP4 (FP7)
856 (2012).
- 857 [24] A. B. Da Rocha, F. J. Lino, N. Correia, J. C. Matos, M. Marques,
858 T. Morais, Offshore renewable energy development of ocean technology
859 projects at INEGI, in: Vith Cuban Congress on Mechanical Engineering
860 and Metallurgy, 2010.
- 861 [25] E. Quevedo, M. Cartón, E. Delory, A. Castro, J. Hernández, O. Llinás,
862 J. de Lara, N. Papandroulakis, P. Anastasiadis, J. Bard, H. Jeffrey, D. In-
863 gram, J. Wesnigk, Multi-use offshore platform configurations in the scope
864 of the FP7 TROPOS Project, in: OCEANS-Bergen, 2013 MTS/IEEE,
865 IEEE, 2013, pp. 1–7.
- 866 [26] H2Ocean Website, Development of a wind-wave power open-sea platform
867 equipped for hydrogen generation with support for multiple users of energy
868 (accessed February 15, 2018).
869 URL <http://www.h2ocean-project.eu/>
- 870 [27] E. D. Christensen, M. Stuiver, R. Guanche, F. Møhlenberg, J.-J. Schouten,
871 O. S. Pedersen, W. He, B. Zanuttigh, P. Koundouri, Go offshore-
872 Combining food and energy production, Technical University of Denmark,
873 2015.
- 874 [28] J. E. Hanssen, L. Margheritini, K. O’Sullivan, P. Mayorga, I. Martinez,
875 A. Arriaga, I. Agos, J. Steynor, D. Ingram, R. Hezari, J. H. Todalshaug,
876 Design and performance validation of a hybrid offshore renewable energy
877 platform, in: Tenth International Conference on Ecological Vehicles and
878 Renewable Energies (EVER), IEEE, 2015, pp. 1–8. doi:10.1109/EVER.
879 2015.7113017.

- 880 [29] A. Peiffer, D. Roddier, Design of an oscillating wave surge converter on the
881 WindFloat structure, in: 4th International Conference on Ocean Energy,
882 2012.
- 883 [30] A. Yde, M. M. Pedersen, S. Bellew, A. K  hler, R. S. Clausen, A. W.
884 Nielsen, Experimental and theoretical analysis of a combined floating wave
885 and wind energy conversion platform, Tech. Rep. 0044, DTU Wind Energy
886 (2014).
- 887 [31] H. Soerensen, E. Friis-Madsen, I. Russel, S. Parmeggiani, J. Fern  ndez-
888 Chozas, Feasibility and LCA for a Wave Dragon platform with wind tur-
889 bines, in: The 26th International Ocean and Polar Engineering Confer-
890 ence, International Society of Offshore and Polar Engineers, 2016, pp.
891 570–575.
- 892 [32] I. Russell, E. Friis-Madsen, H. Soerensen, Wave Dragon—‘Coldward and
893 Stormward’, in: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Re-
894 newable Energies Offshore, Lisbon, Portugal, 2016, pp. 249–254.
- 895 [33] ECOFYS, Marine parks: Sketch for sustainable energy and biomass at
896 sea, Tech. Rep. 08.2.168, [in Dutch] (2008).
- 897 [34] N. Papandroulakis, C. Thomsen, K. Mintenbeck, P. Mayorga, J. J.
898 Hern  ndez-Brito, The EU-Project “TROPOS”, in: Aquaculture Perspec-
899 tive of Multi-Use Sites in the Open Ocean, Springer, 2017, pp. 355–374.
900 doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51159-7_12.
- 901 [35] MERMAID, Integration of energy converters in multi-use offshore plat-
902 forms, Tech. Rep. D 3.4, mermaidproject.eu (2015).
- 903 [36] H. L. Syse, Investigating off-grid energy solutions for the salmon farming
904 industry, Master’s thesis, University of Strathclyde and Universitetet i
905 Stavanger (2016).
- 906 [37] EXPOSED, Aquaculture Operations - Annual Report, Tech. rep., The
907 Research Council of Norway, Trondheim, Norway (2017).

- [38] C. Michailides, Z. Gao, T. Moan, Experimental and numerical study of the response of the offshore combined wind/wave energy concept SFC in extreme environmental conditions, *Marine Structures* 50 (2016) 35–54. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marstruc.2016.06.005>.
- [39] Z. Gao, T. Moan, L. Wan, C. Michailides, Comparative numerical and experimental study of two combined wind and wave energy concepts, *Journal of Ocean Engineering and Science* 1 (1) (2016) 36–51. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joes.2015.12.006>.
- [40] MARINTEK, SIMO User’s Manual, Trondheim, Norway (2011).
- [41] MARINTEK, RIFLEX User’s Manual, Trondheim, Norway (2013).
- [42] M. Karimirad, K. Koushan, WindWEC: Combining wind and wave energy inspired by Hywind and Wavestar, in: *International Conference on Renewable Energy Research and Applications (ICRERA)*, IEEE, 2016, pp. 96–101. doi:[10.1109/ICRERA.2016.7884433](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICRERA.2016.7884433).
- [43] J. Jonkman, Definition of the Floating System for Phase IV of OC3, Tech. Rep. NREL/TP-500-47535, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, Colorado (2010).
- [44] M. Kramer, L. Marquis, P. Frigaard, Performance evaluation of the Wavestar prototype, in: *European Wave and Tidal Energy Conference*, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK, 2011.
- [45] T. Soulard, A. Babarit, B. Borgarino, M. Wyns, M. Harismendy, C-HYP: A combined wave and wind energy platform with balanced contributions, in: *32nd International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*, Nantes, France, 2013. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1115/OMAE2013-10778>.
- [46] M. Karimirad, T. Moan, A simplified method for coupled analysis of floating offshore wind turbines, *Marine Structures* 27 (1) (2012) 45–63. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marstruc.2012.03.003>.

- 936 [47] J. A. Armesto, J. Sarmiento, V. Ayllón, A. Iturrioz, A. Jurado,
937 R. Guanche, I. J. Losada, Numerical and experimental study of a multi-
938 use platform, in: 35th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore
939 and Arctic Engineering, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Bu-
940 san, South Korea, 2016, pp. V006T09A018–V006T09A018. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1115/OMAE2016-54427>.
941
- 942 [48] A. Babarit, G. Delhommeau, Theoretical and numerical aspects of the
943 open source BEM solver NEMOH, in: 11th European Wave and Tidal
944 Energy Conference, École Centrale de Nantes, Nantes, France, 2015.
- 945 [49] L. Li, Y. Gao, Z. Yuan, S. Day, Z. Hu, Dynamic response and power
946 production of a floating integrated wind, wave and tidal energy system,
947 Renewable Energy 116 (2018) 412–422. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2017.09.080)
948 [j.renene.2017.09.080](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2017.09.080).
- 949 [50] A. Bahaj, W. Batten, G. McCann, Experimental verifications of numerical
950 predictions for the hydrodynamic performance of horizontal axis marine
951 current turbines, Renewable energy 32 (15) (2007) 2479–2490. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2007.10.001>.
952
- 953 [51] C. Michailides, Z. Gao, T. Moan, Experimental study of the functionality
954 of a semisubmersible wind turbine combined with flap-type wave energy
955 converters, Renewable Energy 93 (2016) 675–690. doi:[https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.03.024)
956 [10.1016/j.renene.2016.03.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.03.024).
- 957 [52] L. Wan, Z. Gao, T. Moan, C. Lugni, Comparative experimental study
958 of the survivability of a combined wind and wave energy converter in
959 two testing facilities, Ocean Engineering 111 (2016) 82–94. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2015.10.045>.
960
- 961 [53] H. F. Upton, E. H. Buck, Open ocean aquaculture, Congressional Research
962 Service, 2010.
- 963 [54] J. Ryan, Farming the deep blue, Marine Institute - Ireland, 2004.

