



Outcome of the 11th Meeting of the HELCOM Group on Ecosystem-based Sustainable Fisheries (FISH 11-2020)

Contents

Introduction	1
Agenda Item 1 Adoption of the Agenda	1
Agenda Item 2 Matters arising from HELCOM work of relevance to the group.....	2
Agenda Item 3 Implementation and update of the Baltic Sea Action Plan	2
Agenda Item 4 Regional cooperation on Fisheries & Environment	5
Agenda Item 5 BAT/BEP for sustainable aquaculture.....	6
Agenda Item 6 HELCOM data interests.....	6
Agenda Item 7 Salmon and sea trout including HELCOM Recommendation 32-33/1	6
Agenda Item 8 Interactions between fisheries and marine ecosystems	7
Agenda Item 9 Work on indicator development	7
Agenda Item 10 Future work	7
Agenda Item 11 Any other business	7
Agenda Item 12 Outcome of the Meeting	8
Annex 1. List of participants	9
Annex 2. Rephrasing of existing HELCOM actions.....	10
Annex 3. List of contacts and observers.....	22

Introduction

01. With reference to the decision of FISH 10-2019 (Outcome paragraph 10.5), the 11th Meeting of the HELCOM Group on Ecosystem-based Sustainable Fisheries (FISH 10-2020), was held in the premises of Hotel Riverton (Stora Badhusgatan 26, 411 21), in Gothenburg, Sweden, on 11-12 March 2020.
02. The Meeting was attended by delegations from Denmark, Finland, Germany, Lithuania and Sweden, as well as an observer from BSAC. The list of participants is contained in **Annex 1**.
03. The Meeting was chaired by Marianne Goffeng Raakil (Swedish Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation). Markus Helavuori, Professional Secretary and Petra Kääriä, Assisting Professional Secretary, acted as secretaries of the Meeting. Jannica Haldin, Professional Secretary also attended the Meeting.
04. Ulrika Gunnartz from the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management welcomed the participants to the Meeting and to Gothenburg.

Agenda Item 1 Adoption of the Agenda

- 1.1 The Meeting adopted the Agenda of the Meeting as contained in document 1-1.

Agenda Item 2 Matters arising from HELCOM work of relevance to the group

- 2.1 The Meeting took note of the Outcome of HELCOM HOD 57-2019 (document 2-1). In particular, the Meeting noted that HOD 57-2019 had approved the Work Plan for the HELCOM Fish Group for 2020-2021.
- 2.2 The Meeting took note of the Outcome of FISH-PRO III 2-2020 (document 2-2), as introduced by the Secretariat, and noted that the HELCOM Guidelines for coastal fish monitoring, endorsed by STATE&CONSERVATION 10-2019, are published and available on [HELCOM web page](#).
- 2.3 The Meeting noted the Outcome of the 2020 HELCOM Stakeholder Conference (document 2-3), as introduced by the Secretariat, and agreed to consider matters related to BSAP actions relevant for the Fish Group in more detail under Agenda Item 3.
- 2.4 The Meeting noted that the outcome of FISH-M 7-2020 (document 2-4) will be considered under Agenda Item 3.

Agenda Item 3 Implementation and update of the Baltic Sea Action Plan

- 3.1 The Meeting took note of the outline, content and style of the updated BSAP (document 3-1), as presented by the Secretariat and agreed to consider it when preparing proposals for new and rephrased existing actions for the updated BSAP.
- 3.2 The Meeting noted the structure and objectives of the updated BSAP and discussed the possibilities to still make adjustments to them, recalling also the related discussions at the 2020 HELCOM Stakeholder Conference 2020 (document 2-3). The Meeting noted that HELCOM 41-2020 had agreed on the objectives, noting also that there may be need for adjustments to individual objectives or proposals on additional objectives as found relevant in the further BSAP update process
- 3.3 The Meeting discussed the process of updating the BSAP, including drafting of supplementary information to support the follow up of the actions for the updated BSAP, as further specified in document 3-1.
- 3.4 The Meeting noted similarities with the BSAP and the MSFD and discussed ways of ensuring that the needed measures will be included in the updated BSAP in order to achieve its objectives. The Meeting recognized the need to harmonize and increase cooperation in order to agree on measures on indicators.
- 3.5 The Meeting took note of the accomplished and upcoming activities of the BSAP update (document 3-5), presented by the Secretariat, and agreed to use the information when planning work for the BSAP update.

Progress on analyzing sufficiency of measures

- 3.6 The Meeting took note of the progress of the ACTION project, as presented by the Secretariat, and noted that initial data collected related to by-catch has been analysed and provisional rates of by-catch calculated, with a final report on high risk areas for by-catch under preparation. Scenarios for displacing fishing effort from peripheral areas to reduce the spatial impact of benthic impacting fishing gears, while maintaining catches and evaluating economic consequences, have also been run. Final reports for both topics will be available in autumn 2020. The Meeting invited the Secretariat to explore the possibilities of sharing some of the preliminary results already before autumn 2020.
- 3.7 The Meeting took note of the progress on the analysis of sufficiency of measures (SOM) (document 3-4), presented by the Secretariat. Particular attention was drawn to the fact that an expert-based approach has been employed for much of the SOM analysis work and that activity-pressure surveys on a number of topics have been distributed to relevant HELCOM expert bodies (including the Fish Group, EG Fishdata, FISH-M and FISH-PRO III), the ACTION Project and SOM topic teams.

3.8 The Meeting noted that validation by the Fish Group of the results of the surveys will take place tentatively in April 2020 by correspondence. The Meeting further noted the request by FISH-M 7-2020, that FISH-M should also be invited to validate results related to migratory fish (document 2-4).

3.9 The Meeting noted that the validation process was originally requested by the Pressure Working Group, and that the intention is for all Working Groups to have the opportunity to give guidance on what results can and cannot be used in the SOM model. The Meeting further noted a clarification provided by the Secretariat that the validation is related to input going into the SOM model, which will cover all human activities and pressures and all HOLAS II state components and will take into account all existing measures agreed in the Baltic Sea.

3.10 The Meeting noted that experts that have contributed to the SOM surveys will as a general rule not take part in the validation of the results. The Meeting further noted that personal information of those experts that contributed to the survey cannot be provided due to the General Data Protection Regulation, but that general information on their background, experience etc. will be made available. The Meeting discussed the possibility of the experts that contributed to the survey to undertake the validation as well.

3.11 The Meeting noted a comment that national consultations may be needed in some Contracting Parties to enable validation of the results of the surveys. The Meeting agreed that sufficient time for validation is therefore needed. The Meeting noted information provided by the Secretariat that three weeks is envisaged for the validation process.

3.12 Following discussion, the Meeting requested the Secretariat to provide detailed instructions on the validation process when the request for validation is eventually circulated.

3.13 The Meeting noted that the results of the SOM analysis will not only be based on the surveys, but the assumption is that existing measures, such as the CFP and other regional and national measures, are being implemented, incorporating also e.g. ICES advice.

Rephrasing of existing actions, reviewing of new proposed actions

3.14 The Meeting considered document 3-7 on rephrasing of existing actions, and noted guidance provided to all HELCOM Working Groups by HOD 57-2019 as follows:

- formulate actions as concretely as possible;
- propose target years for the implementation of actions; and
- consider merging of actions and proposing actions to be left out if not found relevant.

3.15 In this context, the Meeting also took note of the outcome of the workshop on sufficiency of measures analysis for fish (SOM FISH WS 1-2019), which was held in Warsaw, Poland on 4-6 November 2019 (document 3-3), and noted that discussions and proposals related to existing actions are included also in the Annex of document 3-7.

