



Document title Outcome of EN ESA 9-2020

Date of finalization 28.5.2020

Outcome of the 9th HELCOM expert network on economic and social analyses meeting (EN ESA 9-2020)

The list of Meeting Participants is contained in **Annex 1**.

The agenda of the Meeting is contained in **Annex 2**.

The Meeting was chaired by Ms. Berit Hasler, Aarhus University. Heini Ahtiainen, HELCOM Secretariat, acted as secretary.

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 The Chair opened the meeting.

1.2 The Meeting adopted the agenda as presented in **Annex 2** and agreed to proceed as outlined in the agenda.

2. Timely EN ESA issues

2.1 The Meeting warmly welcomed Berit Hasler as the new chair of EN ESA.

2.2 The Meeting warmly welcomed Ralf Döring, the new representative for Germany, to the network.

2.3 The Meeting warmly welcomed Jonė Vitkauskaitė, the new representative for Lithuania, to the network.

2.4 The Meeting took note that GEAR 22-2020 endorsed the SOM methodology and discussed the CEA analysis.

2.5 The Meeting took note that the proposal on concretization of actions by EN ESA has been reviewed by GEAR and some minor adjustments have been made. The final version will be submitted to the HELCOM HOD Meeting in June.

2.6 The Meeting took note that the findings of the BONUS ROSEMARIE synthesis project on Baltic Sea ecosystem services will be presented in a final seminar of three BONUS Synthesis Projects 16 June at 12:00–14:00 (UTC+3), Baltic Sea Science Synthesized – Time to Take Evidence-based Actions for the Well-being of the Sea and People. More information and registration is available here: [https://www.syke.fi/en-US/Current/Events/Online_seminar_Baltic_Sea_Science_Synthe\(56435\)](https://www.syke.fi/en-US/Current/Events/Online_seminar_Baltic_Sea_Science_Synthe(56435)).

2.7 The Meeting took note of the BONUS DESTONY synthesis project, which focuses on decision-support tools. Information on the project results will be shared by Berit.

3. National ESA work

3.1 The Meeting took note of information that in Denmark, most of recent ESA work has focused on the WFD. Catalogues for measures to reduce nitrogen and phosphorus inputs and their costs have been compiled. For the MSFD, a national project will start in the fall on contaminants (North Sea

- and Baltic Sea), which includes a cost-effectiveness analysis. This may have linkages to the HELCOM SOM analysis, and information from SOM could support the project.
- 3.2 The Meeting took note that in Estonia, there is currently a procurement for the MSFD PoMs update. The work for the update should start in June 2020 and last up to January 2022, and it includes evaluation of current and new measures and ESA.
- 3.3 The Meeting took note of information from the European Union that work is starting now to develop an overview on the information reported on links between activities and pressures, cost of degradation and BAU scenario. Emerging topics for additional analyses include climate change, financing measures and impact of reaching GES on health. BLUE2.2 project develops baseline and policy scenarios. Under POMESA, work is carried out to finalize the recommendations concerning the update of PoMs and exceptions and to organize thematic workshops.
- 3.4 The Meeting took note that Finland is conducting a SOM analysis of existing measures using the same approach as in the HELCOM SOM analysis. Cost information is based on expert-data, and it could also support HELCOM ACTION/SOM analysis. The benefit estimates will be based on the study of the benefits of achieving GES published in 2019.
- 3.5 The Meeting took note of information from Germany on ESA for the Initial Assessment (IA). Groups for measures and economics groups have been merged, and discussion is ongoing for measures and economic analyses. ESA work is arranged in projects, and there are 3-4 small projects dealing with specific measures and a larger project on the cost of degradation. The cost of degradation valuation survey is based on the previous Finnish and Swedish studies. The Meeting noted that it would be interesting to hear about the results, when they are available.
- 3.6 The Meeting took note that in Latvia, the ESA work is carried out in frame of a project implemented by the Ministry of Environment (2017-2021). At first, the focus was on the assessments for the IA. Since 2019, the work has been related to developing new measures and ESA for the PoMs. The work focuses on selected descriptors. A study on the cost-effectiveness analysis of new measures for marine beach litter and a choice experiment valuation study on the benefits and costs of establishing new MPAs have already been conducted, and sufficiency analysis and ESA of new measures for all selected descriptors will start soon.
- 3.7 The Meeting took note of information from Lithuania that a project on ESA for the IA has been completed, including use of marine waters and cost of degradation analyses, and a baseline scenario. New project for PoMs will likely start in the summer 2020.
- 3.8 The Meeting took note of information from Sweden that a report on ESA for PoMs should be ready for internal review before the end of June. Currently, the effectiveness of measures evaluation is being finalized, and cost information is being put together for the cost-effectiveness analysis. The benefit assessment is based on the results from an economic valuation survey similar to the previous Finnish benefit study. Results of the effectiveness of measures analysis will be used to assess the effects on ecosystem services, and work is being carried out for linking ecosystem components to state indicators and further to ecosystem services.
- 3.9 The Meeting took note that a similar valuation study on the benefits of achieving GES has now been conducted in Finland, Germany and Sweden.
- 3.10 The Meeting discussed the challenges of conducting ESA for hazardous substances and considered that exchanging information between CPs would be useful.