- [55] Y. Chu, C. Wang, J. Park, P. Lader, Review of cage and containment tank designs for offshore fish farming, *Aquaculture* (2020) 734928doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2020.734928>.
- [56] N. Goseberg, B. Franz, T. Schlurmann, The potential co-use of aquaculture and offshore wind energy structures, in: *Proceedings of the Sixth Chinese-German Joint Symposium on Hydraulic and Ocean Engineering (CGJOINT 2012)*, Vol. 6, 2012, pp. 597–603.
- [57] MARIBE, Unlocking the potential of multi-use of space and multi-use platforms (accessed April 28, 2018).
URL <http://maribe.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/maribe-booklet.pdf>
- [58] Á. Viúdez, M. F.-P. Balsells, R. Rodríguez-Marroyo, Artificial upwelling using offshore wind energy for mariculture applications, *Scientia Marina* 80 (S1) (2016) 235–248. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.3989/scimar.04297.06B>.
- [59] O. Langhamer, D. Wilhelmsson, Colonisation of fish and crabs of wave energy foundations and the effects of manufactured holes—a field experiment, *Marine Environmental Research* 68 (4) (2009) 151–157. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2009.06.003>.
- [60] L. Recalde, H. Yue, W. Leithead, O. Anaya-Lara, H. Liu, J. You, Hybrid renewable energy systems sizing for offshore multi-purpose platforms, in: *38th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore & Arctic Engineering*, 2019. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1115/OMAE2019-96017>.
- [61] B. Zanuttigh, E. Angelelli, A. Kortenhaus, K. Koca, Y. Krontira, P. Koundouri, A methodology for multi-criteria design of multi-use offshore platforms for marine renewable energy harvesting, *Renewable Energy* 85 (2016) 1271–1289. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2015.07.080>.

- 992 [62] R. Cozzolino, L. Tribioli, G. Bella, Power management of a hybrid renew-
 993 able system for artificial islands: A case study, *Energy* 106 (2016) 774–789.
 994 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2015.12.118>.
- 995 [63] J. V. Ringwood, S. Simani, Overview of modelling and control strategies
 996 for wind turbines and wave energy devices: Comparisons and contrasts,
 997 *Annual Reviews in Control* 40 (2015) 27–49. doi:[https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arcontrol.2015.09.003)
 998 [1016/j.arcontrol.2015.09.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arcontrol.2015.09.003).
- 999 [64] A. Zeng, Q. Xu, M. Ding, K. Yukita, K. Ichiyanagi, A classification control
 1000 strategy for energy storage system in microgrid, *IEEE Transactions on*
 1001 *Electrical and Electronic Engineering* 10 (4) (2015) 396–403. doi:[https:](https://doi.org/10.1002/tee.22099)
 1002 [//doi.org/10.1002/tee.22099](https://doi.org/10.1002/tee.22099).
- 1003 [65] K.-H. Kim, K. Lee, J. M. Sohn, S.-W. Park, J.-S. Choi, K. Hong, Con-
 1004 ceptual design of 10MW class floating wave-offshore wind hybrid power
 1005 generation system, in: *The Twenty-fifth International Ocean and Polar*
 1006 *Engineering Conference*, International Society of Offshore and Polar En-
 1007 *gineers*, 2015.
- 1008 [66] C. Natesan, S. K. Ajithan, S. Chozhavendhan, A. Devendiran, Power
 1009 management strategies in microgrid: A survey, *International Journal Of*
 1010 *Renewable Energy Research* 5 (2) (2016) 334–340.
- 1011 [67] A. Mohanty, M. Viswavandya, P. K. Ray, S. Mohanty, Reactive power
 1012 control and optimisation of hybrid off shore tidal turbine with system
 1013 uncertainties, *Journal of Ocean Engineering and Science* 1 (4) (2016) 256–
 1014 267. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joes.2016.06.005>.
- 1015 [68] O. Erdinc, M. Uzunoglu, Optimum design of hybrid renewable energy
 1016 systems: Overview of different approaches, *Renewable and Sustainable*
 1017 *Energy Reviews* 16 (3) (2012) 1412–1425. doi:[https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2011.11.011)
 1018 [1016/j.rser.2011.11.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2011.11.011).

- [69] A. Bidram, A. Davoudi, Hierarchical structure of microgrids control system, *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 3 (4) (2012) 1963–1976. doi:10.1109/TSG.2012.2197425.
- [70] Z. Zhou, M. Benbouzid, J. F. Charpentier, F. Scuiller, T. Tang, A review of energy storage technologies for marine current energy systems, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 18 (2013) 390–400. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2012.10.006.
- [71] S. Cao, L. Fu, X. Wang, H. Liu, Research on optimal access of fluctuation source and storage device in DN based on statistical and fuzzy theory, in: 8th International Power Electronics and Motion Control Conference (IPEMC 2016-ECCE Asia), Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), 2016, pp. 201–206. doi:10.1109/IPEMC.2016.7512285.
- [72] G. J. Osório, E. M. G. Rodrigues, J. M. Lujano-Rojas, J. C. O. Matias, J. P. S. Catalão, New control strategy for the weekly scheduling of insular power systems with a battery energy storage system, *Applied Energy* 154 (2015) 459–470. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.05.048.
- [73] C. K. Simoglou, E. G. Kardakos, E. A. Bakirtzis, D. I. Chatzigiannis, S. I. Vagropoulos, A. V. Ntomaris, P. N. Biskas, A. Gigantidou, E. J. Thalassinakis, A. G. Bakirtzis, J. P. S. Catalão, An advanced model for the efficient and reliable short-term operation of insular electricity networks with high renewable energy sources penetration, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 38 (2014) 415–427. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.06.015.
- [74] S. Koochi-Kamali, N. A. Rahim, H. Mokhlis, Smart power management algorithm in microgrid consisting of photovoltaic, diesel, and battery storage plants considering variations in sunlight, temperature, and load, *Energy Conversion and Management* 84 (2014) 562–582. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2014.04.072.

- [75] D. Magagna, A. Uihlein, Ocean energy development in Europe: Current status and future perspectives, *International Journal of Marine Energy* 11 (2015) 84–104. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijome.2015.05.001>.
- [76] B. Zhao, X. Zhang, P. Li, K. Wang, M. Xue, C. Wang, Optimal sizing, operating strategy and operational experience of a stand-alone microgrid on Dongfushan Island, *Applied Energy* 113 (2014) 1656–1666. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2013.09.015>.
- [77] N. Hatziargyriou, *Microgrids: architectures and control*, John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- [78] O. Erdinc, N. G. Paterakis, J. P. S. Catalão, Overview of insular power systems under increasing penetration of renewable energy sources: Opportunities and challenges, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 52 (2015) 333–346. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.104>.
- [79] J. Sachs, O. Sawodny, A two-stage model predictive control strategy for economic diesel-PV-battery island microgrid operation in rural areas, *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy* 7 (3) (2016) 903–913. doi:[10.1109/TSTE.2015.2509031](https://doi.org/10.1109/TSTE.2015.2509031).
- [80] L. Zhang, X. He, H. Xin, Z. Wang, D. Gan, Hierarchical control design and verification of a multi-mode microgrid on the Zhairuoshan Island, in: *Power and Energy Society General Meeting (PESGM)*, 2016, IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–5. doi:[10.1109/PESGM.2016.7741089](https://doi.org/10.1109/PESGM.2016.7741089).
- [81] C. E. Lin, B. C. Phan, Optimal hybrid energy solution for island micro-grid, in: *International Conferences on Big Data and Cloud Computing (BDCloud), Social Computing and Networking (SocialCom), Sustainable Computing and Communications (SustainCom)(BDCloud-SocialCom-SustainCom)*, IEEE, 2016, pp. 461–468. doi:[10.1109/BDCloud-SocialCom-SustainCom.2016.74](https://doi.org/10.1109/BDCloud-SocialCom-SustainCom.2016.74).

- 1075 [82] S. Xie, R. Zhai, X. Liu, B. Li, K. Long, Q. Ai, Self-adaptive genetic algo-
1076 rithm and fuzzy decision based multi-objective optimization in microgrid
1077 with DGs, *The Open Electrical & Electronic Engineering Journal* 10 (1)
1078 (2016) 46–57.
- 1079 [83] K. A. Alexander, S. A. Meyjes, J. J. Heymans, Spatial ecosystem mod-
1080 elling of marine renewable energy installations: Gauging the utility of
1081 Ecospace, *Ecological Modelling* 331 (2016) 115–128. doi:[https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2016.01.016)
1082 [org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2016.01.016](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2016.01.016).
- 1083 [84] G. W. Boehlert, A. B. Gill, Environmental and ecological effects of ocean
1084 renewable energy development: A current synthesis, *Oceanography* 23 (2)
1085 (2010) 68–81. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5670/oceanog.2010.46>.
- 1086 [85] A. L. Drewitt, R. H. W. Langston, Assessing the impacts of wind farms
1087 on birds, *IBIS* 148 (s1) (2006) 29–42. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1111/](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2006.00516.x)
1088 [j.1474-919X.2006.00516.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2006.00516.x).
- 1089 [86] Polaris Wind Power Network, The demolition of all 48 Taiwan wind tur-
1090 bines in Long Island, Shandong Province, in Chinese (accessed May 29,
1091 2018).
1092 URL <http://news.bjx.com.cn/html/20170821/844599.shtml>.
- 1093 [87] P. T. Madsen, M. Wahlberg, J. Tougaard, K. Lucke, P. Tyack, Wind
1094 turbine underwater noise and marine mammals: implications of current
1095 knowledge and data needs, *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 309 (2006)
1096 279–295. doi:[10.3354/meps309279](https://doi.org/10.3354/meps309279).
- 1097 [88] J. Tougaard, O. D. Henriksen, L. A. Miller, Underwater noise from three
1098 types of offshore wind turbines: Estimation of impact zones for harbor por-
1099 poises and harbor seals, *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*
1100 125 (6) (2009) 3766–3773. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3117444>.
- 1101 [89] H. Bailey, B. Senior, D. Simmons, J. Rusin, G. Picken, P. M. Thomp-
1102 son, Assessing underwater noise levels during pile-driving at an offshore