3.16 The Meeting considered the outcome of FISH-M 7-2020 on rephrasing of existing actions related to migratory fish, as presented in Annex 2 of the Outcome of that meeting (document 2-4).

3.17 The Meeting discussed and proposed rephrasing of existing actions, based on document 3-7 and 2-4, as detailed in **Annex 2** of this Outcome.

3.18 The Meeting noted that HOD 57-2019 had agreed with the proposal by FISH 10-2019 that the action to *“Further development and implementation of comparable methodology for data collection (salmon and sea trout) through surveys, especially on recreational fisheries”* can be omitted from future implementation and reporting.

3.19 The Meeting discussed the action *“Competent authorities to take immediate action for development of long-term management plans for commercially exploited fish species (flatfish) so that they are within safe biological limits”* which has been reported as accomplished by all Contracting Parties, and therefore not been considered in the context of rephrasing existing actions. The Meeting noted, however, that the management plans focus on plaice and that as the situation for other flatfish has deteriorated, there may be a need to consider a new action on the matter.

3.20 The Meeting considered the information on the review of synopses on potential new actions for the updated BSAP (documents 3-6, 3-6-Add.1 and 3-6-Add.1) as well as guidance for the technical review of the synopses (document 3-8), presented by the Secretariat. In this context, the Meeting also considered the outcome of the 2020 HELCOM Stakeholder Conference (document 2-3) and in particular the actions related to fish and fisheries proposed by the parallel sessions on Sea-based activities and Biodiversity.

3.21 The Meeting discussed the approach in conducting the review and noted that the review aims to provide a preliminary (qualitative) evaluation focusing on the technical aspects and substance of the proposals. The Meeting noted that the review should, in this first step, be carried out from a scientific point of view and focus on technical feasibility of the measures, not legal or other aspects of feasibility.

3.22 The Meeting started undertaking a technical review of the synopses using the guidance and separate Excel attachment provided in document 3-8 and agreed to continue the process via correspondence. The Meeting agreed on the following timeline for finalizing the technical review:

- the Secretariat will circulate the excel file including all actions and comments by the Meeting to the participants and contacts and observers of the Fish Group **by Friday 13 March 2020**
- Contracting Parties and observers to fill in the table/provide comments **by 26 March 2020**
- a possible online meeting on the consolidation and agreement of the review will be held on **16 April 9-17 CET**.

3.23 The Meeting noted that a BSAP UP Workshop on actions related to biodiversity, including fish and fisheries related actions, will be held on 26-28 May 2020, in Helsinki, Finland, and the outcome of the technical review of the fish/fisheries related actions will be submitted to that workshop.

3.24 The Meeting considered the new actions proposed at the 2020 HELCOM Stakeholder Conference set out in document 2-3. The Meeting discussed the proposals as follows:

- *Initiate the process to conclude a more complete set of criteria to indicate the health of a fish stock, besides fishing pressure and biomass criteria also including size and age distribution:* the Meeting noted that the proposed action falls under relevant EU regulation as well as ICES processes and that certain clarifications are needed. The Meeting agreed on the relevance of this proposal and agreed to consider it as part of the review of synopsis and the Attachment to document 3-8;
- *Development of alternative fishing gear to replace gillnets:* The Meeting noted that this proposal is already partly covered by other existing and new proposals, but agreed on the relevance of this proposal and agreed to consider it as part of the review of synopsis and the Attachment to document 3-8;
- *Transboundary management plan for critically endangered species sea spawning grayling:* The Meeting noted that the proposal had been made by CCB, and further noted that CCB was not in a position to provide further information in a synopsis format to enable a review of the action;
- *Stronger cooperation between BALTFISH and relevant HELCOM working groups;* The Meeting noted that this proposal relates to a more concrete process for cooperation between HELCOM and BALTFISH. The Meeting agreed on the relevance of this proposal and agreed to consider it as part of the review of synopsis and the Attachment to document 3-8;
- *Active restoration and restocking of candidate species (populations):* The Meeting took note of the proposal and noted that it may be relevant to consider in the context of Recommendation 37/2, but did not support further review of the proposed action for possible uptake in the BSAP in its current form.

3.25 The Meeting noted that all the new proposed actions agreed to be considered as part of the review of synopsis had been made at the 2020 HELCOM Stakeholder Conference by CCB. The Meeting invited CCB to provide synopsis on these actions, in order to enable such a review. The Meeting further invited the Secretariat to circulate the synopsis to Contacts and observers of the Fish Group when available.

3.26 The Meeting considered the proposal by FISH-M 7-2020 for a new BSAP action on “*National environmental permitting authorities to take into account possible impacts on weak migratory fish stocks, particularly salmon, as recognized by ICES or nationally, and how this may compromise the ability to reach agreed river specific fish population targets.*” The Meeting agreed to consider it as part of the review of synopsis and the Attachment to document 3-8, and invited the Secretariat to circulate the synopsis for this proposed action together with the ones to be provided by CCB.

Agenda Item 4 Regional cooperation on Fisheries & Environment

Cooperation between HELCOM and BALTFISH

4.1 The Meeting took note of the proposal on swift action related to the HELCOM Roadmap on fisheries data (document 4-1), as submitted by CCB.

4.2 The Meeting invited the Secretariat to inform BALTFISH on the Roadmap on fisheries data in order to assess incidental bycatches and fisheries impact on benthic biotopes in the Baltic Sea and agreed that the list of specified actions proposed by CCB should also be shared with BALTFISH, noting that some of those actions may fall under EU competency.

4.3 The Meeting also invited the Secretariat to request BALTFISH to consider the Roadmap and provide feedback on the ways of following up the Roadmap within the framework of the CFP.

4.4 The Meeting took note of recent information sharing and cooperation between HELCOM and BALTFISH and noted that the HELCOM Executive Secretary attended the previous BALTFISH Forum, held in September 2019 in Helsinki, Finland.

4.5 The Meeting invited the Secretariat to continue sharing the outcomes of the Meetings of the Fish Group with BALTFISH.

4.6 The Meeting discussed the need and possibilities to engage BALTFISH in the process of updating the BSAP and noted specifically the importance of the deteriorated eastern cod stock in the Baltic Sea in this regard, which is covered by existing and proposed new BSAP actions.

4.7 The Meeting invited the Secretariat to inform the BALTFISH Presidency on the BSAP update and to invite them to comment as appropriate.

Cooperation with the BSAC sub-group on ecosystem-based fisheries management

4.8 The Meeting took note of information on ongoing work regarding ecosystem-based fisheries management, presented by BSAC and noted inter alia that BSAC has contributed to the development of synopses for proposals of new BSAP actions, submitted by CCB. The Meeting also noted that BSAC is interested in continuing their involvement in the update of the BSAP and would also need information on the timeline of this work. The BSAC reiterated its open invitation for HELCOM to attend meetings and share information. The Meeting encouraged the BSAC representative to report back to the BSAC on the developments and timelines with regard to the BSAP update, as well as the dates of upcoming meetings of the Fish Group, on the basis of the present Outcome and meeting documents. The Meeting further agreed that input by the BSAC on the BSAP update process is most welcome and invited the BSAC representative to convey such input at future meetings.

4.9 The Meeting further noted that BSAC is continuing its discussions related to the revision of the CFP, including also MSFD and regionalization under the CFP. The Meeting further noted that a survey regarding regionalization has been circulated to BSAC members and that the outcome of that survey will be prepared into a document.

