Document title	EN-HZ 10-2019 Meeting Outcomes
Code	
Category	DEC

The EN-HZ 10-2019 Meeting was held at the ICES Headquarters (Copenhagen, Denmark), 4-5 April 2019. The meeting started at 10.00 on 4 April and concluded at 16.00 on 5 April.

The meeting was opened by co-Chairs Elisabeth Nyberg and Sara Danielsson, and after election of the new co-Chairs the Chairing of the meeting was handed over.

The Meeting thanked ICES for the excellent hosting.

All presentations are available at the designated meeting portal for the EN-HZ 10-2019 meeting.

The next meeting of HELCOM EN-HZ was proposed as an online event in September/October 2019, with a doodle poll to be sent out closer to the date.

Agenda Item 1: Adoption of the Agenda - DEC

1.1 The Meeting adopted the agenda.

1.2 The Meeting carried out a round-the-table of introductions.

Agenda Item 2: Election of new Chair(s) DEC

2.1 As had previously been indicated, the co-Chairs of the group stepped down, and a process to elect a new Chair or Chairs was initiated.

2.2 Sweden nominated a co-Chair pairing of Germany (Berit Brockmeyer) and Finland (Jaakko Mannio).

2..3 The Meeting unanimously approved the newly nominated co-Chairs.

2.4 The new co-Chairs and the Meeting thanked the departing co-Chairs for their efforts in the previous three year period, noting that they would remain active members of the group.

Agenda Item 3: Information from other HELCOM processes and meetings - INF

3.1 The Meeting took note of brief updates related to hazardous substances stemming from previous meetings of GEAR, State and Conservation, HELCOM and HOD.

3.2 The Meeting noted that the majority of issues raised were addressed within the existing meeting agenda.

Agenda item 4: Update on automated indicator evaluation system from ICES. CMNT

4.1 ICES (Hans Jensen) introduced recent developments in the automated indicator evaluation system that is being developed by ICES, in cooperation with OSPAR (see Presentation Agenda 4 HELCOM Hazardous Assessment Tool -HAT_20190403).

4.2 In general the system implements the MIME tool indicator evaluation onto data extracted directly from the ICES hosted HELCOM COMBINE database and currently provides three tabs/panel that offer: 1) an overview of the assessment where stations can be clicked on to show the underlying assessment plot, trends and supporting information, 2) a station overview map including a list of all data parameters for each station, and 3) an overview of the accessions and reported information and their status. This allows data to be tracked throughout the process.

4.3 The Meeting took note that the system was heavily based on the system previously used by the group in 2017/2018, but significant organisational improvements had been implemented to create a more user-friendly system and eliminate outdated software that impeded the system.

4.4 The Meeting took note that the new systems used R scripts (R environment) and aims to follow the ICES TAF approach (Transparent Assessment Framework). Such open data availability considerations are highly compatible with HELCOM's own data policy.

4.5 The Meeting noted that this work is ongoing and further progress is expected during 2019.

4.6 The Meeting noted that a plan is being explored to establish a section in GitHUB for the further development of this system, utilising a project management forum within the system to allow idea and proposals on future development or adjustment ideas to be collated (i.e. once testing of the system is complete).

4.7 The Meeting was invited to provide feedback on the existing developments and noted that suggestions would be welcomed. The Meeting proposed/discussed that a few items for possible consideration at this stage. The proposals/suggestions will be considered and where possible they will be implemented within the existing development contract **(Secretariat, ICES - in cooperation with OSPAR and NIVA experts - to follow up).** The suggestions discussed included:

