



---

<b>Document title</b>	Guidance for technical review of new measures for the updated Baltic Sea Action Plan
<b>Code</b>	4-1
<b>Category</b>	INF
<b>Agenda Item</b>	4 – Implementation and update of the HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan
<b>Submission date</b>	3.4.2020
<b>Submitted by</b>	Secretariat
<b>Reference</b>	

---

### Background

To support the selection of new measures and actions for the updated Baltic Sea Action Plan, an invitation to submit synopses on potential new HELCOM actions was put forward in spring 2019 with an indicative closing date by end of 2019. HELCOM 40-2019 agreed that such synopses could be submitted by the Contracting Parties, HELCOM subsidiary bodies, international projects and HELCOM Observers

The preparation of synopses has followed a common template with the aim to summarize existing information in a format that can be used as background information for Working Group meetings and BSAP UP workshops. The template also requires data and information on the effect of proposed measures so that their contribution to reaching good status can be estimated as part of the analysis of sufficiency of measures. References to scientific articles, project deliverables and/or reports has also been requested to justify the proposals.

According to the workplan for the BSAP update Working Groups are to review the synopses in the preparation for the BSAP workshops that will be held in August/September. There are no submitted synopses directly relevant for the GEAR Group however this document presents the guidance provided to the Working Groups to support their technical review of the submitted synopses related to their respective mandates, for information. It should be noted that some of the synopses are overlapping with the mandate of other HELCOM Groups. Where this is the case both Groups will consider these synopses and the BSAP UP workshop gives an opportunity to discuss them jointly.

### Action requested

The Meeting is invited to take note of the guidance provided for the technical review of the synopses.

## Guidance for WG review of synopses on new HELCOM actions

### Background

HELCOM has invited submissions of proposals on new actions for the updated BSAP with closing date at the end of 2019. As a response, HELCOM subsidiary bodies, HELCOM observers, and HELCOM and BONUS projects have submitted synopses of about 80 potential new actions. According to the BSAP work plan, HELCOM Working Groups will carry out a first review of the synopses at their regular meetings in spring 2020. Such review round aims to provide a preliminary (qualitative) evaluation focusing on the technical aspects and substance of the proposals. 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. At the BSAP UP workshops in May 2020, further deliberation and evaluation of the proposals will continue based on a set of criteria agreed by the GEAR Group (see document 3-4), also taking into account the results of the ongoing analysis of sufficiency of measures. The outcome of the Working Group Meeting will be used as a basis for the BSAP UP workshops.

The Working Groups are asked to consider the proposals in their field of expertise and to give feedback on the following aspects/questions:

- 1) to suggest whether a submitted proposal is best categorized as a measure, research need, or monitoring/data need. All types of proposals will be considered in the BSAP update process but only those that can contribute directly to the reduction of pressures or improvement of the state of the environment will be considered when analysing of sufficiency of measures in the updated BSAP. Proposals related to research needs will be considered for the HELCOM Science Agenda that is under development.
- 2) to consider whether a proposal is a new measure or is already entirely/partly covered by an existing HELCOM action. In the latter case, identify if the proposal should be, or already is, taken into account in the review and revision of existing HELCOM actions.
- 3) to evaluate if the proposal is sufficiently substantiated, i.e. if appropriate supporting references and evidence of effect have been provided. This step could make use of a scale low-medium-high.
- 4) if the proposed action concerns a technical measure, evaluate if it is technically feasible to implement the proposed measure, e.g. is the proposed technique sufficiently developed and tested to be considered for practical implementation. This step could make use of a scale low-medium-high.
- 5) to identify potential gaps in the proposed new action; it could be that a measure/action has to be implemented first (before the proposed action) or some steps are missing in the proposal.
- 6) consider gaps and overlaps for the set of synopses: are there any central issues for HELCOM work that are not represented in the set of existing actions or synopses (activities, pressures, state components highlighted in HELCOM strategies, Ministerial Declarations)? If yes, identify how the gap could be resolved, e.g. for a lead country to prepare additional synopses. Are there overlaps? If overlaps exist, suggest merging of proposals.

**Note that no proposals will be excluded at this stage;** the aim is to identify how the proposal is placed in the framework of existing HELCOM actions and make a qualitative evaluation of the technical soundness of the synopses.

### Response template

Table 1 outlines the type of questions the Working Groups are invited to answer for each of the proposed measures to be considered under their mandate.

The first Working Group to start the technical review was FISH 11-2020, and a concrete example of the table can be found [here](#).

Proposed measure: XX		
Question	Response option	Comments/suggestions
1. Is the submitted proposal best categorized as a measure, research need, or monitoring/data need	Measure / research need / monitoring or data need	...
2. Is it a new measure or entirely/partly covered by an existing HELCOM action	New measure / Partly covered by existing action/Covered by existing action	[Clarify the potential overlap]
3. Is the proposal sufficiently substantiated	Low-medium-high	...
4. Is it technically feasible to implement the proposed measure	Low-medium-high (or Not applicable)	...
5 Potential gaps in the proposed new action	Yes/No	[Clarify the potential gap. The submitters could be asked to complement the synopsis]

Consideration of the set synopses		
6a. Potential gap in the set of proposed new actions	Yes/No	[Clarify the potential gap and propose how it could be resolved]
6b. Potential overlap between proposed new actions	Yes/No	[Clarify the potential overlap]