4.10 The Meeting recalled that FISH 10-2019 had taken note of the questionnaire on alternative fishing gears and fishing techniques as published in a dedicated [Workspace](#) on the HELCOM Meeting Portal. The Meeting noted that the Secretariat has added introductory text and a disclaimer, based on the Outcome of FISH 10-2019, and encouraged the Contracting Parties and observers to keep the questionnaire up to date

on the dedicated Workspace by providing updates before **31 December** each year. The Meeting invited the Secretariat to send reminders of this, as appropriate.

Cooperation with other organizations

4.11 The Meeting took note of information regarding the global work on identifying other area-based conservation measures (OECMs), i.e. spatial conservation measures outside of marine protected areas, guided by the CBD, IUCN, WCPA and, for marine areas, supported by FAO. The majority of identified measures relevant for the marine environment are related to fisheries management. The Meeting took note that a proposal to arrange a regional OECM process will be presented to State and Conservation Working Group and that the Secretariat has been in contact with FAO representatives regarding the possibility to support such a workshop.

4.12 The Meeting expressed support for such a proposal and highlighted that fisheries management authorities should be invited to take part in the process and that when available information on the workshop should be shared with e.g. BALTFISH.

4.13 The Meeting noted that the HELCOM Secretariat was invited to the 3rd Meeting of the Sustainable Ocean Initiative (SOI) in Busan, Republic of Korea, originally scheduled for April 2020 but currently postponed indefinitely.

Agenda Item 5 BAT/BEP for sustainable aquaculture

5.1 The Meeting took note of ongoing work regarding the development of BAT/BEP for sustainable aquaculture.

5.2 The Meeting reiterated the invitation for Contracting Parties to consider Chairing the Group and contributing to the work.

5.3 The Meeting noted that the next meeting of CG AQUACULTURE will be held in Mariehamn, Åland Islands, on 25-26 June 2020.

5.4 The Meeting noted that CCB is working on a compilation of legal cases related to aquaculture.

5.5 The Meeting invited the Secretariat to inform FISH 12-2020 on progress in the development of BAT/BEP, highlighting any need for further action to complete the task.

Agenda Item 6 HELCOM data interests

6.1 The Meeting noted that the draft Roadmap on fisheries data in order to assess incidental bycatches and fisheries impact on benthic biotopes in the Baltic Sea was approved by HOD 57-2020 and adopted by HELCOM 41-2020.

6.2 The Meeting further noted that HOD 57-2019 had agreed that initial follow up on the Roadmap should be reported to HOD 59-2020.

6.3 The Meeting recalled the discussion on the matter under Agenda Item 4 and agreed to revisit the matter at FISH 12-2020, to prepare first report on implementation to HELCOM HOD 59-2020.

Agenda Item 7 Salmon and sea trout including HELCOM Recommendation 32-33/1

7.1 The Meeting took note of the report from yearly partnership meeting of the RETROUT project (document 7-1) as well as recent and upcoming activities of the RETROUT project (document 7-2), presented by the Secretariat.

7.2 The Meeting noted that the RETROUT Project will organize its end conference in Tallinn, Estonia, on 22-23 September 2020.

Agenda Item 8 Interactions between fisheries and marine ecosystems

8.1 The Meeting took note of the outcome of the fourth workshop on implementation of the Regional Action Plan on Marine Litter (WS RAP ML 4-2019), as presented by the Secretariat. The Meeting invited interested parties to comment on the proposed further actions to address ALDFG in the Baltic Sea (Annex 2 of [document 3-8](#) to PRESSURE 11-2019) directly through the national representatives of the Pressure Working Group.

8.2 The Meeting took note of the [Outcome](#) of HELCOM Workshop on Seal-Fisheries Interactions (SFI WS 1-2019), as introduced by the Secretariat. The Meeting noted that EG MAMA 13-2019 had considered the outcome of SFI WS 1-2019, with more information available in the [Outcome](#) of that meeting.

8.3 The Meeting took note of the letter from the EU Commissioner addressing harbour porpoise by-catch in EU-waters (document 8-2), as presented by Germany. The Meeting noted that the BALTFISH Presidency has recently approached Member States on the matter, asking for views on the need to include the issue on the BALTFISH agenda and that BALTFISH has within its mandate to consult relevant expert networks as appropriate, such as relevant HELCOM groups, ASCOBANS, ICES and BSAC. The Meeting further noted that an ICES workshop is also planned for spring 2020. The Meeting recalled that a number of proposals for new BSAP actions are related to minimizing by-catch.

8.4 The Meeting asked the Secretariat to invite BALTFISH to inform the HELCOM Secretariat on if and how the matter has progressed within BALTFISH and invited the Secretariat to report back to FISH 12-2020.

Agenda Item 9 Work on indicator development*HELCOM indicators*

9.1 The Meeting took note of the Outcome of the second HELCOM indicator workshop ([INDICATOR WS 2-2019](#)), held in Copenhagen, Denmark, on 16-18 October 2019, as presented by the Secretariat.

HELCOM-OSPAR by-catch workshop

9.2 The Meeting took note of the [outcome](#) of the joint OSPAR-HELCOM workshop on incidental bycatch (WS 1-2019), organized in Copenhagen, Denmark, on 3-5 September 2019, as presented by the Secretariat.

Agenda Item 10 Future work

10.1 The Meeting noted that HOD 57-2019 approved the Work Plan for the Fish Group for 2020-2021.

10.2 The Meeting agreed to organize the next meeting of the Group on 11–12 November 2020 and welcomed the offer by Denmark to consider hosting the meeting. The Meeting further welcomed the offer by Germany to host the following meeting, tentatively in early March 2021.

Agenda Item 11 Any other business

11.1 The Meeting updated the list of contacts and observers of the Fish Group, as included in **Annex 3**.

11.2 The Meeting invited the contact points of the Fish Group (Contracting Parties and Observers) to inform the Secretariat (petra.kaaria@helcom.fi) of contacts to be included in the contact list of FISH-M at their earliest convenience, and to keep the list up to date on an annual basis.

11.3 The Meeting noted that Ulrika Gunnartz (Sweden) will be leaving the Fish Group for the time being due to other commitments and thanked her for her constructive and active contribution to the work of the Group.

11.4 The Meeting thanked Sweden for the generous hospitality and excellent organization of the Meeting.

Agenda Item 12 Outcome of the Meeting

12.1 The Meeting adopted the Outcome of the Meeting. The Outcome of the Meeting, together with the documents and presentations considered by the Meeting are available on the [FISH 11-2020 meeting site](#).

Annex 1. List of participants

Representing	Name	Name of organization	Email address
Chair			
Chair	Marianne Goffeng Raakil	Swedish Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation	marianne.goffeng-raakil@gov.se
Contracting Parties			
Denmark	Janne Palomino Dalby	Ministry of environment and food	jpda@mfvm.dk
Finland	Heikki Lehtinen	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	heikki.lehtinen@mmm.fi
	Penina Blankett (via skype)	Ministry of the Environment	penina.blankett@ym.fi
Germany	Christian Pusch	Federal Agency for Nature Conservation	christian.pusch@bfn.de
	Miriam Mueller	Federal Agency for Nature Conservation	miriam.mueller@bfn.de
Lithuania	Antanas Kontautas	Klaipeda University	antanas.kontautas@ku.lt
Sweden	Ulrika Gunnartz	Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management	ulrika.gunnartz@havochvatten.se
Observer organizations			
BSAC	Nils Höglund	BSAC (CCB)	nils.hoglund@ccb.se
HELCOM Secretariat			
Secretariat	Markus Helavuori	HELCOM Secretariat	markus.helavuori@helcom.fi
Secretariat	Jannica Haldin	HELCOM Secretariat	jannica.haldin@helcom.fi
Secretariat	Petra Kääriä	HELCOM Secretariat	petra.kaaria@helcom.fi
Secretariat	Luke Dodd (via skype)	HELCOM Secretariat	luke.dodd@helcom.fi

Annex 2. Rephrasing of existing HELCOM actions

Actions likely to be implemented by 2021

The actions in this table were reported to HOD 57-2019 as likely to be implemented by 2021.