- 1103 windfarm and its potential effects on marine mammals, *Marine Pollu-*
 1104 *tion Bulletin* 60 (6) (2010) 888–897. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.01.003)
 1105 [marpolbul.2010.01.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.01.003).
- 1106 [90] M. J. Brandt, A. Diederichs, K. Betke, G. Nehls, Responses of harbour
 1107 porpoises to pile driving at the Horns Rev II offshore wind farm in the
 1108 Danish North Sea, *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 421 (2011) 205–216.
 1109 doi:<https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08888>.
- 1110 [91] S. Koschinski, B. M. Culik, O. D. Henriksen, N. Tregenza, G. Ellis,
 1111 C. Jansen, G. Kathe, Behavioural reactions of free-ranging porpoises and
 1112 seals to the noise of a simulated 2 MW windpower generator, *Marine*
 1113 *Ecology Progress Series* 265 (2003) 263–273. doi:[10.3354/meps265263](https://doi.org/10.3354/meps265263).
- 1114 [92] F. Thomsen, K. Lüdemann, R. Kafemann, W. Piper, Effects of offshore
 1115 wind farm noise on marine mammals and fish, Tech. rep., Biola, Hamburg,
 1116 Germany on behalf of COWRIE Ltd (2006).
- 1117 [93] R. Kikuchi, Risk formulation for the sonic effects of offshore wind farms
 1118 on fish in the EU region, *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 60 (2) (2010) 172–177.
 1119 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2009.09.023>.
- 1120 [94] M. Wahlberg, H. Westerberg, Hearing in fish and their reactions to sounds
 1121 from offshore wind farms, *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 288 (2005) 295–
 1122 309. doi:[10.3354/meps288295](https://doi.org/10.3354/meps288295).
- 1123 [95] W. J. Grecian, R. Inger, M. J. Attrill, S. Bearhop, B. J. Godley, M. J.
 1124 Witt, S. C. Votier, Potential impacts of wave-powered marine renewable
 1125 energy installations on marine birds, *IBIS* 152 (4) (2010) 683–697. doi:
 1126 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2010.01048.x>.
- 1127 [96] R. Inger, M. J. Attrill, S. Bearhop, A. C. Broderick, W. James Grecian,
 1128 D. J. Hodgson, C. Mills, E. Sheehan, S. C. Votier, M. J. Witt, B. J. Godley,
 1129 Marine renewable energy: potential benefits to biodiversity? An urgent

- 1130 call for research, *Journal of Applied Ecology* 46 (6) (2009) 1145–1153.
 1131 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2009.01697.x>.
- 1132 [97] D. Wilhelmsson, T. Malm, M. C. Öhman, The influence of offshore wind-
 1133 power on demersal fish, *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 63 (5) (2006)
 1134 775–784. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icesjms.2006.02.001>.
- 1135 [98] E. A. S. Linley, T. A. Wilding, K. Black, A. J. S. Hawkins, S. Mangi,
 1136 Review of the reef effects of offshore wind farm structures and their po-
 1137 tential for enhancement and mitigation, Tech. Rep. RFCA/005/0029P,
 1138 PML Applications Ltd and SAMS (2007).
- 1139 [99] O. Langhamer, D. Wilhelmsson, J. Engström, Artificial reef effect and
 1140 fouling impacts on offshore wave power foundations and buoys—a pilot
 1141 study, *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 82 (3) (2009) 426–432. doi:
 1142 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2009.02.009>.
- 1143 [100] A. H. Fayram, A. de Risi, The potential compatibility of offshore wind
 1144 power and fisheries: An example using bluefin tuna in the Adriatic Sea,
 1145 *Ocean & Coastal Management* 50 (8) (2007) 597–605. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2007.05.004>.
- 1147 [101] T. Dempster, P. Sanchez-Jerez, J. T. Bayle-Sempere, F. Giménez-
 1148 Casalduero, C. Valle, Attraction of wild fish to sea-cage fish farms in
 1149 the south-western Mediterranean Sea: spatial and short-term temporal
 1150 variability, *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 242 (2002) 237–252. doi:
 1151 [10.3354/meps242237](https://doi.org/10.3354/meps242237).
- 1152 [102] P. Tett, S. Benjamins, K. D. Black, M. Coulson, K. Davidson, T. Fer-
 1153 nandes, C. Fox, M. Hart, N. Hicks, A. Hughes, D.-C. Hunter, T. Nickell,
 1154 D. Risch, D. Tocher, L. L. Vare, E. Verspoor, T. Wilding, B. Wilson,
 1155 A. Wittich, Review of the environmental impacts of salmon farming in
 1156 Scotland. A Report by SAMS Research Services Limited for the Environ-
 1157 ment, Climate Change and Land Reform (ECCLR) Committee), Tech.
 1158 Rep. 02468–0001, The Scottish Parliament (2018).

- 1159 [103] M. J. Costello, Ecology of sea lice parasitic on farmed and wild fish, Trends
1160 in Parasitology 22 (10) (2006) 475–483. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/
1161 j.pt.2006.08.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2006.08.006).
- 1162 [104] P. A. Bjørn, R. Sivertsgård, B. Finstad, R. Nilsen, R. M. Serra-Llinares,
1163 R. Kristoffersen, Area protection may reduce salmon louse infection risk
1164 to wild salmonids, Aquaculture Environment Interactions 1 (3) (2011)
1165 233–244. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3354/aei00023>.
- 1166 [105] I. P. Helland, I. Uglem, P. A. Jansen, O. H. Diserud, P. A. Bjørn,
1167 B. Finstad, Statistical and ecological challenges of monitoring parasitic
1168 salmon lice infestations in wild salmonid fish stocks, Aquaculture Envi-
1169 ronment Interactions 7 (3) (2015) 267–280. doi:[https://doi.org/10.
1170 3354/aei00155](https://doi.org/10.3354/aei00155).
- 1171 [106] P. Gargan, S. Shephard, C. Macintyre, Assessment of the increased mor-
1172 tality risk and population regulating effect of sea lice (*Lepeophtheirus*
1173 *salmonis*) from marine salmon farms on wild sea trout in Ireland and
1174 Scotland, in: G. Harris (Ed.), Sea trout: Science & Management, 2017,
1175 pp. 507–522.
- 1176 [107] A. Ferguson, I. A. Fleming, K. Hindar, Ø. Skaala, P. McGinnity, T. Cross,
1177 P. Prodöhl, Farm Escapes, in: E. Verspoor, L. Stradmeyer, J. L. Nielsen
1178 (Eds.), The Atlantic salmon: genetics, conservation and management,
1179 Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 2007, Ch. 12, pp. 357–398.
- 1180 [108] Ø. Skaala, K. A. Glover, B. T. Barlaup, T. Svåsand, F. Besnier, M. M.
1181 Hansen, R. Borgstrøm, Performance of farmed, hybrid, and wild Atlantic
1182 salmon (*Salmo salar*) families in a natural river environment, Canadian
1183 Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 69 (12) (2012) 1994–2006. doi:
1184 <https://doi.org/10.1139/f2012-118>.
- 1185 [109] L. Sundt-Hansen, J. Huisman, H. Skoglund, K. Hindar, Farmed Atlantic
1186 salmon *Salmo salar* L. parr may reduce early survival of wild fish, Jour-