4. Presenting the results of the SOM analysis

- 4.1 The Meeting took note of Document 2 and Presentation 1 on the progress and presentation of SOM results.

- 4.2 The Meeting considered and discussed the presentation of SOM results, and provided the following general suggestions:
- i) Present first the results of the gap assessment, as it is the main result of the analysis.
 - ii) Consider presenting the results in a reverse order, starting from the gap assessment and state components, and continuing to pressures, effectiveness of measures and activities.
 - iii) Consider carefully what are the main results and questions we want to answer, and which results should be presented in the main report and which in the annexes. Detailed results are useful but could be included in the annex. For example, many of the distributions and graphs could be in the annex. Full results should be made available, but potentially in a digital annex/supplementary material.
 - iv) The main result is the gap assessment, and findings for the other components should fit the gap narrative.
- 4.3 The Meeting took note that the spatial resolution differs substantially between topics and data components. The Meeting discussed the spatial resolution of the results, and suggested that it should be explained why the level of spatial resolution differs across the different data components, and that the results present clearly the spatial resolution/geographic area for each topic and data component. The Meeting also suggested that the results should be made available to the most detailed spatial level possible to be useful for national analyses and processes. The Meeting took note that the findings can be presented at the spatial level the data has been reported or the assessment made on, and all results are not available at the sub-basin level.
- 4.4 The Meeting suggested to add explanation to Table 1 to help its understanding.
- 4.5 The Meeting discussed the presentation of the activity-pressure results, and provided the following views:
- i) Information on the importance of the pressures in different basins/geographic areas would be useful for the interpretation of the results. However, this information may not be easily available, but HOLAS II findings could be checked.
 - ii) No figure is needed if a colour-coded table is available.
 - iii) Results could be presented side-by side with the results on the significance of pressures to state components.
- 4.6 The Meeting discussed the presentation of the effectiveness of measures results, and provided the following views:
- i) Tables with numbers are easier to read than the figures, but figures on the distributions are also useful and could be included in the annex. It should be explained what the distributions mean, i.e. they illustrate the uncertainty and that the experts have differing opinions.
 - ii) Impacts of measures should be added.
- 4.7 The Meeting discussed the presentation of the pressure reductions from existing measures results, and provided the following views:
- i) Figure 2 on probability of total pressure reductions is difficult to read, as it presents the results for all sub-basins at once. The results should be put into several graphs, e.g. there could be one graph for 4-5 basins.
 - ii) The figure could be put in the annex.
- 4.8 The Meeting discussed the presentation of the pressure-state linkages results, and provided the following views:
- i) Description and explanation on the use of the results in Figure 4 should be added (by comparing to pressure reduction from existing measures). Information in Figure 4 should be used together with information on how much existing measures reduce pressures.

- ii) If possible, Figure 4 could include information on the pressure reductions from existing measures. This has the potential problems that the assessment of all pressures does not go up until the state components.
- iii) Results could be also be put in tables in addition to figures.
- iv) Figure 4 could potentially be placed in the annex.

4.9 Gap assessment

- i) Figure 4 could be used to show the gap as well, if information on the pressure reductions from existing measures can be added.

4.10 The Meeting took note that additional comments on the presentation of the SOM results, including the colour scales, can be sent to Heini Ahtainen (heini.ahntianen@helcom.fi) by 31 May.