Existing action	Proposals from FISH 10-2019 and FISH-M 7-2020	Comments by FISH 11-2020
<p>Further development and implementation of common practices for breeding, rearing and releasing salmon and sea trout as reintroductions in potential salmonid rivers</p> <p>Origin: MD 2013 Implementation: Joint Status: Not accomplished</p>	<p>FISH 10-2019 <u>agreed</u> that although it is ambitious, the aim should be to develop common guidelines by 2021. For this purpose, a FISH-M workshop should be organized in early 2020, possibly back to back with the next meeting of the Fish Group.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Meeting <u>encouraged</u> Contracting Parties to take the lead in this work.</p> <p>FISH-M 7-2020 took note of a presentation by Sweden on national procedures and the ongoing update of the national legislation and strategy concerning e.g. release of fish (not only salmonids) (Presentation 1). The Meeting discussed principles on breeding, rearing and releasing fish in general, and concluded that it would be possible to develop common guidelines on the matter. The Meeting agreed on the importance on developing common guidelines on the matter and welcomed the offer by Sweden to develop a first draft for common guidelines based on the Swedish national strategy, NAFCO guidelines etc. in autumn 2020. The Meeting proposed that the guidelines should be annexed to Recommendation 32/33-1, which already contains related provisions in its paragraph 7. The Meeting further proposed that the guidelines should include general principles on breeding, rearing and releasing salmonids, making reference also to relevant EU and other legislation. The Meeting invited FISH 11-2020 to agree on this way forward and invited interested parties to liaise with Sweden (sofia.brockmark@havochvatten.se and fredrik.arrhenius@havochvatten.se) in order to contribute to the work.</p>	<p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that based on the proposal by FISH-M 7-2020, Recommendation 32/33-1 would need to be revised, and <u>noted</u> that not all Contracting Parties are able to confirm agreement with such a revision at this stage.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>agreed</u> with the way forward proposed by FISH-M and welcomed the offer by Sweden to develop a first draft for common guidelines based on the Swedish national strategy, NASCO guidelines etc. in autumn 2020. The Meeting <u>invited</u> interested parties to liaise with Sweden (sofia.brockmark@havochvatten.se and fredrik.arrhenius@havochvatten.se) in order to contribute to the work.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>emphasized</u> the need to ensure follow up on the implementation of such guidelines but, <u>agreed</u> that further consideration of whether this should be ensured as an annex to Recommendation 32-22-1 should be considered once the first draft of the guidelines have been provided</p> <p>The Meeting <u>agreed</u> that this action does not need to be included in the updated BSAP, provided that common guidelines are finalized in time.</p>
<p>Further development and implementation of recommendations for riverine and estuarine management and conservation measures, such as fish ways for up and down migration, restoration and protection of spawning grounds, concerning fisheries within rivers and estuaries</p> <p>Origin: MD 2013 Implementation: Joint Status: Partly accomplished</p>	<p>FISH 10-2019 Meeting <u>agreed</u> to invite the Secretariat to do so by adding guidelines on restoration measures to a draft revised Recommendation 32/33-1, taking into account the outcome of FISH-M 4-2017 and developments within the RETROUT Project. The Meeting also <u>agreed</u> that the draft revised Recommendation should be considered by FISH 11, with a view to approval at HOD 58-2020. FISH 10-2019 furthermore <u>agreed</u> that Estonia should be invited to contribute to the work as they have recent experience from several dam removal projects.</p>	<p>The Meeting considered document 3-2 and agreed on the way forward to await the outcome of the RETROUT Project before developing draft guidelines on restoration measures to a draft revised Recommendation 32/33-1.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>welcomed</u> the offer by Germany to contribute to the work and <u>invited</u> other Contracting Parties to do the same.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>agreed</u>, however, that when considering draft guidelines based on the outcome of the RETROUT project, consideration should be given on whether they could cover all migratory fish and whether an annex to Rec. 32/33-1 is appropriate in this regard. The Meeting also <u>agreed</u> that the status of the guidelines needs to be clarified, e.g. would they be a toolbox of options or a more formal guideline with reporting obligations.</p>

		<p>The Meeting asked the Secretariat to investigate also the possibility and need to merge Recommendations 19/2 and 32/33-1 as a part of revision of the Recommendations.</p>
<p>Classify and make inventories of rivers with European eel</p> <p>Origin: BSAP Implementation: National Status: Partly accomplished (2/9 countries)</p>	<p>Remaining Contracting Parties are encouraged to accomplish the action by 2021, in which case the action can be deleted.</p>	<p>The Meeting <u>discussed</u> whether the action refers to rivers connected to the sea, or also inland waterways with eel that are unable to migrate. The Meeting <u>noted</u> that this action is relevant also for prioritizing in which rivers mitigation actions such as removal of migration barriers should be undertaken. Furthermore, the Meeting <u>noted</u> that in some Contracting Parties, a full inventory of all rivers will be difficult to conduct. The Meeting agreed that accomplishing this action should not necessarily be understood to require that.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that this action is also linked to new proposed actions as well as the proposal by SOM FISH M-1 2020 to develop a Baltic Sea eel programme.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>proposed</u> that if this action has not been accomplished before adoption of the updated BSAP, the following action should be included in the updated BSAP: Inventory and identify rivers where management measures for eel would have the greatest impact</p>

Actions not likely to be implemented by 2021

The tables in this section include the existing HELCOM actions linked to the Fish Group that are not likely to be implemented by 2021 and proposals on how they could be revised/rephrased if included in the updated BSAP.

Theme: By-catch

Existing action	Proposals from FISH 10-2019 and SOM FISH WS 1-2019	Comments by FISH 11-2020	Proposed formulation for the updated BSAP
<p>Implementation of non-lethal mitigations measures for seals-fisheries interactions (HELCOM Recommendation 27-28/2) (2012)</p> <p>Origin: BSAP Implementation: National Status: Partly accomplished (2/9 countries)</p>	<p>FISH 10-2019 <u>noted</u> that the HELCOM Workshop on seal-fisheries interactions will take place on 27 June 2019 back to back with FISH 10-2019. The Meeting <u>agreed</u> that this action should be considered intersessionally based on the outcome and recommendations of that workshop.</p> <p>SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 <u>noted</u> that the HELCOM workshop on seal-fisheries interactions did not provide any concrete proposals on this action. The Workshop agreed that this action addresses an important issue which is needed in the updated BSAP. The Workshop further <u>agreed</u> that there is also a need for a joint action on the matter, and that information on non-lethal mitigation measures should be shared among Contracting Parties and with BALTFISH and BSAC.</p> <p>The Workshop further <u>agreed</u> that the action could be rephrased as follows:</p> <p>Implementation and sharing of information among Contracting Parties, BALTFISH and BSAC on non-lethal mitigations measures for seals-fisheries interactions.</p>	<p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that a BALTFISH symposium was held in March 2019 on this topic, where proposals had inter alia been made to prepare a HELCOM BALTFISH toolbox on non-lethal mitigation measures, and that an overview of what actions are suitable within the existing legal framework should be undertaken.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>agreed</u> that creating such a toolbox for sharing of non-lethal mitigation measures and legal overview would be relevant as supplementary actions on this matter in the updated BSAP.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that wording from Recommendation 27-28/2 may be used in rephrasing this action.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that sharing of information is not a solution on issues related to seal-fisheries interactions and <u>considered</u> the need for a new framework or procedures between HELCOM, BSAC and BALTFISH to address the seal-fisheries interactions issue, e.g. by organizing annual joint meetings or thematic workshops on the matter. Also supportive actions are needed.</p>	<p>Sharing of information and implementation among Contracting Parties, BALTFISH and BSAC on the implementation of non-lethal mitigation measures or ways to manage seals-fisheries interactions.</p>
<p>Reduce the negative impacts of fishing activities on the marine ecosystem and to this end, support the development of fisheries management and technical measures to minimize unwanted by-</p>	<p>SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 <u>proposed</u> that the commitment should be split into separate concrete actions. The Workshop <u>noted</u> that for harbour porpoise, the target should be zero by-catch. The Workshop also <u>noted</u> that a new</p>	<p>The Meeting <u>agreed</u> that the “close to zero target” should be an aspiration also for other by-catch than harbour porpoises.</p>	<p>Reduce the negative impacts of fishing activities on the marine ecosystem and to this end, support the development of fisheries management including technical measures to minimize unwanted by-catch of fish, birds and</p>