I. The Meeting took note that the R code underlying the assessment (i.e. the HELCOM equivalent of the MIME script, adapted to HELCOM specificities) would be updated in the future as part of this process and placed on an open source code repository (i.e. GitHUB) during the development of this system.
II. The addition of a time-to-target panel/tab within the system – i.e. a predictive tool that extrapolates the time to reach Good Environmental Status based on the available trend data.
III. Implementation of the assessment unit level assessment.
IV. The development of a confidence assessment and accompanying map to support each indicator assessment. Aspects discussed included assessing confidence of data based on spatial, temporal and supporting parameter quality factors.
V. A panel/tab that would indicate what of the raw data has been excluded during the analysis and evaluation (i.e. during the MIME script application), and the reason for its exclusion (i.e. lack of sufficient data, missing supporting parameters etc, supporting parameters create pivot points*). Possibly the map could also be adjusted to show such stations as 'ghost stations', i.e. in a shaded colour.
VI. A system to identify or automatically flag potential outliers (e.g. those over 10% higher or lower than the main data set) may also be valuable, if possible.
VII. Add the CHASE tool in current form but acknowledge that further adjustment is needed. Adjustment of CHASE integrated assessment tool to improve confidence assessment by ensuring for example two or more independent metals are required for high confidence, and that a lack of coverage of selected major drivers of poor status (e.g. Hg, PBDEs or Radioactive substances during HOLAS II) can also influence confidence. **Sweden, Germany and Secretariat to develop proposal further after reviewing HOLAS II HZ WS1 outcome.** Noted also, after the meeting, that a solution to bring data related to radioactive substances into the CHASE assessment will need to be addressed.
VIII. When fully functional the assessment, stations and data panels/tabs will all have the same 'extraction' date (i.e. all be set to a single date at which the data was taken from the database and into the indicator evaluation).
IX. Updating of the methodology links will be needed to ensure that these reflect the HELCOM assessment approach, e.g. specific threshold values or supporting parameters.

X. The implementation of a DOI system so that data (raw) or assessments (i.e. assessment, stations, accession tabs/panels) for a specific time point/period applied in the automated system can be catalogued and preserved as reference material.
XI. Linkage/clarification of station data to assessment data (i.e. clarification between data used in assessments and other data that is reported but not currently applied in indicator assessments, e.g. Fish Disease Index) may also be valid.
XII. Links from accession ID to DOME may also add value.

*pivot points occur when, for example, a supporting parameter used for normalisation created a negative value in the assessment output.

4.8 Other related issues were also discussed, including:

I. Clarification that the CHASE tool does not create a dilution effect – i.e. addition of further substances does not result in a dilution of the most influential hazardous substances – and that the system instead reflects those substances most strongly driving the poor status based on a ratio between the threshold value and the assessment value.
II. Deeper understanding of data reporting and options (e.g. simplified reporting) for preparing hazardous substance data for the ICES hosted HELCOM COMBINE database. **Latvia and ICES to discuss intersessionally.**
III. Ensuring all HELCOM Monitoring and Assessment Guidelines (and indicator reports) are up-to-date and clearly state all required supporting parameters for indicator evaluation.
IV. Possibility to develop and implement regional normalization factors if needed and scientifically justified.
V. Use of ICES DOME and related data in national reporting processes (e.g. when reporting for MSFD purposes) was discussed. General consensus was that ICES and regional sea commission resources (e.g. HELCOM Map and Data services and indicator links) could, and had been utilised by some countries in 2017/18.
VI. Some reported stations are often clustered under the definitions of the ICES station dictionary where closely associated spatial data are reported.

Agenda item 5: Development of workplan to accompany the ToRs of the group. DEC

5.1 The Terms of Reference (ToRs) of the group were updated to include a proposed work plan and timeline, HELCOM EN HZ Draft Terms of Reference 2018-2021_post EN-HZ 10.

