



Document title	Synopses on proposed new actions
Code	2-1-Rev.3
Category	CMNT
Agenda Item	2 – Results of the prior analyses
Submission date	24.8.2020
Submitted by	Secretariat
Reference	

The changed in Rev.1 were marked in red color, changes to Rev.2 in blue color and changes to Rev.3 in purple color.

Background

The aim of the workshop is to evaluate proposed new actions for the updated Baltic Sea Action Plan. The proposed new actions (synopses) to be evaluated in the workshop are listed in the attached Excel table (2-1-Att.1-Rev.1). All the synopses can be found in the dedicated [workspace](#) where you may filter the synopses according to workshop and breakout group. The potential new actions for the updated HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan are based on the synopses submitted by Contracting Parties, HELCOM subsidiary bodies, international projects and HELCOM Observers in 2019-2020.

The HELCOM Working Groups carried out a technical review of the synopses at their meetings in spring 2020. The aim of the review was to provide a preliminary evaluation focusing on the technical aspects and substance of the proposals. The review was, in this first step, to be carried out from a scientific point of view and focus on technical feasibility of the measures, not legal, political or other aspects of feasibility. The guidance for conducting the technical review is attached to this document for background information.

The results of the technical review are included in the attached Excel table (2-1-Att.1-Rev.3). In case the synopsis was reviewed by several Working Groups and their views differed, all views are included. Most of the groups first gathered national views via correspondence before conducting the review in the meeting. These national views are also included. It should be noted, however, that the national views might have changed at the meeting due to the clarifications on the task and/or the content of the synopsis given. If the group made a short summary of the views in the meeting, this summary has been included instead of the national views.

The Working Groups could also point out any gaps in the synopses and ask for further information from the submitters. The synopses that have been updated after the technical review based on the request by Working Groups will be marked with “_updated” in in the dedicated [workspace](#). **If the changes have not been marked in the updated version, the old version is still available in the workspace for comparison. Please see the Excel file “Overview of synopses_workspace” in the workspace for more information.**

The following synopses have been updated in the workspace and in the attachment 2-1-Att.1-Rev.3:

Breakout group 1) Spatial conservation

- **Establish an effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected system of highly protected marine protected areas (MPAs), covering a minimum of 30 % of the Baltic Sea area by 2030. All MPAs shall include fully closed zones (complying with IUCN 1a category1) or be fully closed in their entirety, depending on the conservation objectives and needs of the specific site (Updated in the end of June)**
- **Areas around windfarms as potential refugia (Updated in the end of June)**

Breakout group 2) Conservation/restoration of species

- Identify and limit the negative effects on migratory birds from wind and wave energy production at sea (*Updated in the end of June*)
- Management plan for haploids species and biotope (*Updated in the end of June*)
- Specific measures to address and protect all biogenic structures (*Updated in the end of June*)

Breakout group 3) Restoration of habitats

- Elimination of invasive plant Elodea (*Updated in the end of June*)
- Harvesting of reed and excessive vegetation (*Updated in the end of June*)
- Measures related to restoration of coastal habitats (*Updated in the end of June*)

Breakout group 4) Mapping and monitoring

- Establishing a harmonized eDNA methodology and start a baseline monitoring system throughout the Baltic Sea (*Updated on 17 August*)

Breakout group 5) Management of human activities

- Joint action to form a common understanding of ecosystem based management by 2023 (*Updated on 17 August*)
- MSP to signal areas of high nature value (*New synopsis submitted on 17 August*)
- MSP should steer sea-based activities away from areas where they can cause serious damage or disturbance (*New synopsis submitted on 17 August*)

Breakout group 6) Fisheries

- Mandatory use of Acoustic Deterrent Devices or other effective mitigation measures to minimize bycatch of the Baltic Sea harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) (*Updated on 10 August*)
- Development of alternative fishing gear to replace gillnets (*Updated on 10 August*)
- Concrete steps to make progress on cooperation between HELCOM and fisheries management (e.g. Baltfish) to improve implementation of BSAP (*Updated on 17 August*)
- Phase out all recreational fishing on eel by 2022 (*Updated on 17 August*)

The synopsis titled “Measures related to restoration of coastal habitats” includes several proposals that have been individually reviewed as part of the technical review. Please note that also proposals “10.Rehabilitation of hypoxic areas by oxygen pumping” and “11.Reducing internal phosphorus loads by metal bounding” that are included in the synopsis will be discussed in the breakout group 3) Restoration of habitats. These two proposals have now been included in the Excel table (2-1-Att.1-Rev.3).

The Excel table (2-1-Att.1-Rev.3) also includes information on whether the action targets activities, pressures or environmental state, based on the description in the synopsis. The classification follows the [DPSIR concept](#) (drivers-pressures-state-impacts-responses). The classification has been done by the Secretariat and only for actions that have been categorized in the technical review as a “measure”.

Action requested

The workshop is invited to take note of the technical review of the synopses conducted by the HELCOM Working Groups and to use the results in the evaluation of synopses.

Background information on the technical review

The Working Groups were 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, step towards measure, research need, knowledge sharing, or monitoring/data/assessment 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.

No proposals were to be excluded at this stage unless they were overlapping; the aim was 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:

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 /step towards measure/ research need / monitoring, assessment 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]