<p>catch of fish, birds and mammals in order to achieve the close to zero target for by-catch rates of the Baltic Sea Action Plan and minimize damage to sea bed habitats.</p> <p>Origin: MD 2013 Not reported: Considered as too general for follow-up</p>	<p>objective on seafloor integrity will be included in the updated BSAP and that new actions related to the matter are expected and consequentially minimization of seabed habitats would not need to be addressed as part of this action. Following discussion, the Workshop <u>agreed</u> that the following revision could be used as a basis for the further development of this commitment into more concrete actions:</p> <p><i>Reduce the negative impacts of fishing activities on the marine ecosystem and to this end, support the development of fisheries management and technical measures to minimize unwanted by-catch of fish, birds and sea mammals and achieve the close to zero target for by-catch rates of harbour porpoise and other relevant species of the Baltic Sea Action Plan.</i></p>	<p>The Meeting <u>discussed</u> the option of mentioning also specific species of birds in the action, facilitating therefore also the development of measures to reduce by-catch of those species. The Meeting <u>noted</u>, however, that naming species in the BSAP is problematic and <u>agreed</u> instead to reformulate the action to refer to relevant species. The Meeting <u>stressed</u>, that both the eastern and the western harbour porpoise should be considered to be among the relevant species.</p> <p>The Meeting further <u>agreed</u> that the identification of all relevant species should be added as a supplementary action in the BSAP, in order to facilitate the development and implementation of the action. The Meeting also <u>agreed</u> that such a supporting action would be a more appropriate place for setting a timeframe for the action.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that by following up on the Roadmap on fisheries data, adopted by HELCOM 41-2020, will contribute to achieving this action.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>agreed</u> that the seabed disturbance, as reflected in the original action, should be covered by other actions in the updated BSAP.</p>	<p><i>marine mammals and achieve the close to zero target for by-catch rates of relevant species, e.g. harbour porpoise</i></p>
---	---	---	--

Theme: Conservation and restocking of fish stocks, restoration of habitats

Existing action	Proposals from FISH 10-2019, SOM FISH WS 1-2019 and FISH-M 7-2020	Comments by FISH 11-2020	Proposed formulation for the updated BSAP
<p>Continue the efforts underway and enhance co-ordination and evaluation of measures within the Baltic Sea as well as with other European countries, for the conservation of eel stocks, in line with national eel management plans</p> <p>Origin: BSAP Implementation: Joint Status: Partly accomplished (5/9 countries)</p>	<p>SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 <u>noted</u> that for eel, there is a state target and that pressures need to be addressed, rather than only measures. The Workshop also <u>noted</u> that discussions within the EU on eel are more on the management level rather than the pressure level and that it may not be worthwhile to wait for EU to conclude on the matter. The Workshop <u>noted</u> the view of the BSAC that measures on dams are needed and illegal fishing (both unreported and poaching, as well as commercial and recreational) should be stopped. The Workshop <u>agreed</u> that the 2007 ambition level needs to be revitalised and further <u>proposed</u> that FISH 11-2020 should establish a HELCOM Eel Task Force to develop a HELCOM programme to ensure successful eel migrations from the Baltic Sea drainage basin to their spawning grounds by late 2021 with implementation starting by 2022 and intermediate assessments e.g. in 2024 in order to identify problems and address them. The Workshop <u>noted</u> that active involvement of BALTFISH will eventually be needed in implementation of the programme.</p> <p>In this respect, the Workshop <u>invited</u> Contracting Parties to take the lead in the Eel Task Force and to submit draft Terms of Reference to FISH 11-2020 for consideration.</p>	<p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> the discussions at FISH-M 7-2020 on the matter (paragraphs 3.3 to 3.8 of the Outcome), and considered the possibility of FISH-M to develop the proposed HELCOM programme instead of an eel task force.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>agreed</u> with the views of FISH-M 7-2020 on the importance taking into account the EU Eel Regulation and the CMS in developing the HELCOM programme on eel.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that establishment of a task force would in itself lead to accomplishment of the existing action.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that the proposed target dates are in line with ICES reporting dates.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>supported</u> the development of a HELCOM eel programme and <u>invited</u> Contracting Parties to work intersessionally in order to submit a proposal on terms of reference for the work, as well as a proposed way forward for developing the programme e.g. by a task force or by FISH-M.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that Denmark manages eel in accordance with the EU Eel Regulation.</p>	<p><i>Initiate implementation by 2022 of a Baltic coordinated programme of protective measures ensuring successful eel migrations, aligned with CMS, the EU Eel Regulation and other relevant instruments, including a monitoring and post-evaluation process of levels of pressures affecting eel that begins no later than 2024.</i></p>
<p>Competent authorities to implement national programs for the conservation of eel stocks as a contribution to a Baltic coordinated programme to ensure successful eel migrations from the Baltic Sea drainage basin to national spawning grounds</p>	<p>SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 <u>proposed</u> that the action should be rephrased as follows:</p> <p><i>Competent authorities to implement national programs for the conservation of eel stocks as a contribution to a Baltic coordinated programme to ensure successful eel</i></p>	<p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that this action is covered by the above action and that it does therefore not need to be transferred to the updated BSAP.</p>	