5.2 The draft ToRs will be submitted to State and Conservation 10-2019 for approval.

5.3 Several related issues were raised during the development of the ToRs and workplan, In particular the role of the EN-HZ group related to these issues. These are documented for possible future consideration, including:

I. The role and hosting of the White-tailed Sea Eagle indicator was raised and discussion covered a number of topics including: if the indicator is only representative of coastal ecosystems, if the indicator is better considered as a biodiversity indicator (i.e. since hazardous substances are addressed as pressures while breeding and survival parameters, that can have numerous other drivers, are data of indicator), if it may be better hosted by a group considering top predators, how it does represent a good effect based indicator so should not be omitted or lost, and if egg shell thickness could be explored since this parameter has been shown to directly link to hazardous substances (i.e. biological effect).
II. Relationship between dumped munitions and marine litter and release of hazardous substances.

III. A number of projects were identified as potentially offering valuable information for future development by the group regarding approaches to classify/manage contaminant hotspots (including chemical warfare agents, CWA) comparably across Baltic Sea region (UDEMM, DAIMON).

IV. Cooperation with biodiversity aspects to develop overview and interlinkages across food webs and ecosystem.

V. Support any work developed in mammal health team that examines hazardous substances directly.

VI. Re-look at developments for Fish Disease Index that have taken place in HELCOM and OSPAR region (**GER to explore for next meeting**).

VII. Biological effects experience sharing should be looked at during next meeting, if possible (**FIN and EST to initiate introduction**).

VIII. Countries attending MSFD Descriptor 8/9 workshop in May 2019 to inform the group of pertinent information (**SWEDEN and FINLAND, plus others attending**).

IX. Biological effects work and indicators may be a valid topic for a specific workshop or an additional designated meeting of an expanded EN-HZ group in the near future. Associated to this discussion it was proposed that a document should be prepared for State and Conservation to request national support for a review, by ICES WGBEC, of available data and information to support solid development of relevant indicators (**DEN to provide draft request**).

Agenda item 6: Indicator assessment. CMNT/DEC

6.1 The Meeting was informed of the plans for the HELCOM indicator workshop on 14-15 May 2019, and how the focus will be on the overview of the HELCOM indicator catalogue and its functionality.

6.2 Improving linkages between sources/pathways and status were discussed and are considered to be a valid approach for future indicator and assessment updates.

6.3 A recent HELCOM PLC data compilation related to hazardous substances (BSEP 162) was briefly discussed, and the link is provided here: http://www.helcom.fi/Lists/Publications/BSEP162%20-%20Inputs%20of%20hazardous%20substances.pdf

6.4 Indicator update frequency was discussed, including proposals for intermediate updates that updated key information and a summary. The Meeting agreed that once the automated system was fully operational a process should be established where once all data has been reported in a given year (i.e. after 1 September each year), at a subsequent date to be confirmed as suitable for ICES (tentatively set for 15 November each year), the automated system would be run (i.e. a data extraction be made). Subsequently the indicator leads would be charged with reviewing the output and informing the EN-HZ group if major changes had occurred and an update (either key message or full) should be considered. The annual update of the assessment would then be provided on the indicator web pages, clearly marked by the years of data covered.

Agenda item 7: HELCOM Hazardous substances Guidelines. CMNT/DEC

7.1 The Meeting took note that Monitoring and Assessment Guidelines for which a commenting period was set at the last meeting will now be revised to address issues raised prior to their submission to State and Conservation 10-2019 (**GER to submit**).

7.2 The Meeting took note that ISO standards are being developed for PFOS in seawater and due out shortly (‘early 2019’). The Meeting agreed to wait on the release of these documents so as to ensure HELCOM guidelines were developed with consideration of all relevant information. GER offered to lead this aspect.

7.3 The Meeting took note that the ISO standard may also have relevance for guidelines related to PFOS in biota and that OSPAR has a technical annex on PFOS in Biota which may offer valid information.

7.4 The Meeting took note that HBCDD was not discussed in the OSPAR MIME meeting, but that a technical annex does exist on HBCD in biota and sediments also.

7.5 The Meeting welcomed the offer **of EST to develop the first draft of the HELCOM Monitoring and Assessment Guideline PFOS in biota** with a draft update prepared for the next EN-HZ meeting (autumn 2019) and a target of a full guideline in spring 2020 (i.e. to submit to State and Conservation 12-2020).