- 1187 nal of Fish Biology 86 (6) (2015) 1699–1712. doi:[https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.12677)
1188 1111/jfb.12677.
- 1189 [110] K. A. Glover, C. Pertoldi, F. Besnier, V. Wennevik, M. Kent, Ø. Skaala,
1190 Atlantic salmon populations invaded by farmed escapees: quantifying ge-
1191 netic introgression with a Bayesian approach and SNPs, BMC Genetics
1192 14 (1) (2013) 74. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2156-14-74>.
- 1193 [111] S. Karlsson, O. H. Diserud, P. Fiske, K. Hindar, Widespread genetic
1194 introgression of escaped farmed Atlantic salmon in wild salmon pop-
1195 ulations, ICES Journal of Marine Science 73 (10) (2016) 2488–2498.
1196 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsw121>.
- 1197 [112] E. Mente, J. C. Martin, I. Tuck, K. A. Kormas, M. B. Santos, N. Bai-
1198 ley, G. J. Pierce, Mesoscale effects of aquaculture installations on benthic
1199 and epibenthic communities in four Scottish sea lochs, Aquatic Living
1200 Resources 23 (3) (2010) 267–276. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1051/alr/](https://doi.org/10.1051/alr/2010030)
1201 2010030.
- 1202 [113] N. B. Keeley, C. K. Macleod, G. A. Hopkins, B. M. Forrest, Spatial and
1203 temporal dynamics in macrobenthos during recovery from salmon farm
1204 induced organic enrichment: When is recovery complete?, Marine Pol-
1205 lution Bulletin 80 (2014) 250–262. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.12.008)
1206 marpolbul.2013.12.008.
- 1207 [114] P. A. Gillibrand, C. J. Cromey, K. D. Black, M. E. Inall, S. J. Gontarek,
1208 Identifying the risk of deoxygenation in Scottish sea lochs with isolated
1209 deep water, in: Scottish Aquaculture Research Forum, SARF, Vol. 7,
1210 2006.
- 1211 [115] P. Tett, V. Edwards, Review of harmful algal blooms in Scottish coastal
1212 waters, Tech. rep., Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (2002).
- 1213 [116] L. Rydberg, B. Sjöberg, A. Stigebrandt, The interaction between fish

- 1214 farming and algal communities of the Scottish waters: A review, Tech.
1215 rep., Scottish Executive Environment Group Research (2003).
- 1216 [117] T. J. Smayda, Harmful algal bloom communities in Scottish coastal wa-
1217 ters: Relationship to fish farming and regional comparisons: A review,
1218 Tech. rep., Scottish Executive Environment Group Research (2006).
- 1219 [118] M. J. Costello, A. Grant, I. M. Davies, S. Cecchini, S. Papoutsoglou,
1220 D. Quigley, M. Saroglia, The control of chemicals used in aquaculture
1221 in Europe, *Journal of Applied Ichthyology* 17 (4) (2001) 173–180. doi:
1222 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1439-0426.2001.00314.x>.
- 1223 [119] L. Burrige, J. S. Weis, F. Cabello, J. Pizarro, K. Bostick, Chemical
1224 use in salmon aquaculture: A review of current practices and possible
1225 environmental effects, *Aquaculture* 306 (2010) 7–23. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2010.05.020>.
- 1227 [120] S. Northridge, A. Coram, J. Gordon, Investigations on seal depredation at
1228 Scottish fish farms, Tech. rep., Edinburgh: Scottish Government (2013).
- 1229 [121] A. Coram, J. Gordon, D. Thompson, S. Northridge, Evaluating and as-
1230 sessing the relative effectiveness of non-lethal measures, including acoustic
1231 deterrent devices, on marine mammals, Tech. rep., Scottish Government
1232 (2014).
- 1233 [122] N. J. Quick, S. J. Middlemas, J. D. Armstrong, A survey of antipredator
1234 controls at marine salmon farms in Scotland, *Aquaculture* 230 (2004) 169–
1235 180. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486\(03\)00428-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486(03)00428-9).
- 1236 [123] P. F. Olesiuk, L. M. Nichol, M. J. Sowden, J. K. Ford, Effect of the sound
1237 generated by an acoustic harassment device on the relative abundance and
1238 distribution of harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) in Retreat Passage,
1239 British Columbia, *Marine Mammal Science* 18 (4) (2002) 843–862. doi:
1240 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.2002.tb01077.x>.

- 1241 [124] M. J. Brandt, C. Höschle, A. Diederichs, K. Betke, R. Matuschek,
1242 S. Witte, G. Nehls, Far-reaching effects of a seal scarer on harbour por-
1243 poises, *Phocoena phocoena*, *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwa-*
1244 *ter Ecosystems* 23 (2) (2013) 222–232. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1002/](https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2311)
1245 [aqc.2311](https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2311).
- 1246 [125] M. Holmer, Environmental issues of fish farming in offshore waters: per-
1247 spectives, concerns and research needs, *Aquaculture Environment Inter-*
1248 *actions* 1 (1) (2009) 57–70. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3354/aei00007>.
- 1249 [126] J. Liu, Y. Cui, J. Liu, Advances in studies on the effect of cage culture on
1250 the environment, *Acta Hydrobiologica Sinica* 21 (1997) 174–184.
- 1251 [127] P. A. Azevedo, C. L. Podemski, R. H. Hesslein, S. E. M. Kasian, D. L.
1252 Findlay, D. P. Bureau, Estimation of waste outputs by a rainbow trout
1253 cage farm using a nutritional approach and monitoring of lake water qual-
1254 ity, *Aquaculture* 311 (1-4) (2011) 175–186. doi:[https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2010.12.001)
1255 [1016/j.aquaculture.2010.12.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2010.12.001).
- 1256 [128] H. Cai, L. G. Ross, T. C. Telfer, C. Wu, A. Zhu, S. Zhao, M. Xu, Modelling
1257 the nitrogen loadings from large yellow croaker (*Larimichthys crocea*) cage
1258 aquaculture, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 23 (8) (2016)
1259 7529–7542. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-6015-0>.
- 1260 [129] X. Wang, L. M. Olsen, K. I. Reitan, Y. Olsen, Discharge of nutrient wastes
1261 from salmon farms: environmental effects, and potential for integrated
1262 multi-trophic aquaculture, *Aquaculture Environment Interactions* 2 (3)
1263 (2012) 267–283. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3354/aei00044>.
- 1264 [130] J. G. Ferreira, H. C. Andersson, R. A. Corner, X. Desmit, Q. Fang, E. D.
1265 de Goede, S. B. Groom, H. Gu, B. G. Gustafsson, A. J. S. Hawkins,
1266 R. Hutson, H. Jiao, D. Lan, J. Lencart-Silva, R. Li, X. Liu, Q. Luo, J. K.
1267 Musango, A. M. Nobre, J. P. Nunes, P. L. Pascoe, J. G. C. Smits, A. Stige-
1268 brandt, T. C. Telfer, M. P. de Wit, X. Yan, X. L. Zhang, Z. Zhang, M. Y.

1269 Zhu, C. B. Zhu, S. B. Bricker, Y. Xiao, S. Xu, C. E. Nauen, M. Scalet, Sus-
1270 tainable Options for People, Catchment and Aquatic Resources (SPEAR),
1271 Tech. Rep. INCO-CT-2004-510706, Institute of Marine Research, Bergen,
1272 Norway (2015).

1273 [131] H. Ackefors, M. Enell, Discharge of nutrients from Swedish fish farming
1274 to adjacent sea areas, *Ambio* 19 (1) (1990) 28–35.

1275 [132] E. Papatryphon, J. Petit, H. M. G. Van Der Werf, K. J. Sadasivam,
1276 K. Claver, Nutrient-balance modeling as a tool for environmental man-
1277 agement in aquaculture: the case of trout farming in France, *Environ-*
1278 mental Management 35 (2) (2005) 161–174. doi:[https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-004-4020-z)
1279 1007/s00267-004-4020-z.

1280 [133] E. Willsted, A. B. Gill, S. Birchenough, S. R. Jude, Assessing the cumu-
1281 lative environmental effects of marine renewable energy developments: Es-
1282 tablishing common ground, *Science of the Total Environment* 577 (2017)
1283 19–32. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.10.152)
1284 scitotenv.2016.10.152.

1285 [134] E. A. Willsted, S. Jude, A. B. Gill, S. N. R. Birchenough, Obligations and
1286 aspirations: A critical evaluation of offshore wind farm cumulative impact
1287 assessments, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 82 (3) (2017)
1288 2332–2345. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.08.079)
1289 rser.2017.08.079.

1290 [135] TROPOS, Comparative statement/assessment for selected deployment lo-
1291 cations including comparison to non-multi-use platforms, Tech. Rep. D6.5,
1292 TROPOS Project (2015).

1293 [136] H. Bush, G. Bawn, N. Minns, C. Raimundo, Environmental impact scop-
1294 ing study, Tech. Rep. D9.1, H2OCEAN (2013).

1295 [137] I. Hart, T. Chanvrier, Environmental impact assessment, Tech. Rep. D9.6,
1296 H2OCEAN (2015).