Existing action	Proposals from FISH 10-2019, SOM FISH WS 1-2019 and FISH-M 7-2020	Comments by FISH 11-2020	Proposed formulation for the updated BSAP
<p>Origin: BSAP Implementation: National Status: Partly accomplished (8/9 countries)</p>	<p><i>migrations from the Baltic Sea drainage basin to their spawning grounds</i></p>		
<p>Consider additional measures if necessary, such as reducing fishing mortality in accordance with the ICES advice, removing migration barriers, and re-stocking in eel-safe river systems, e.g. utilising the outcomes of co-operation between ICES, HELCOM and other stakeholders on this issue</p> <p>Origin: BSAP Implementation: National Status: Partly accomplished (3/9 countries)</p>	<p>SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 <u>agreed</u> that the measures detailed in this action would be key elements for consideration by the proposed Eel Task Force and the HELCOM programme to ensure successful eel migrations, and that there would consequently be no need for this action in the updated BSAP.</p>	<p>The Meeting <u>agreed</u> with the conclusion by SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 that the measures detailed in this action would be key elements for consideration by the HELCOM programme to ensure successful eel migrations, and that there would consequently be no need for this action in the updated BSAP. The Meeting also <u>noted</u> that a number of other existing and proposed new actions also cover this action.</p>	
<p>Develop restoration plans (including restoration of spawning sites and migration routes) in suitable rivers to reinstate migratory fish species</p> <p>Origin: BSAP Implementation: National Status: Partly accomplished (7/9 countries)</p>	<p>SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 <u>agreed</u> that it would be useful if the RETROUT Project and the next FISH-M workshop (agreed by FISH 10-2019) should consider this action in more detail.</p> <p>FISH-M 7-2020 <u>noted</u> that the action relates to HELCOM Recommendations 19/2 and 32-33/1</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that the action should address strengthening of native strains as well as reintroductions in potential habitat rivers for migratory fish species.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>discussed</u> the original term "suitable rivers" as it was considered unclear and agreed that rivers with degraded habitats of connectivity could be a more suitable formulation. Following discussion, the Meeting <u>agreed</u> that relevant rivers would be more appropriate, leaving it up to the Contracting Parties to determine which rivers are in need of restoration plans. The Meeting further <u>agreed</u> on the importance of Contracting</p>	<p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> the relevance on the development of draft guidelines on river restoration measures related to Recommendation 32/33-1, as discussed above, in the context of this action.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>agreed</u> with the formulation by FISH-M 7-2020 and also <u>noted</u> that the discussion by FISH-M 7-2020 related to this action (see column to the left) should be utilized in the development of supplementary actions to facilitate implementation and follow up of the action.</p>	<p><i>Develop and implement habitat restoration plans (including spawning sites and migration routes) in relevant rivers by 2025 to strengthen native strains and to reinstate migratory fish species</i></p>

Existing action	Proposals from FISH 10-2019, SOM FISH WS 1-2019 and FISH-M 7-2020	Comments by FISH 11-2020	Proposed formulation for the updated BSAP
	<p>Parties providing information on which the relevant rivers are, when reporting on implementation of the action in the future. The Meeting further <u>noted</u> that priority rivers have already been agreed as part of Recommendation 32-33/1, but that such priority lists are not available for other migratory fish species.</p> <p>FISH-M 7-2020: <i>Develop and implement habitat restoration plans (including spawning sites and migration routes) in relevant rivers by 2025 to strengthen native strains and to reinstate migratory fish species</i></p>		
<p>Development and implementation of fisheries management measures for fisheries inside marine protected areas (BSAP)</p> <p>Origin: BSAP Implementation: Joint Status: Partly accomplished</p>	<p>FISH 10-2019 proposed the following formulation: <i>Development, implementation and documentation of fisheries management measures for fisheries inside marine protected areas.</i></p>	<p>The Meeting <u>discussed</u> the importance of documenting the fisheries management in the HELCOM MPA Database, which is required for all Contracting Parties.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that State & Conservation reviews such reporting by Contracting Parties annually, and that subject to funding being available, the Database is to be updated in order to make it more functional and enable inclusion of data on measures.</p>	<p><i>Development, implementation and information sharing of management measures for fisheries inside marine protected areas.</i></p>

Theme: Management plans for fish stocks

Existing action	Proposals from FISH 10-2019, SOM FISH WS 1-2019 and FISH-M 7-2020	Comments by FISH 11-2020	Proposed formulation for the updated BSAP
<p>Competent authorities to take immediate action for development of long-term management plans for commercially exploited fish stocks so that they are within safe biological limits and reach agreed targets, such as maximum sustainable yield, improve their distribution and size/age range (salmon)</p> <p>Origin: BSAP Implementation: National Status: Partly accomplished (2/9 countries)</p>	<p>SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 <u>noted</u> that upstream mitigation measures, rearing and releasing methodologies etc. are not part of the existing salmon management plans. The Workshop <u>recognized</u> the importance of addressing these matters within the BSAP, but <u>noted</u> that due to lack of specific expertise present, the Workshop was not in a position to discuss the matter in any detail. The Workshop further <u>agreed</u> to recommend that the next FISH-M Workshop (agreed by FISH 10-2019 to take place in 2020) should consider the matter further.</p> <p>FISH-M 7-2020: The Meeting noted that ICES is currently preparing long term salmon management plans.</p> <p>The Meeting noted that set targets in the proposed revised action refer to national as well as regionally agreed targets, e.g. as specified in Recommendation 32-33/1 and relevant EU legislation.</p> <p>FISH-M 7-2020: <i>Competent authorities to establish and implement long-term national management plans for salmon stocks by 2025 so that they reach set targets, including but not limited to smolt production, genetic diversity and distribution throughout the river habitat.</i></p>	<p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that the target date 2025 proposed by FISH-M 7-2020 is not ambitious enough for establishing national management plans and <u>agreed</u> to rephrase the proposal by that Meeting.</p>	<p><i>Competent authorities to establish long-term national management plans for salmon stocks by 2023 and implement them at the latest by 2025 so that they reach set targets, including but not limited to smolt production, genetic diversity and distribution throughout the river habitat.</i></p>
<p>Competent authorities to take immediate action for development of long-term management plans for commercially exploited fish species (sea trout) so that they are within safe biological limits</p>	<p>SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 <u>noted</u> that upstream mitigation measures, rearing and releasing methodologies etc. are not part of the existing sea trout management plans. The Workshop <u>recognized</u> the importance of addressing these matters within the BSAP but noted that due to</p>	<p>The Meeting <u>made</u> minor adjustments to the rephrased text proposed by FISH-M</p>	<p><i>Competent authorities to improve data related to sea trout stocks with the view to establish and implement long-term national management plans for sea trout stocks at latest by 2025 so that they reach set targets, including but not limited to recruitment</i></p>

Existing action	Proposals from FISH 10-2019, SOM FISH WS 1-2019 and FISH-M 7-2020	Comments by FISH 11-2020	Proposed formulation for the updated BSAP
<p>Origin: BSAP Implementation: National Status: Partly accomplished (2/9 countries)</p>	<p>lack of specific expertise present, the Workshop was not in a position to discuss the matter in any detail. The Workshop invited the RETROUT Project to consider this action and provide proposals to FISH 11-2020. The Workshop further <u>agreed</u> to recommend that the next FISH-M Workshop (agreed by FISH 10-2019 to take place in 2020) should consider the matter further.</p> <p>FISH-M 7-2020 <u>noted</u> that set targets in the proposed revised action refer to national as well as regionally agreed targets, e.g. as specified in Recommendation 32-33/1 and relevant EU legislation.</p> <p>FISH-M 7-2020 : <i>Competent authorities to improve data related to sea trout stocks with the view to establish and implement long-term national management plans for sea trout stocks by 2025 so that they reach set targets, including but not limited to recruitment status, genetic diversity and distribution throughout the river habitat.</i></p>		<p><i>status, genetic diversity and distribution throughout the river habitat.</i></p>
<p>Competent authorities to take action to implement existing long-term management plans for eel</p> <p>Origin: BSAP Implementation: National Status: On-going</p>	<p>SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 <u>agreed</u> that this action is already covered by the above joint and national actions related to eel, and that there is no need for it to be included in the updated BSAP.</p>	<p>The Meeting <u>agreed</u> with the conclusion by SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 that this action is already covered by the above joint and national actions related to eel, and that there is no need for it to be included in the updated BSAP.</p>	
<p>Implement existing long-term management plans for eel to improve their distribution size/age-range</p> <p>Origin: BSAP Implementation: National Status: Future target year (2021)</p>	<p>SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 <u>agreed</u> that this action is already covered by the above joint and national actions related to eel, and that there is no need for it to be included in the updated BSAP.</p> <p>The workshop further <u>noted</u> that size/age range is not relevant for eel.</p>	<p>The Meeting <u>agreed</u> with the conclusion by SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 that this action is already covered by the above joint and national actions related to eel, and that there is no need for it to be included in the updated BSAP</p>	