7.6 Discussion relating to HBCDD addressed a range of topics, and a review of these was considered important prior to a more detailed discussion at the next meeting of EN-HZ. Topics to gain national positions on, prior to the next meeting, or for conclusion at the next meeting, included:

I. The need for further discussion related to the indicator as a whole (e.g. its relevance).
II. Reviewing the OSPAR technical annexes should be carried out by the group (with comments from all Contracting Parties and their relevant laboratories/experts).
III. Changes in EQS values (i.e. the applied threshold values).
IV. Detection limits.
V. Monitoring in lipids and/or conversion based on lipids could be a very critical issue that would re-scale the assessment.
VI. Discussion on limited assessment in sediment in the region.
VII. Potential for this substance to be a 'future' problem. For example large amounts currently used in buildings and their existing materials, which if inappropriately disposed of will end in the environment.
VIII. Noted that in some countries HBCDD is monitored at no extra cost in association with PBDEs (e.g. in Sweden).
IX. These topics are considered highly relevant with the update of monitoring programmes due shortly.

7.7 A proposal was made for 'Master Stations' to address issues such as HBCDD (potential future risks defined by good temporal and spatial initial assessments) and other substances where Good Environmental Status (GES) is achieved. Such an approach could allow monitoring (and thus cost) to be scaled back to the 'Master Stations' though ensure GES is maintained. Such an approach could be applied by categorising hazardous substances in two lists: 'priority action substances' and 'substances of concern'

7.8 The integration of Water Framework Directive (WFD) and Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) assessments was also discussed and will likely be relevant in future assessments, e.g. JRC proposal on criteria for not including assessment of priority substances beyond 12 nautical miles. Such topics are anticipated to be raised at the MSFD Descriptor 8/9 workshop in May 2019.

Agenda item 8: Sediment normalisation with Li or Al. CMNT/DEC

8.1 An introduction to sediment normalization with Li and Al discussed based on studies in the OSPAR region, and seen as in generally highly relevant to the HELCOM region. See presentation Agenda 8 Li AL Normalization.

8.2 Discussion was held with a general consensus that using Li was appropriate in most Baltic sea areas. Related issues were also raised, such as:

I. Regional specificity may require alternative application is some areas.
II. Loss of good data by selection only one approach should be avoided.

III. Clear definition of the appropriate supporting parameters should be provided in the guidelines, these acting as a 'best practice' guideline.
IV. A more detailed review of existing data and implications should be carried out before suggestion that a specific normalisation approach be implemented. An initial summary based on existing data from COMBINE will be run and shared with group (**DENMARK to explore for next meeting**)
V. Maintaining both normalizing approaches could be maintained with regional 'best practice' and any deviation from that being reflected and built into an indicator assessment confidence evaluation.

Agenda item 9: Use of sediment cores for assessment. CMNT/DEC

9.1 A presentation was made to initiate discussion on the possible application of sediment core sampling for the assessment hazardous substances, particularly long term trends. See presentation Agenda 9 Mannio_Sediment_Stratigraphy_EN-HZ-10 and supporting information.

9.2 Discussion included aspects such as:

I. Applying the approach can strengthen trend assessment (and linkages to inputs).
II. Would also support historical trends, for example when developing indicator reports.
III. Would be beneficial to encourage Contracting Parties to add data to ICES related to sediment cores and dated sediment cores. This would allow a good initial evaluation of potential added value.
IV. Exploring additional data parameters to cover dating (e.g. isotopic dating) may need further discussion. Currently possible to report certain parameters (e.g. Pb^{210}) but other parameters can likely be added also within HELCOM COMBINE.
V. Microplastics input history could also be explored in a similar approach.
VI. Such an approach could allow Baltic Sea specific Background Assessment Concentrations (BAC) to be developed.
VII. A review of available information could be compiled, including proposals on a potential approach for the whole Baltic Sea region (e.g. in the form of a Baltic Sea Environmental Proceedings, BSEP).