1297 [138] A. Nobre, M. Pacheco, R. Jorge, M. F. P. Lopes, L. M. C. Gato, Geo-
1298 spatial multi-criteria analysis for wave energy conversion system deploy-

- 1297 ment, Renewable energy 34 (1) (2009) 97–111. doi:[https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2008.03.002)
1298 10.1016/j.renene.2008.03.002.
- 1299 [139] M. J. Punt, R. A. Groeneveld, E. C. Van Ierland, J. H. Stel, Spatial
1300 planning of offshore wind farms: A windfall to marine environmental
1301 protection?, Ecological Economics 69 (1) (2009) 93–103. doi:[https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.07.013)
1302 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.07.013.
- 1303 [140] S. Jay, Planners to the rescue: Spatial planning facilitating the devel-
1304 opment of offshore wind energy, Marine Pollution Bulletin 60 (4) (2010)
1305 493–499. doi:[https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2009.11.010)
10.1016/j.marpolbul.2009.11.010.
- 1306 [141] K. A. Alexander, T. Potts, T. A. Wilding, Marine renewable energy and
1307 Scottish west coast fishers: Exploring impacts, opportunities and potential
1308 mitigation, Ocean & Coastal Management 75 (2013) 1–10. doi:[https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2013.01.005)
1309 10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2013.01.005.
- 1310 [142] J. K. Petersen, T. Malm, Offshore windmill farms: threats to or possi-
1311 bilities for the marine environment, AMBIO: A Journal of the Human
1312 Environment 35 (2) (2006) 75–80.
- 1313 [143] P. F. Sale, R. K. Cowen, B. S. Danilowicz, G. P. Jones, J. P. Kritzer,
1314 K. C. Lindeman, S. Planes, N. V. C. Polunin, G. R. Russ, Y. J. Sadovy,
1315 R. S. Steneck, Critical science gaps impede use of no-take fishery reserves,
1316 Trends in Ecology & Evolution 20 (2) (2005) 74–80. doi:[https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2004.11.007)
1317 10.1016/j.tree.2004.11.007.
- 1318 [144] M. Coll, J. Steenbeek, J. Sole, I. Palomera, V. Christensen, Modelling the
1319 cumulative spatial–temporal effects of environmental drivers and fishing in
1320 a NW Mediterranean marine ecosystem, Ecological modelling 331 (2016)
1321 100–114. doi:[https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2016.03.020)
10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2016.03.020.
- 1322 [145] C. Piroddi, M. Coll, C. Liqueste, D. Macias, K. Greer, J. Buszowski,
1323 J. Steenbeek, R. Danovaro, V. Christensen, Historical changes of the
1324 Mediterranean Sea ecosystem: modelling the role and impact of primary

- 1325 productivity and fisheries changes over time, *Scientific reports* 7 (2017)
1326 1–18. doi:10.1038/srep44491.
- 1327 [146] D. Martin, F. Bertasi, M. A. Colangelo, M. de Vries, M. Frost, S. J.
1328 Hawkins, E. Macpherson, P. S. Moschella, M. P. Satta, R. C. Thomp-
1329 son, V. U. Ceccherelli, Ecological impact of coastal defence structures on
1330 sediment and mobile fauna: evaluating and forecasting consequences of
1331 unavoidable modifications of native habitats, *Coastal engineering* 52 (10-
1332 11) (2005) 1027–1051. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.
1333 2005.09.006.
- 1334 [147] J. C. Wilson, M. Elliott, The habitat-creation potential of offshore wind
1335 farms, *Wind Energy* 12 (2) (2009) 203–212. doi:https://doi.org/10.
1336 1002/we.324.
- 1337 [148] N. Davis, G. R. VanBlaricom, P. K. Dayton, Man-made structures on ma-
1338 rine sediments: Effects on adjacent benthic communities, *Marine Biology*
1339 70 (3) (1982) 295–303. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00396848.
- 1340 [149] F. Barros, A. J. Underwood, M. Lindegarth, The influence of rocky reefs
1341 on structure of benthic macrofauna in nearby soft-sediments, *Estuarine,
1342 Coastal and Shelf Science* 52 (2) (2001) 191–199. doi:https://doi.org/
1343 10.1006/ecss.2000.0734.
- 1344 [150] G. Fabi, F. Luccarini, M. Panfili, C. Solustri, A. Spagnolo, Effects of an
1345 artificial reef on the surrounding soft-bottom community (central Adriatic
1346 Sea), *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 59 (suppl) (2002) S343–S349. doi:
1347 https://doi.org/10.1006/jmsc.2002.1308.
- 1348 [151] A. Fukunaga, J. H. Bailey-Brock, Benthic infaunal communities around
1349 two artificial reefs in Mamala Bay, Oahu, Hawaii, *Marine Environmen-
1350 tal Research* 65 (3) (2008) 250–263. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.
1351 marenvres.2007.11.003.

- 1352 [152] C. Piroddi, G. Bearzi, V. Christensen, Marine open cage aquaculture in
1353 the eastern Mediterranean Sea: a new trophic resource for bottlenose
1354 dolphins, *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 440 (2011) 255–266. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3354/meps09319>.
1355
- 1356 [153] A. Beattie, U. R. Sumaila, V. Christensen, D. Pauly, A model for the
1357 bioeconomic evaluation of marine protected area size and placement in
1358 the North Sea, *Natural Resource Modeling* 15 (4) (2002) 413–437. doi:
1359 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-7445.2002.tb00096.x>.
- 1360 [154] A. K. Salomon, N. P. Waller, C. McIlhagga, R. L. Yung, C. Walters,
1361 Modeling the trophic effects of marine protected area zoning policies: A
1362 case study, *Aquatic Ecology* 36 (1) (2002) 85–95. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013346622536>.
1363
- 1364 [155] Z. Chen, S. Xu, Y. Qiu, Z. Lin, X. Jia, Modeling the effects of fishery
1365 management and marine protected areas on the Beibu Gulf using spatial
1366 ecosystem simulation, *Fisheries Research* 100 (3) (2009) 222–229. doi:
1367 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2009.08.001>.
- 1368 [156] P. M. Mace, A new role for MSY in single-species and ecosystem ap-
1369 proaches to fisheries stock assessment and management, *Fish and Fish-*
1370 *eries* 2 (1) (2001) 2–32. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-2979.](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-2979.2001.00033.x)
1371 [2001.00033.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-2979.2001.00033.x).
- 1372 [157] D. Pauly, V. Christensen, S. Gu  nette, T. J. Pitcher, U. R. Sumaila,
1373 C. J. Walters, R. Watson, D. Zeller, Towards sustainability in world
1374 fisheries, *Nature* 418 (2002) 689–695. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1038/](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01017)
1375 [nature01017](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01017).
- 1376 [158] A. D. M. Smith, E. J. Fulton, A. J. Hobday, D. C. Smith, P. Shoulder, Sci-
1377 entific tools to support the practical implementation of ecosystem-based
1378 fisheries management, *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 64 (4) (2007) 633–
1379 639. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsm041>.

- 1380 [159] L. B. Crowder, E. L. Hazen, N. Avissar, R. Bjorkland, C. Latanich, M. B.
1381 Ogburn, The impacts of fisheries on marine ecosystems and the transition
1382 to ecosystem-based management, *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution,*
1383 *and Systematics* 39 (2008) 259–278. doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.39.
1384 110707.173406.
- 1385 [160] M. R. Heithaus, A. Frid, A. J. Wirsing, B. Worm, Predicting ecological
1386 consequences of marine top predator declines, *Trends in Ecology & Evo-*
1387 *lution* 23 (4) (2008) 202–210. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.
1388 2008.01.003.
- 1389 [161] K. Hyder, A. G. Rossberg, J. I. Allen, M. C. Austen, R. M. Barciela, H. J.
1390 Bannister, P. G. Blackwell, J. L. Blanchard, M. T. Burrows, E. Defriez,
1391 T. Dorrington, K. P. Edwards, B. Garcia-Carreras, M. R. Heath, D. J.
1392 Hembury, J. J. Heymans, J. Holt, J. E. Houle, S. Jennings, S. Mackin-
1393 son, S. J. Malcolm, R. McPike, L. Mee, D. K. Mills, C. Montgomery,
1394 D. Pearson, J. K. Pinnegar, M. Pollicino, E. E. Popova, L. Rae, S. I.
1395 Rogers, D. Speirs, M. A. Spence, R. Thorpe, R. K. Turner, J. van der
1396 Molen, A. Yool, D. M. Paterson, Making modelling count - increas-
1397 ing the contribution of shelf-seas community and ecosystem models to
1398 policy development and management, *Marine Policy* 61 (2015) 291–302.
1399 doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2015.07.015.
- 1400 [162] X. Corrales, M. Coll, E. Ofir, C. Piroddi, M. Goren, D. Edelist, J. J.
1401 Heymans, J. Steenbeek, V. Christensen, G. Gal, Hindcasting the dynam-
1402 ics of an Eastern Mediterranean marine ecosystem under the impacts
1403 of multiple stressors, *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 580 (2017) 17–36.
1404 doi:https://doi.org/10.3354/meps12271.
- 1405 [163] V. Stelzenmüller, M. Coll, A. D. Mazaris, S. Giakoumi, S. Katsanevakis,
1406 M. E. Portman, R. Degen, P. Mackelworth, A. Gimpel, P. G. Albano,
1407 V. Almpanidou, J. Claudet, F. Essl, T. Evagelopoulos, J. J. Heymans,
1408 T. Genov, S. Kark, F. Micheli, M. G. Pennino, G. Rilov, B. Rumes,