5. Cost-effectiveness analysis of new measures

- 5.1 The Meeting took note of Document 3 and Presentation 2 on the method for analysing the cost-effectiveness of new measures and the cost template.
- 5.2 The Meeting took note that GEAR 22-2020 invited EN ESA to support the collection of the national information on the costs of measures.
- 5.3 The Meeting took note that the cost-effectiveness analysis is conducted for the proposed new measures for the updated BSAP. The Meeting took note that the synopses are in some places rather vague and EN ESA representatives might not be able to review all synopses and limit their search for national cost information based on them.
- 5.4 The Meeting proposed to limit the scope of the collection of cost data through EN ESA, e.g. based on the synopses, measures and environmental themes, to reduce the efforts and avoid unnecessary work. The Meeting proposed that the ACTION project could go through synopses and identify the measures (or pressures and state components) for which information is needed to limit the scope of the exercise. To take this comment into account, more specific instructions and information will be provided later by the ACTION project to EN ESA.
- 5.5 The Meeting took note of the simplified cost template (Document 3, Annex 1) and provided the following suggestions to the templates for collecting cost information:
- i) excluding or rephrasing “benefit” as a cost category
 - ii) separating between negative and positive costs
 - iii) including information on the base year and unit for the cost estimates in the template.
- 5.6 The Meeting suggested that an alternative approach for collecting information on land-based nutrient abatement measures could be developed, as the unit and extent of the measure affects the costs substantially. Baltic-wide studies on the cost estimates could be used, as several are available. Relevant references can be sent to Liisa Saikkonen (liisa.saikkonen@ymparisto.fi).
- 5.7 The Meeting took note that filling in the excel cost template is preferable, but data in other formats are also welcomed. Any type of cost data would be useful, and if there is not possible to compile the national information into the template, also the references to useful source materials could be sent.
- 5.8 The Meeting discussed the value of assessing the costs and effectiveness of some of the measures, and took note that this is the first attempt of producing cost estimates of measures for regional HELCOM policy processes , and as such, would be useful.
- 5.9 The Meeting agreed to set up a short meeting for cost collection in June to discuss the changes and limited scope of the information collection.
- 5.10 The Meeting agreed to send national cost information by the end of August to Liisa Saikkonen (liisa.saikkonen@ymparisto.fi) and Tin-Yu Lai (tin-yu.lai@ymparisto.fi).

6. ESA in HOLAS III

6.1 The Meeting agreed to postpone the discussion on ESA for the 3rd HELCOM Holistic Assessment and the Methodology Development (MetDev) Project plan to its next meeting.

7. Next meetings

7.1 The next EN ESA meetings will be arranged in June (cost information collection) and September (ESA for HOLAS III and other matters), and the exact times will be decided based on doodle polls.

8. Closing the meeting

8.1 The Chair closed the Meeting.

Annex 1. List of Participants

Representing	Name	Organization	Email address
The Chair			
Denmark	Berit Hasler	Aarhus University	bh@envs.au.dk
Contracting Parties			
Denmark	Nathia Hass Brandtberg	Ministry of Environment and Food	nathb@mfvm.dk
Estonia	Liis Kikas	Tallinn Technical University	liis.kikas@taltech.ee
EU	Jacques Delsalle	European Commission	jacques.delsalle@ec.europa.eu
Finland	Liisa Saikkonen	Finnish Environment Institute	liisa.saikkonen@ymparisto.fi
Germany	Ralf Döring	Thünen-Federal Research Institute/German MSFD ESA Working group	ralf.doering@thuenen.de
Latvia	Kristine Pakalniete	AKTiiVS Ltd.	kristinepa@apollo.lv
Lithuania	Daiva Semėnienė	Center for Environmental Policy	daiva@aapc.lt
Lithuania	Jonė Vitkauskaitė	Center for Environmental Policy	jone@aapc.lt
Sweden	Max Vretborn	SwAM	max.vretborn@havochvatten.se
External experts			
ACTION project	Tin-Yu Lai	Finnish Environment Institute	tin-yu.lai@ymparisto.fi
ACTION project	Kaius Oljemark	Finnish Environment Institute	kaius.oljemark@ymparisto.fi
HELCOM Secretariat			
	Heini Ahtiainen	HELCOM Secretariat	heini.ahtiainen@helcom.fi
	Luke Dodd	HELCOM Secretariat	luke.dodd@helcom.fi

Annex 2. Meeting agenda

25 May 2020	
11:30	Words of welcome and timely EN ESA issues
11:45 – 12:45	National ESA work (round-table)
12:45 – 13:00	<i>Break</i>
13:00 – 14:45	Progress and results of the SOM analysis
14:45 – 15:00	<i>Break</i>
15:00 – 16:00	Cost-effectiveness analysis
16:00	Meeting ends