FINLAND and SWEDEN will explore options for developing a path forward on this topic.

Agenda item 10: Inclusion of Zebra mussels in future assessments. CMNT/DEC

10.1 The meeting took note of information provided by Germany and discussed the inclusion of Zebra mussels in future assessments and saw no problem to include it where it is considered to be an important species.

10.2 The Meeting discussed the need for testing, and potentially for appropriate threshold value development, or development of appropriate conversion factors. The Meeting agreed that testing should be carried out, based on existing data available in the HELCOM COMBINE database.

Agenda item 11: Assessment of Cu in the HELCOM region. CMNT/DEC

11.1 The assessment of copper in the marine environment has been flagged in OSPAR processes and in HELCOM PRESSURE. The information gathered to date was presented to the group, see presentation Agenda 11 Cu.

11.2 Data is present in the ICES hosted HELCOM COMBINE database and responses from 5 countries were gathered. Most data are WFD-related data and there is a large range detected, up to 50 x range in water and 3x in sediment. Difference in sediment type (e.g. particle size etc) and monitoring approach exist. There is however monitoring data available for a number of countries.

11.3 The ICES hosted HELCOM COMBINE database has data for 1995-2017, including some 2400 data points in water, but mixed quality of data (i.e. quantification limits). Some data values do exceed national Swedish WFD threshold values.

11.4 The ICES hosted HELCOM COMBINE database has sediment data for 1985-2017, with 1346 data points. Some comparability issue exist, but compared to the water data seem less likely to exceed Swedish national threshold value for sediment (WFD and MSFD).

11.5 The Meeting noted that the copper is, and has been, an extensively used substance to prevent biofouling and thus assessment of copper would represent both its historic use and its ongoing application. The meeting also noted that copper is used directly in the marine environment (i.e. on boats and offshore installations) thus represents a good indicator of marine related activities, whereas many other substances have land-based sources.

11.5 The Meeting agreed that copper represents a hazardous substance that should be further reviewed – and likely represents a valid indicator of hazardous substances, proposing the following next steps:

I. Data sorting and evaluation, source more data if available, and develop an initial assessment/evaluation across as large a spatial are as possible.
II. Explore application of WFD thresholds across the region to see if all comparable.
III. Draft an overview concept for a HELCOM Cu indicator – using indicator template.
IV. Examine correspondence with recent OSPAR work on the topic.
V. Where possible look into: linkages of data to sources (e.g. shipping, offshore platforms, fish farms), possible local nature of the Cu impact, and definition of reference sites.
VI. Highlight the potential for a Cu indicator at the HELCOM indicator WS in May 2019.

DENMARK and SWEDEN will develop aspects of the plan for further discussion at the next meeting.

11.6 The Meeting proposed that copper should be considered as a candidate indicator and developed further. Later discussions on how to link it should be taken once the substance specific aspects and data have been fully developed.

Agenda item 12: Discussion surrounding existing threshold value study reservations. CMNT/DEC

12.1 Denmark informed that good progress has been made, with a view to removing existing study reservations, and a further update will come in the near future (before the next EN-HZ meeting).

Denmark will inform the group as soon as further decisions processes have concluded.

Agenda item 13: Correction factors for biota threshold values. CMNT/DEC

13.1 The subject was introduced and addressed issues for conversion between tissue type and also for trophic position, see presentation Agenda 13 Translation of data in comparison to thresholds.