- 1409 J. Steenbeek, H. Ojaveer, A risk-based approach to cumulative effect as-
 1410 sessments for marine management, *Science of The Total Environment* 612
 1411 (2018) 1132–1140. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.08.289)
 1412 08.289.
- 1413 [164] J. W. Baretta, W. Ebenhöh, P. Ruardij, The European regional seas
 1414 ecosystem model, a complex marine ecosystem model, *Netherlands Jour-*
 1415 *nal of Sea Research* 33 (1995) 233–246. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/](https://doi.org/10.1016/0077-7579(95)90047-0)
 1416 0077-7579(95)90047-0.
- 1417 [165] E. A. Fulton, N. J. Bax, R. H. Bustamante, J. M. Dambacher, C. Dich-
 1418 mont, P. K. Dunstan, K. R. Hayes, A. J. Hobday, R. Pitcher, É. E.
 1419 Plagányi, A. E. Punt, M. Savina-Rolland, A. D. M. Smith, D. C. Smith,
 1420 Modelling marine protected areas: insights and hurdles, *Philosophical*
 1421 *Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 370 (1681) (2015)
 1422 20140278. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2014.0278>.
- 1423 [166] D. Gascuel, M. Coll, C. Fox, S. Guénette, J. Guitton, A. Kenny, L. Knit-
 1424 tweis, J. R. Nielsen, G. Piet, T. Raid, M. Travers-Trolet, S. Shephard,
 1425 Fishing impact and environmental status in European seas: a diagnosis
 1426 from stock assessments and ecosystem indicators, *Fish and Fisheries* 17 (1)
 1427 (2014) 31–55. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12090>.
- 1428 [167] T. J. Pitcher, E. A. Buchary, T. Hutton, Forecasting the benefits of no-
 1429 take human-made reefs using spatial ecosystem simulation, *ICES Journal*
 1430 *of Marine Science* 59 (2002) S17–S26. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1006/](https://doi.org/10.1006/jmsc.2002.1185)
 1431 jmsc.2002.1185.
- 1432 [168] M. Colléter, D. Gascuel, C. Albouy, P. Francour, L. T. de Morais,
 1433 A. Valls, F. Le Loc’h, Fishing inside or outside? A case studies analy-
 1434 sis of potential spillover effect from marine protected areas, using food
 1435 web models, *Journal of Marine Systems* 139 (2014) 383–395. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2014.07.023>.
 1436

- 1437 [169] M. Coll, E. Akoglu, F. Arreguín-Sánchez, E. A. Fulton, D. Gascuel,
1438 J. J. Heymans, S. Libralato, S. Mackinson, I. Palomera, C. Piroddi,
1439 L. J. Shannon, J. Steenbeek, S. Villasante, V. Christensen, Modelling
1440 dynamic ecosystems: venturing beyond boundaries with the Ecopath ap-
1441 proach, *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* 25 (2) (2015) 413–424.
1442 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11160-015-9386-x>.
- 1443 [170] L. Morissette, K. Kaschner, L. R. Gerber, Ecosystem models clarify the
1444 trophic role of whales off Northwest Africa, *Marine Ecology Progress Series*
1445 404 (2010) 289–302. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08443>.
- 1446 [171] N. Serpetti, A. R. Baudron, M. T. Burrows, B. L. Payne, P. Helaouet,
1447 P. G. Fernandes, J. Heymans, Impact of ocean warming on sustain-
1448 able fisheries management informs the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries,
1449 *Scientific reports* 7 (1) (2017) 13438. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-13220-7>.
- 1451 [172] J. Steenbeek, M. Coll, L. Gurney, F. Mélin, N. Hoepffner, J. Buszowski,
1452 V. Christensen, Bridging the gap between ecosystem modeling tools and
1453 geographic information systems: Driving a food web model with external
1454 spatial-temporal data, *Ecological Modelling* 263 (2013) 139–151. doi:
1455 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2013.04.027>.
- 1456 [173] J. Steenbeek, J. Buszowski, V. Christensen, E. Akoglu, K. Aydin,
1457 N. Ellis, D. Felinto, J. Guitton, S. Lucey, K. Kearney, S. Mackinson,
1458 M. Pan, M. Platts, C. Walters, Ecopath with Ecosim as a model-building
1459 toolbox: Source code capabilities, extensions, and variations, *Ecologi-
1460 cal Modelling* 319 (2016) 178–189. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.
1461 ecolmodel.2015.06.031](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2015.06.031).
- 1462 [174] L. Tong, Ecopath model—a mass-balance modeling for ecosystem estima-
1463 tion, *Marine Fisheries Research* 20 (2) (1999) 103–107.
- 1464 [175] J.-f. Feng, L. Zhu, H.-l. Wang, Study on characters of coastal ecosystem

- 1465 in Bohai Bay with EwE, *Marine Environmental Science* 29 (6) (2010)
1466 781–784.
- 1467 [176] Q. Lin, X. S. Jin, B. Zhang, X. Guo, Comparative study on the changes
1468 of the Bohai Sea ecosystem structure based on Ecopath model between
1469 ten years, *Acta Ecologica Sinica* 29 (7) (2009) 3613–3620.
- 1470 [177] Q. Lin, X.-s. Jin, X.-w. Guo, B. Zhang, Study on the structure and energy
1471 flow of the Yangtze River Estuary and adjacent waters ecosystem based
1472 on Ecopath model, *Journal of Hydroecology* 2 (2) (2009) 30–38.
- 1473 [178] H. Jiang, H.-Q. Cheng, H.-G. Xu, F. Arreguín-Sánchez, M. J. Zetina-
1474 Rejón, P. D. M. Luna, W. J. F. Le Quesne, Trophic controls of jelly-
1475 fish blooms and links with fisheries in the East China Sea, *Ecological*
1476 *Modelling* 212 (3-4) (2008) 492–503. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2007.10.048)
1477 [ecolmodel.2007.10.048](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2007.10.048).
- 1478 [179] J. K. Kaldellis, D. Apostolou, M. Kapsali, E. Kondili, Environmental
1479 and social footprint of offshore wind energy. Comparison with onshore
1480 counterpart, *Renewable Energy* 92 (2016) 543–556. doi:[https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.02.018)
1481 [org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.02.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.02.018).
- 1482 [180] M. Busch, K. Gee, B. Burkhard, M. Lange, N. Stelljes, Conceptualiz-
1483 ing the link between marine ecosystem services and human well-being:
1484 the case of offshore wind farming, *International Journal of Biodiver-*
1485 *sity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management* 7 (3) (2011) 190–203.
1486 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/21513732.2011.618465>.
- 1487 [181] P. Devine-Wright, Y. Howes, Disruption to place attachment and the
1488 protection of restorative environments: A wind energy case study, *Jour-*
1489 *nal of Environmental Psychology* 30 (3) (2010) 271–280. doi:[https:](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.01.008)
1490 [//doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.01.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.01.008).
- 1491 [182] J. R. Nedwell, S. Cheesman, R. Barham, Measurement of the underwa-
1492 ter noise from operational windfarms, and assessment of the potential for