Existing action	Proposals from FISH 10-2019, SOM FISH WS 1-2019 and FISH-M 7-2020	Comments by FISH 11-2020	Proposed formulation for the updated BSAP
<p>Implement long-term management plans for cod to improve their distribution size/age-range</p> <p>Origin: BSAP Implementation: National Status: Future target year (2020)</p>	<p>FISH 10-2019 proposed the following formulation:</p> <p><i>Define necessary completion of multi-annual plans of cod, within the framework of the CFP for Contracting Parties which are also EU Member States, in order to improve cod size/age-range</i></p> <p>SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 agreed that this action is of utmost importance, but also noted that the revised action proposed by FISH 10-2019 is not clear, and <u>suggested</u> the following revision:</p> <p><i>Define necessary complementary measures and completion of multi-annual plans of cod, within the framework of the CFP for Contracting Parties which are also EU Member States, in order to improve cod size/age-range</i></p>	<p>The Meeting <u>discussed</u> the proposal by SOM FISH WS 1-2019 and noted that the “complementary measures” refer to identifying other measures than fishing regulations aiming to improve the state of the Baltic cod.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that Denmark considers management of cod to be under exclusive EU competence.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>rephrased</u> the text in order to increase clarity.</p>	<p><i>Define necessary complementary measures supporting the EU multi-annual plans of cod, sprat and herring (Regulation (EU) 2016/1139) for Contracting Parties which are also EU Member States, in order to improve cod size/age-range.</i></p>
<p>Introduction of additional fisheries management measures to achieve: - that all caught species and by-catch are landed and reported</p> <p>Origin: BSAP Not reported so far: Considered as too general for follow-up in its current form</p>	<p>FISH 10-2019 proposed the following formulation:</p> <p><i>Improvement of compliance with the landing obligation regarding commercial fish species with a TAC. Identify species on which there is a need for better data and encourage fishermen to record by-caught specimen of these species in dedicated programmes.</i></p>	<p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that since the BSAP was adopted in 2007, significant development on this issue has taken place.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that the text proposed by FISH 10-2019 is unclear. The Meeting further <u>noted</u> that compliance with the landing obligation is under the CFP, and as such the first sentence may not be appropriate for inclusion in the updated BSAP. The Meeting, however, <u>stressed</u> the importance of compliance with the landing obligation.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that in enabling the recording of catches, including by-catches, the Roadmap on fisheries data will play an important role.</p>	<p><i>Identify fish species for which there is a need for better data for identified purposes, e.g. GES, and enable fishermen to record catches of relevant species in dedicated programmes.</i></p>

Theme: Monitoring and assessment

Existing action	Proposals from FISH 10-2019 and SOM FISH WS 1-2019	Comments by FISH 11-2020	Proposed formulation for the updated BSAP
<p>Development and implementation of effective monitoring for by-caught birds and mammals</p> <p>Origin: BSAP Implementation: Joint Status: Partly accomplished</p>	<p>FISH 10-2019 proposed the following formulation:</p> <p><i>Development and implementation of effective monitoring for by-caught birds and mammals in line with the assessment method by ICES WGBYC and the identified data-gaps outlined in the HELCOM Roadmap on fisheries data.</i></p>	<p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that the term monitoring refers mainly to data collection and recording and <u>agreed</u> to rephrase the action to increase clarity.</p>	<p><i>Development and implementation of effective data collection for by-caught birds and mammals in line with the needs identified by ICES and the identified data-gaps outlined in the HELCOM Roadmap on fisheries data.</i></p>
<p>Development and implementation of effective reporting systems for by-caught birds and mammals (BSAP)</p> <p>Partly accomplished</p>	<p>SOM-FISH WS 1-2019 <u>recommended</u> that the <i>Draft Roadmap on fisheries data in order to assess incidental bycatches and fisheries impact on benthic biotopes in the Baltic Sea</i>, agreed by FISH 10-2019 and to be considered by HOD 57-2019, should be used as basis for discussion. The Workshop <u>agreed</u> that the rephrased action could make reference to the Roadmap and follow up on its implementation.</p> <p>The Workshop <u>agreed</u>, nevertheless, that implementation of the Roadmap in 2020 should determine any further details of a new, or more concrete action related to such a reporting system for by-caught birds and mammals.</p>	<p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that the reformulated action above covers this action and that data collection in line with ICES needs already includes reporting. The Meeting therefore <u>agreed</u> that a separate action on the matter is not needed in the updated BSAP.</p>	
<p>The further development and testing of the HELCOM generic decision-support tool to map possible negative impacts of specific gear types on threatened or declining species and habitats, and which helps to develop and/or recommend measures to address these</p> <p>Origin: MD 2013 Implementation: Joint Status: Partly accomplished</p>	<p>FISH 10-2019 proposed the following formulation:</p> <p><i>To update and harmonize the 2016 decision-support tool approach with ongoing initiatives e.g. in ICES on a seafloor assessment framework for the Baltic Sea. This tool should also provide options on how to reduce the environmental impact of bottom fishing on seafloor habitats and reducing the impact of fisheries inside marine protected areas in the most cost-effective way.</i></p>	<p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that the decision support tool refers to the BALTFIMPA generic tool developed under the BALTFIMPA Project.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> that this action is closely related to the action on “Development, implementation and information sharing of management measures for fisheries inside marine protected areas.”</p>	<p><i>To update and harmonize the 2016 BALTFIMPA decision-support tool approach with ongoing initiatives e.g. in ICES on a seafloor assessment framework for the Baltic Sea. This tool should also provide options on how to reduce the possible negative impact of fisheries on conservation values in the most cost-effective way, including in marine protected areas</i></p>

<p>Ask for advice from Regional Coordination Groups within the EU Data Collection Framework and ICES on how to improve data collected on such recreational fisheries, with a view to evaluate the impacts of such recreational fisheries on the marine environment.</p> <p>Not reported so far: Considered as too general for follow-up in its current form</p>	<p>FISH 10-2019 proposed the following formulation:</p> <p><i>Develop guidance in cooperation with the Regional Coordination Groups within the EU Data Collection Framework and ICES on how to improve data collected on such recreational fisheries, with a view to evaluate the impacts of such recreational fisheries on the marine environment.</i></p>	<p>The Meeting <u>noted</u> a comment that the formulation by FISH 10-2019 does not provide much added value from a data collection point of view.</p> <p>The Meeting <u>noted</u>, however, the lack of data available from recreational fisheries and the importance of having such data for relevant species. The Meeting also <u>discussed</u> for what purposes such data would be needed, noting that data collection always entails costs.</p>	<p><i>Develop guidance in cooperation with the Regional Coordination Groups within the EU Data Collection Framework and ICES on how to improve data collected on recreational fisheries in a cost-effective way, with a view to evaluate the impacts of recreational fisheries on the marine environment, where there is a need.</i></p>
---	--	---	---

