



Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission

Making the HELCOM eutrophication assessment
operational (EUTRO-OPER)
Video Meeting, 2 June 2015

EUTRO-OPER 5-2015

Document title	German comments on the eutrophication indicators under development
Code	5-2
Category	INF
Agenda Item	5 – Further development of HELCOM eutrophication assessment methodology (WP3)
Submission date	Secretariat to fill in
Submitted by	Germany
Reference	

Background

Four indicators under development in EUTRO-OPER (total nitrogen, total phosphorus, spring bloom based on chlorophyll-*a* and cyanobacterial surface accumulations) were presented to STATE&CONSERVATION 2-2015 for technical view, with the aim of including these among core indicators. STATE&CONSERVATION 2-2015 propose to give them pre-core status, with some comments on the development needs prior to raising giving them core status, and reservations from Germany.

GEAR 11-2015 also supported giving these four indicators pre-core status. Germany was not ready to lift their study reservation.

The indicators will be presented to HOD 48-2015 on 10-11 June, presenting the proposals of the STATE&CONSERVATION and GEAR groups.

Action required

The Meeting is invited to take note of the information, when discussing the development of new eutrophication indicators.

Indicator name	Category	The Meeting is requested to:	Comments and guidance
EUTRO OPER Indicators (Document 4J-2)			
Total nitrogen		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - review the indicator report - agree to shift from candidate to core 	<p>Final vote: DE supports the promotion of the indicator to core indicator.</p> <p>We prefer to use data throughout the year for the indicator, since only this will guarantee the added value of the indicator in addition to DIN-concentration, which is the capturing of the effect of climate change and a high confidence due to a large data pool. While for coastal waters it could be left to the CPs which assessment protocol they prefer for the open waters only annual values should be used.</p> <p>As stated in the indicator report DE has already derived GES boundaries for coastal and open waters and these should be used for the indicator, since the BALTSEM model is not producing very reliable results for the Western Baltic Sea.</p> <p>Editorial comment: Text under “optimal monitoring” is wrong and does not fit the assessment protocol.</p>
Total phosphorus		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - review the indicator report - agree to shift from candidate to core 	<p>Final vote: DE supports the promotion of the indicator to core indicator.</p> <p>We prefer to use data throughout the year for the indicator, since only this will guarantee the added value of the indicator in addition to DIP-concentration, which is the capturing of the effect of climate change and a high confidence due to a large data pool. While for coastal waters it could be left to the CPs which assessment protocol they prefer for the open waters only annual values should be used.</p> <p>As stated in the indicator report DE has already derived GES boundaries for coastal and open waters and these should be used for the indicator, since the BALTSEM model is not producing very reliable results for the Western Baltic Sea.</p> <p>Editorial comment: Text under “optimal monitoring” is wrong and does not fit the assessment protocol.</p>
Spring bloom intensity index		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - review the indicator report - agree to shift from candidate to core 	<p>The indicator does currently not cover the Western Baltic Sea. Furthermore, the GES boundary is still under development and it is questionable whether a suitable boundary can be found. Germany is still discussing the added value of the indicator since there are already enough indicators that describe eutrophication. Agreement of Germany to the indicator will depend on applicability in the Western Baltic Sea and associated costs (could the satellite images be analysed commonly within HELCOM or do we need to do extra national work?). It is unlikely that we can commit to the latter.</p> <p>Final vote: The indicator should not yet be promoted as a core indicator but remain candidate.</p>

			<p>Detailed technical comment: This seems to be an example for an indicator where aggregating over the large Baltic Sea basins makes little sense and a finer resolution (20km grid) would be more suitable.</p> <p>Editorial comment: Text under “optimal monitoring” is wrong. Indicator is measured in spring and not in winter. The policy relevance section needs to be harmonized between the eutrophication indicators.</p>
Cyanobacterial surface accumulations		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - review the indicator report - agree to shift from candidate to core 	<p>The indicator does currently not cover the Western Baltic Sea. It also does not yet consider the field data analysed by PEG for the cyanobacteria indicator fact sheet. Only when these 2 issues are addressed Germany can promote the indicator to a core indicator. Furthermore, it is unclear how the GES boundary was derived for the indicator when only data after 1979 were available, with this already being a time with high eutrophication.</p> <p>Final vote: The indicator should not yet be promoted as a core indicator but remain candidate.</p> <p>Editorial comment: Text under “optimal monitoring” is wrong. Indicator is measured in summer and not in winter. The policy relevance section needs to be harmonized between the eutrophication indicators.</p>