- 1493 effects on the environment, in: The 11th European Conference on Under-
1494 water Acoustics, Institute of Acoustics, 2012, pp. 1098–1103.
- 1495 [183] J. Nedwell, J. Langworthy, D. Howell, Assessment of sub-sea acoustic
1496 noise and vibration from offshore wind turbines and its impact on marine
1497 wildlife; initial measurements of underwater noise during construction of
1498 offshore windfarms, and comparison with background noise, Tech. Rep.
1499 544R0423, COWRIE Ltd (2003).
- 1500 [184] J. R. Nedwell, S. J. Parvin, B. Edwards, R. Workman, A. G. Brooker,
1501 J. E. Kynoch, Measurement and interpretation of underwater noise during
1502 construction and operation of offshore windfarms in UK waters, Tech. Rep.
1503 544R0738, COWRIE Ltd (2007).
- 1504 [185] C. Hattam, T. Hooper, E. Papathanasopoulou, Understanding the Im-
1505 pacts of offshore wind farms on well-being, The Crown Estate, 2015.
- 1506 [186] V. Westerberg, J. B. Jacobsen, R. Lifran, The case for offshore wind
1507 farms, artificial reefs and sustainable tourism in the French mediterranean,
1508 Tourism Management 34 (2013) 172–183. doi:[https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.04.008)
1509 [1016/j.tourman.2012.04.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.04.008).
- 1510 [187] S. Mackinson, H. Curtis, R. Brown, K. McTaggart, N. Taylor, S. Neville,
1511 S. Rogers, A report on the perceptions of the fishing industry into the
1512 potential socio-economic impacts of offshore wind energy developments on
1513 their work patterns and income, Tech. Rep. 133, Centre for Environment
1514 Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (2006).
- 1515 [188] J. Firestone, W. Kempton, Public opinion about large offshore wind
1516 power: Underlying factors, Energy policy 35 (3) (2007) 1584–1598. doi:
1517 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2006.04.010>.
- 1518 [189] A. Vanhulle, R. Houthave, M. Di Marcantonio, Seascape and socio-
1519 economic study: final results, Offshore wind farms in the Belgian part

- of the North Sea: Early environmental impact assessment and spatio-temporal variability. Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences. Management Unit of the North Sea Mathematical Models. Marine Ecosystem Management Unit: Brussel (2010) 165–186.
- [190] Å. Waldo, Offshore wind power in Sweden—A qualitative analysis of attitudes with particular focus on opponents, *Energy Policy* 41 (2012) 692–702. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.11.033>.
- [191] I. Bailey, J. West, I. Whitehead, Out of sight but not out of mind? Public perceptions of wave energy, *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 13 (2) (2011) 139–157. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2011.573632>.
- [192] C. Haggett, Over the sea and far away? A consideration of the planning, politics and public perception of offshore wind farms, *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 10 (3) (2008) 289–306. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/15239080802242787>.
- [193] WAVEPLAM, Wave Energy: A Guide for Investors and Policy Makers (accessed May 9, 2018).
URL http://www.waveplam.eu/files/downloads/D.3.2.Guidelines_FINAL.pdf.
- [194] S. Kerr, L. Watts, J. Colton, F. Conway, A. Hull, K. Johnson, S. Jude, A. Kannen, S. MacDougall, C. McLachlan, T. Potts, J. Vergunst, Establishing an agenda for social studies research in marine renewable energy, *Energy Policy* 67 (2014) 694–702. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.11.063>.
- [195] A. Babarit, D. Bull, K. Dykes, R. Malins, K. Nielsen, R. Costello, J. Roberts, C. B. Ferreira, B. Kennedy, J. Weber, Stakeholder requirements for commercially successful wave energy converter farms, *Renewable Energy* 113 (2017) 742–755. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2017.06.040>.

- [196] F. Flocard, D. Ierodiaconou, I. R. Coghlan, Multi-criteria evaluation of wave energy projects on the south-east Australian coast, *Renewable Energy* 99 (2016) 80–94. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.06.036>.
- [197] S. Kerr, J. Colton, K. Johnson, G. Wright, Rights and ownership in sea country: implications of marine renewable energy for indigenous and local communities, *Marine Policy* 52 (2015) 108–115. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.11.002>.
- [198] S. Kerr, K. Johnson, J. Colton, G. Wright, S. Weir, Mare reservarum: enclosure of the commons and the evolution of marine rights in an era of ocean industrialisation, in: G. Wright, S. Kerr, K. Johnson (Eds.), *Ocean Energy: Governance Challenges for Wave and Tidal Stream Technologies*, Routledge, United Kingdom, 2018, pp. 80–98.
- [199] S. Vezmar, A. Spajić, D. Topić, D. Šljivac, L. Jozsa, Positive and negative impacts of renewable energy sources, *International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering Systems* 5 (2) (2014) 15–23.
- [200] T. Potts, D. Burdon, E. Jackson, J. Atkins, J. Saunders, E. Hastings, O. Langmead, Do marine protected areas deliver flows of ecosystem services to support human welfare?, *Marine Policy* 44 (2014) 139–148. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2013.08.011>.
- [201] R. Bedard, Economic and social benefits from wave energy conversion marine technology, *Marine Technology Society Journal* 41 (3) (2007) 44–50. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4031/002533207787442123>.
- [202] C. McLachlan, You don’t do a chemistry experiment in your best china: Symbolic interpretations of place and technology in a wave energy case, *Energy Policy* 37 (12) (2009) 5342–5350. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.07.057>.

- 1576 [203] K. A. Alexander, T. A. Wilding, J. J. Heymans, Attitudes of Scottish
1577 fishers towards marine renewable energy, *Marine Policy* 37 (2013) 239–
1578 244. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2012.05.005>.
- 1579 [204] S. Kerr, S. Weir, Community benefits schemes: Fair shares or token ges-
1580 tures?, in: G. Wright, S. Kerr, K. Johnson (Eds.), *Ocean Energy: Gov-
1581 ernance Challenges for Wave and Tidal Stream Technologies*, Routledge,
1582 United Kingdom, 2018, pp. 191–204.
- 1583 [205] G. Krause, E. Mikkelsen, The socio-economic dimensions of offshore aqua-
1584 culture in a multi-use setting, in: *Aquaculture Perspective of Multi-Use
1585 Sites in the Open Ocean*, Springer, 2017, pp. 163–186. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51159-7_8.
1586
- 1587 [206] B. A. Costa-Pierce, Sustainable ecological aquaculture systems: The need
1588 for a new social contract for aquaculture development, *Marine Technology
1589 Society Journal* 44 (3) (2010) 88–112. doi:[https://doi.org/10.4031/
1590 MTSJ.44.3.3](https://doi.org/10.4031/MTSJ.44.3.3).
- 1591 [207] G. Krause, C. Brugere, A. Diedrich, M. W. Ebeling, S. C. A. Ferse,
1592 E. Mikkelsen, J. A. P. Agúndez, S. M. Stead, N. Stybel, M. Troell, A
1593 revolution without people? Closing the people–policy gap in aquaculture
1594 development, *Aquaculture* 447 (2015) 44–55. doi:[https://doi.org/10.
1595 1016/j.aquaculture.2015.02.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2015.02.009).
- 1596 [208] O. J. Bergfjord, Risk perception and risk management in Norwegian aqua-
1597 culture, *Journal of Risk Research* 12 (1) (2009) 91–104. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/13669870802488941>.
1598
- 1599 [209] B. Belton, D. C. Little, L. X. Sinh, The social relations of catfish produc-
1600 tion in Vietnam, *Geoforum* 42 (5) (2011) 567–577.
- 1601 [210] B. Belton, M. M. Haque, D. C. Little, L. X. Sinh, Certifying catfish in
1602 Vietnam and Bangladesh: Who will make the grade and will it matter?,

- Food Policy 36 (2) (2011) 289–299. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2010.11.027>.
- [211] B. Aarset, S. Beckmann, E. Bigne, M. Beveridge, T. Bjørndal, J. Bunting, P. McDonagh, C. Mariojous, J. Muir, A. Prothero, R. Lucia, A. Smith, R. Tveteras, J. Young, The European consumers’ understanding and perceptions of the “organic” food regime: The case of aquaculture, British Food Journal 106 (2) (2004) 93–105. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1108/00070700410516784>.
- [212] C. Pattanaik, S. N. Prasad, Assessment of aquaculture impact on mangroves of Mahanadi delta (Orissa), East coast of India using remote sensing and GIS, Ocean & Coastal Management 54 (11) (2011) 789–795. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2011.07.013>.
- [213] M. D. Smith, C. A. Roheim, L. B. Crowder, B. S. Halpern, M. Turnipseed, J. L. Anderson, F. Asche, L. Bourillon, A. G. Guttormsen, A. Khan, L. A. Liguori, A. McNevin, M. I. O’Connor, D. Squires, P. Tyedmers, C. Brownstein, K. Carden, D. H. Klinger, R. Sagarin, K. A. Selkoe, Sustainability and global seafood, Science 327 (2010) 784–786. doi:[10.1126/science.1185345](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1185345).
- [214] D. Pauly, The Sea Around Us Project: documenting and communicating global fisheries impacts on marine ecosystems, AMBIO: a Journal of the Human Environment 36 (4) (2007) 290–295. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1579/0044-7447\(2007\)36\[290:TSAUPD\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1579/0044-7447(2007)36[290:TSAUPD]2.0.CO;2).
- [215] C. Pipitone, F. Badalamenti, T. V. Fernández, G. D’Anna, Spatial management of fisheries in the Mediterranean sea: Problematic issues and a few success stories, in: Advances in Marine Biology, Vol. 69, Elsevier, 2014, pp. 371–402. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-800214-8.00010-4>.
- [216] R. Tiller, R. Gentry, R. Richards, Stakeholder driven future scenarios as an element of interdisciplinary management tools; the case of future