13.2 The topic was considered as valid and important by the group. A number of associated issues were raised, including:

I. Relevance for PFOS, Hg, and Cd/Pb.
II. Future development of biota assessments for Cd.
III. Potential application of conversion factors to address contaminants in foodstuffs.
IV. Primary and secondary definitions and applications of threshold values need to be considered in relation to such discussions.
V. Important aspect for future indicator development work.
VI. Feedback from participants at the MSFD Descriptor 8/9 workshop will be valuable.
VII. Information on trophic position and biomagnification (trophic magnification factors) are important and needed for a more correct assessment of data towards threshold values. Bioaccumulation and biomagnification vary greatly between substances but also within same substance due to e.g.

regional differences. Species composition differences can also influence this, i.e. by altering relative trophic position of same species between areas, so extensive work is required.

VIII. Inclusion of stable isotopes adds great value to understanding tropic position.

IX. Inclusion of stable isotope analysis should be included in all relevant Monitoring and Assessment guidelines.

X. Recommendation on Trophic Magnification Factors (TMF), methodology, and ICES reporting possibilities need to be considered.

13.3 **Proposed that a 'theme team', including persons from SWEDEN, FINLAND, DENMARK, LATVIA (contact person TBC) further work on this issue intersessionally for the next meeting**.

13.4 The Meeting agreed that all Contracting Parties submit relevant data and reports related to this subject (conversion factors for biota and trophic position) to the 'theme team' by **1 June, 2019**.

Agenda item 14: Any other business. CMNT

A. Invited guest (Swedish Geological Survey) to present results and discussion from the Swedish monitoring of offshore sediments – see documents 14-1 and 14-1 Att.1-3.

14.1 The Meeting welcomed the presentation by Sweden (invited guest Sarah Josefsson), see presentation Agenda 14.1 Swedish off-shore sediment monitoring_NMOS_HCB.

14.2 Sixteen stations in Swedish waters across the latitudinal gradient of the Baltic Sea were sampled in 2003, 2008 and 2014. Spatial and temporal trends were explored as well as comparisons to threshold values. A large number of substances were analysed including metals, TBT, cybutryne, PAHs, and HCB. HCB appears to be increasing in Swedish sediments in past decade, though reasons are not clear.

14.3 Sweden also informed that they are examining dioxins in new smaller project.

B. Discussion and knowledge exchange on issues related to future research needs, such as: research focusing on sub-lethal problems in the Baltic Sea that may have multiple causes – i.e. in part be due to exposure to hazardous substances but also potentially due to changes in the ecosystem composition (including examples from ongoing research).

14.4 An introduction to the topic was provided, see presentation Agenda 14.2 and 14.3 Sub-lethal effects in the Baltic andTransport of chemicals in tankers.

14.5 The complex nature of ecosystems needs the Interlinkages between indicators/assessments to be explored in order to support clear identification of pressures and impacts. Two examples were provided where 1) a deeper investigation was carried out in response to local reports of poor water quality and poor fish health – though hazardous substances were not significantly higher than at other unaffected sites, and 2) large numbers of migratory fish were dying at the river mouth before entering rivers – though hazardous substances alone were not the cause.

14.6 Poland informed that similar instances or cofactors such as food web problems confounded by hazardous substances has been encountered.

14.7 **Other Contracting Parties were asked to consider if they have seen equivalent issues and report on them at the next meeting of the group.**

C. Discussion and knowledge exchange on transport of hazardous substances and procedures used to clean transport equipment (e.g. tanks). Discussion will include: how this is approached, if these processes are potential sources of hazardous substances, and how this issue addressed across the region.

14.8 An introduction to the topic was provided, see presentation Agenda 14-3 Transport of chemicals in tankers.

14.9 There have been several instances where spills of varying size have been documented due to cleaning of transport tanks, though it is often difficult to ascertain the specific details of such incidents or the compounds released.

14.10 A number of issues such as the development of indicators for such events (e.g. spills/discharge events should not increase in number or size), and how to monitor such events were raised.

14.11 Other Contracting Parties were asked to share experiences or solutions on the problem at the next meeting.

14.12 The Meeting was informed that the subject will also be raised at HELCOM response.

D. Request on information of emerging contaminants by MCWG (ICES – Marine chemistry working group). See document 14.4 and 14.4 Att.1.