Theme: coastal fish

Existing action	Proposal from FISH-PRO III 2-2020	Comments by FISH 11-2020	Proposed formulation for the updated BSAP
<p>Develop long-term management plans by 2012 for protecting, monitoring and sustainably managing coastal fish species, including the most threatened and/or declining, including anadromous ones, according to BSEP109</p> <p>Partly accomplished 2/9</p>	<p>Proposal by FISH-PRO III 2-2020: To assess the state of coastal fish* and to develop and coordinate monitoring and measures to achieve favourable status of these populations and communities, also including threatened, exploited and declining species.</p> <p><i>*Coastal fish are fish that utilise the coastal habitats in at least one life history stage.</i></p>	<p>The Meeting <u>agreed</u> that any fisheries management measures developed as a result of this action should be under the CFP, where applicable.</p>	<p><i>To assess the state of coastal fish*, to develop and coordinate monitoring and assessment methods, and implement management measures with the view to achieve good environmental status for coastal fish, including threatened and declining coastal fish species.</i></p> <p><i>*Coastal fish are fish that utilise the coastal habitats in at least one life history stage.</i></p>

Annex 3 List of contacts and observers

Name	Organization	E-mail address
Chair		
Marianne Goffeng Raakil	Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation, Sweden	marianne.goffeng-raakil@gov.se
Denmark		
Flemming Kjærulf	Danish Recreational Fishermen	fkjerulf@mail.dk
Janne Palomino Dalby	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	jpda@mfv.dk
Kim Raegaard	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	kimrae@mfv.dk
Lonnie Mikkelsen	Ministry of Environment and Food of Denmark	lomik@mfv.dk
Mikkel Stage	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	miksta@mfv.dk
EU		
Adrea Weber	European Commission	andrea.weber@ec.europa.eu
Antoine Kopp	European Commission	antoine.kopp@ec.europa.eu
Estonia		
Ulvi Päädam	Ministry of Environment of Estonia	ulvi.paadam@envir.ee
Lauri Saks	Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu	lauri.saks@ut.ee
Sander Sandberg	Ministry of Environment of Estonia	sander.sandberg@envir.ee
Roland Svirgsden	Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu	roland.svirgsden@ut.ee
Markus Vetemaa	Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu	markus.vetemaa@ut.ee
Finland		
Penina Blankett	Ministry of the Environment	penina.blankett@ym.fi
Heikki Lehtinen	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	heikki.lehtinen@mmm.fi
Mirva Wideskog	The Center of Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	mirva.wideskog@ely-keskus.fi
Maria Laamanen	Ministry of the Environment	maria.laamanen@ym.fi
Germany		
Dieter Boedeker	German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)	dieter.boedeker@bfn.de
Marina Carstens	Ministry of Agriculture, Environment and Consumer Protection Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	m.carstens@lm.mv-regierung.de
Hans-Peter Damian	Federal Environment Agency	hans-peter.damian@uba.de
Lothar Fiedler	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety	lothar.fiedler@bmub.bund.de
Ulfert Focken	Thünen-Institute of Fisheries Ecology	ulfert.focken@thuenen.de
Sven Koschinski	on behalf of German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)	sk@meereszoologie.de
Eva Papaioannou	Geomar Helmholtz Center for Ocean research	epapaioannou@geomar.de
Christian Pusch	German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)	christian.pusch@bfn.de
Miriam Muller	German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)	Miriam.mueller@bfn.de

Latvia		
Janis Birzaks	Institute of Food, Safety, Animal Health and Environment "BIOR"	janis.birzaks@bior.lv (e-mails not received by the address)
Laura Briekmane	Institute of Food, Safety, Animal Health and Environment "BIOR"	laura.briekmane@bior.gov.lv
Lithuania		
Adrija Gasiliauskienė	Ministry of Agriculture	adrijag@zum.lt
Antanas Kontautas	University of Klaipeda	antanas.kontautas@ku.lt
Loreta Bražinskaitė	Ministry of Agriculture	loreta.brazinskaite@zum.lt
Jūranda Savukynienė	Ministry of Agriculture	juranda.savukyniene@zum.lt
Poland		
Katarzyna Kaminska Vice-Chair of Fish	Ministry of Maritime and Inland Navigation	k.kaminska@mgm.gov.pl
Andrzej Kapusta	Inland Fisheries Institute in Olsztyn	kasta@infish.com.pl
Paweł Łazarski	Ministry of Maritime and Inland Navigation	pawel.lazarski@mgm.gov.pl
Wojciech Pelczarski	National Marine Fisheries Research Institute	wpelczar@mir.gdynia.pl
Iwona Psuty	National Marine Fisheries Research Institute	iwona.psuty@mir.gdynia.pl
Igor Wawrzyniak	Ministry of Maritime and Inland Navigation	igor.wawrzyniak@mgm.gov.pl
Russia		
Natalia Bobyleva	State Company "Mineral"	bobyleva@helcom.ru
Sergey Shibaev	Kaliningrad State Technical Univeristy	shibaev@klgtu.ru
Svetlana Tochanskaya	Saint-Petersburg State Company "Mineral"	svetlana@helcom.ru
Sweden		
Jacob Hagberg	Ministry of the Environment and Energy	jacob.hagberg@regeringskansliet.se
Fredrik Arrhenius	Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management	fredrik.arrhenius@havochvatten.se
Observers		
Sally Clink	Baltic Sea Advisory Council (BSAC)	sc@bsac.dk
Ewa Milewska	Baltic Sea Advisory Council (BSAC)	em@bsac.dk
Gesine Lange	BirdLife International	gesine.lange@nabu.de
Ida Carlen	Coalition Clean Baltic (CCB)	ida.carlen@ccb.se
Lennart Gladh	Coalition Clean Baltic (CCB)	lennart.gladh@tele2.se
Mikhail Durkin	Coalition Clean Baltic (CCB)	mikhail.durkin@ccb.se
Nils Höglund	Coalition Clean Baltic (CCB)	Nils.Hoglund@ccb.se
Glenn Douglas	European Anglers Alliance (EAA)	glenn.douglas@sportfiskarna.se
Torben Wallach	Federation of European Aquaculture Producers (FEAP)	torben@danskakvakultur.dk
Irja Skytén-Suominen	Federation of European Aquaculture Producers (FEAP)	irja.skyten-suominen@kalankasvatus.fi
Anna Pyc	Federation of European Aquaculture Producers (FEAP)/Polish Trout Breeders Association	anna@pstraaqrustelnia.pl

Lisbeth Jess Plesner	Federation of European Aquaculture Producers (FEAP)	lisbeth@danskakvakultur.dk
Courtney Hough	Federation of European Aquaculture Producers (FEAP)	courtney@feap.info
Eugene Nixon	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)	ernixon1@gmail.com
Lotte Worsøe Clausen	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)	lotte.worsoe.clausen@ices.dk
Mark Dickey-Collas	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)	mark.dickey-collas@ices.dk
Wojciech Wawrzynski (substitute for Lotte)	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)	Wojciech@ices.dk
Sebastian Valanko	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)	Sebastian.valanko@ices.dk
Marjukka Porvari	John Nurminen Foundation	marjukka.porvari@jnfoundation.fi
Miina Mäki	John Nurminen Foundation	miina.maki@jnfoundation.fi
Hans Jacob Jensen	Low Impact Fishers of Europe (LIFE)	argonautjacob@gmail.com
Marcin Rucinski	Low Impact Fishers of Europe (LIFE)	bans@lifeplatform.eu
Linnea Engström	Marine Stewardship Council	Linne.engstrom@msc.org
Dennis Hamro-Drotz	Nordic Environment Finance Corporation (NEFCO)	dennis.hamro-drotz@nefco.fi
Andrzej Białas	OCEANA	abialas@oceana.org
Liene Stikane	VASAB Secretariat	liene.stikane@vasab.org
Matti Ovaska	WWF Finland	matti.ovaska@wwf.fi