- 1632 offshore aquaculture development and the potential effects on fishermen
1633 in Santa Barbara, California, *Ocean & Coastal Management* 73 (2013)
1634 127–135. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2012.12.011>.
- 1635 [217] D. Peel, M. Lloyd, Governance and planning policy in the marine envi-
1636 ronment: regulating aquaculture in Scotland, *The Geographical Journal*
1637 174 (4) (2008) 361–373.
- 1638 [218] J. Klijnstra, X. Zhang, S. van der Putten, C. Röckmann, Technical risks
1639 of offshore structures, in: *Aquaculture Perspective of Multi-Use Sites in*
1640 *the Open Ocean*, Springer, 2017, pp. 115–127. doi:[https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51159-7_5)
1641 [10.1007/978-3-319-51159-7_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51159-7_5).
- 1642 [219] S. Jude, A. B. Gill, C. Mauelshagen, E. Willsteed, Risk and ocean energy,
1643 in: G. Wright, S. Kerr, K. Johnson (Eds.), *Ocean Energy: Governance*
1644 *Challenges for Wave and Tidal Stream Technologies*, Routledge, United
1645 Kingdom, 2018, pp. 13–26.
- 1646 [220] G. Wright, A. M. O’Hagan, J. de Groot, Y. Leroy, N. Soininen, R. Salcido,
1647 M. A. Castelos, S. Jude, J. Rochette, S. Kerr, Establishing a legal research
1648 agenda for ocean energy, *Marine Policy* 63 (2016) 126–134. doi:[https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2015.09.030)
1649 [10.1016/j.marpol.2015.09.030](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2015.09.030).
- 1650 [221] A. Brito-Melo, J. Huckerby (Eds.), 2012 Annual Report, The Executive
1651 Committee of Ocean Energy Systems, 2012.
- 1652 [222] A. Brito-Melo, J. L. Villate (Eds.), 2015 Annual Report, The Executive
1653 Committee of Ocean Energy Systems, 2015.
- 1654 [223] M. Arshad, B. C. O’Kelly, Offshore wind-turbine structures: a review,
1655 *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Energy* 166 (4) (2013)
1656 139–152. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1680/ener.12.00019>.
- 1657 [224] M. Collu, M. Borg, Design of floating offshore wind turbines, in: *Offshore*
1658 *Wind Farms*, Elsevier, 2016, pp. 359–385. doi:[https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-100779-2.00011-8)
1659 [1016/B978-0-08-100779-2.00011-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-100779-2.00011-8).

- [225] M. Karimirad, Offshore Energy Structures: for Wind power, wave energy and hybrid marine platforms, Springer, 2014.
- [226] H. M. Jansen, S. Van Den Burg, B. Bolman, R. G. Jak, P. Kamermans, M. Poelman, M. Stuiver, The feasibility of offshore aquaculture and its potential for multi-use in the North Sea, *Aquaculture International* 24 (3) (2016) 735–756. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10499-016-9987-y>.
- [227] H. Osawa, T. Miyazaki, Wave-PV hybrid generation system carried in the offshore floating type wave power device Mighty Whale, in: *OCEANS'04. MTTs/IEEE TECHNO-OCEAN'04*, Vol. 4, IEEE, 2004, pp. 1860–1866. doi:[10.1109/OCEANS.2004.1406427](https://doi.org/10.1109/OCEANS.2004.1406427).
- [228] G. Barlowe, R. Day, D. Kilfoyle, R. Roberts, G. Smith, Hybrid renewable energy systems for off-shore naval installations, in: *Photovoltaic Specialists Conference, 1988., Conference Record of the Twentieth IEEE, IEEE, 1988*, pp. 1179–1181.
- [229] A. Uihlein, D. Magagna, Wave and tidal current energy—A review of the current state of research beyond technology, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 58 (2016) 1070–1081. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.12.284>.
- [230] Y. Shirai, S. Minamoto, K. Yonemura, M. L. Rahman, Output power control of hybrid off-shore-wind and tidal turbine generation system with battery storage system, in: *19th International Conference on Electrical Machines and Systems (ICEMS)*, IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [231] R. Hilborn, F. Micheli, G. A. De Leo, Integrating marine protected areas with catch regulation, *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 63 (3) (2006) 642–649. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1139/f05-243>.
- [232] D. Alston, A. Cabarcas, J. Capella, D. Benetti, S. Keene-Meltzoff, J. Bonilla, R. Cortes, Environmental and social impacts of sustainable

- 1687 offshore cage culture production in Puerto Rican waters, Tech. Rep.
1688 NA16RG1611, NOAA (2005).
- 1689 [233] R. Pittenger, B. Anderson, D. D. Benetti, P. Dayton, B. Dewey, R. Gold-
1690 burg, A. Rieser, B. Sher, A. Sturgulewski, Sustainable marine aquaculture:
1691 fulfilling the promise. managing the risks, Tech. rep., The Pew Charitable
1692 Trusts (2007).
- 1693 [234] R. R. Gentry, S. E. Lester, C. V. Kappel, C. White, T. W. Bell,
1694 J. Stevens, S. D. Gaines, Offshore aquaculture: Spatial planning prin-
1695 ciples for sustainable development, *Ecology and evolution* 7 (2) (2017)
1696 733–743. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.2637>.
- 1697 [235] S. E. Shumway, Shellfish aquaculture and the environment, John Wiley &
1698 Sons, 2011. doi:[10.1002/9780470960967](https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470960967).
- 1699 [236] C. W. McKindsey, P. Archambault, M. D. Callier, F. Olivier, Influence of
1700 suspended and off-bottom mussel culture on the sea bottom and benthic
1701 habitats: a review, *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 89 (7) (2011) 622–646.
1702 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1139/z11-037>.
- 1703 [237] C. Röckmann, S. Lagerveld, J. Stavenhagen, Operation and maintenance
1704 costs of offshore wind farms and potential multi-use platforms in the Dutch
1705 North Sea, in: *Aquaculture Perspective of Multi-Use Sites in the Open*
1706 *Ocean*, Springer, 2017, pp. 97–113. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51159-7_4)
1707 [978-3-319-51159-7_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51159-7_4).
- 1708 [238] State Oceanic Administration People’s Republic of China, 13th Ocean
1709 Energy Development Five Year Plan (2016-2020) (accessed February 28,
1710 2018).
1711 URL [http://www.soa.gov.cn/zwgk/zcgh/kxcg/201701/t20170112_](http://www.soa.gov.cn/zwgk/zcgh/kxcg/201701/t20170112_54473.html)
1712 [54473.html](http://www.soa.gov.cn/zwgk/zcgh/kxcg/201701/t20170112_54473.html)
- 1713 [239] European Commission, Blue growth. opportunities for marine and mar-
1714 itime sustainable growth, Communication from the Commission to the

- 1715 European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social
1716 Committee and the Committee of the Regions (2012).
- 1717 [240] Horizon 2020, Work Programme 2014-2015 -General Annexes (accessed
1718 April 28, 2018).
1719 URL [http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/pdf/
1720 work-programmes/general_annexes_draft_work_programme.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/pdf/work-programmes/general_annexes_draft_work_programme.pdf)
- 1721 [241] M. Menicou, V. Vassiliou, Prospective energy needs in Mediterranean
1722 offshore aquaculture: Renewable and sustainable energy solutions, Re-
1723 newable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 14 (9) (2010) 3084–3091. doi:
1724 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2010.06.013>.



DSPACE

<https://dspace.org/>

Offshore multi-purpose platforms for a Blue Growth: a technological, environmental and socio-economic review

Abhinav, K. A.; Collu, Maurizio; Benjamins, Steven; Cai, Huiwen; Hughes, Adam ...

2020-05-15

Elsevier

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138256>

Abhinav KA, Collu M, Benjamins S, et al., (2020) Offshore multi-purpose platforms for a Blue Growth: a technological, environmental and socio-economic review. Science of the Total Environment, Volume 734, September 2020, Article number 138256