14.13 The Meeting took note of ongoing processes within MCWG (document and excel) and agreed to spread the information to relevant contacts nationally to ensure the best possible update. Distribution of the information nationally would be helpful.

14.14 It was clarified that new data was represented by data that has not been published/release by March 2017. This data is what is required for the call.

14.15 **The Meeting is invited share nationally and respond by 1 June, 2019, and that replies should be sent directly to Kine Bæk (email: kine.baek@niva.no).**

14.16 The group agreed to review the information overview at future meetings, with a Baltic Sea specific focus.

E. HELCOM SOM Platform (Sufficiency of Measures Platform) – Hazardous substances Topic Team. Introduction to the concept and discussion to support the work from EN-HZ. See document 14.5, document 14.5 A, and 14.5 B.

14.17 The Meeting was introduced to the Baltic Sea Action Plan Update Project (BSAP UP), the HELCOM ACTION Project, and the HELCOM Sufficiency of Measures Platform (SOM Platform).

14.18 A general introduction of how the ACTION project will develop a SOM analysis approach (Work Package 6) that will be applied to the all topics (including hazardous substances), and how these processes support the BSAP UP project was given. It was also explained that the ACTION Project Work Package 5 will address issues related to natural conditions that prevent the achievement of GES for hazardous substances.

14.19 The Meeting considered discussed how clear guidance would be critical, that an ambitious, data driven assessment should be carried out where data facilitates this, and that where possible high data quality should be applied to reduce uncertainty in any assessment made.

14.20 The Meeting discussed the issues related to grouping of substances, an approach understood to facilitate a reduction in individual parameters to facilitate more detailed assessment of these exemplar substances, and considered that if required the following substances may be appropriate: Hg, PFOS, Diclofenac and TBT.

14.21 The Meeting discussed how substances such as HBCDD which is in large volumes of current building material, or PBDE substitutes should be considered in future updates of BSAP to ensure that good

measures are implemented to prevent their release in the future, for example due to poor waste management.

14.22 The Meeting considered that if limited to selected substances the model/tool should be easily accessible so that further assessments can be made in the future once specific 'pilot' analyses had been completed.

14.23 **The Meeting considered the request to support these processes intersessionally, and agreed to this approach.** The group wished to be able to provide input in the process and support the development of new measures, indicating that their expertise would be well suited to assessing relevant topics that, for example, do not enter the initial SOM analysis.

Agenda Item 15: Outcome of the Meeting. DEC

A draft Outcome will be prepared by the Secretariat for consideration and approval by the participants of the Meeting.

Person	**HELCOM Contracting Party**	**Contact details**
Elisabeth Nyberg (co-Chair 'departing')	Sweden	elisabeth.nyberg@naturvardsverket.se
Sara Danielsson (co-Chair 'departing')	Sweden	sara.danielsson@nrm.se
Berit Brockmeyer (new co-Chair)	Germany	Berit.brockmeyer@bsh.de
Jaakko Mannio (new co-Chair)	Finland	jaakko.mannio@ymparisto.fi
Martin Larsen	Denmark	mml@bios.au.dk
Mailis Laht	Estonia	mailis.laht@klab.ee
Juris Aigars	Latvia	juris.aigars@lhei.lv
Tamara Zalewska	Poland	tamara.zalewska@imgw.pl
Maria Linderoth	Sweden	maria.linderoth@naturvardsverket.se
Tobias Porsbring	Sweden	tobias.porsbring@havochvatten.se
Sarah Josefsson (guest sediment expert)	Sweden	sarah.josefsson@sgu.se
Hans Jensen	ICES	hans.jensen@ices.dk
Anna Osypchuk	ICES	anna.osypchuk@ices.dk
Neil Holdsworth (guest)	ICES	Neil.Holdsworth@ices.dk
Owen Rowe	HELCOM Secretariat	Owen.rowe@helcom.fi