



Document title	Synopses on proposed new actions
Code	2-1-Rev.1
Category	CMNT
Agenda Item	2 – Results of the prior analyses
Submission date	12.8.2020
Submitted by	Secretariat
Reference	

The changes in Rev.1 version have been marked in red 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.2). 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.2). 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.2:

Session on hazardous substances

- **Development of Best Environmental Practice (BEP) and control of threats posed by munitions, wrecks and other hazardous submerged objects in the Baltic Sea, including the preparation for the remediation of areas contaminated with munitions (*merges two previous proposals, submitted on 12 August*)**
- **Decreasing the emissions of hazardous substances from small scale emitters in urban areas (municipal entities, businesses and private households) by chemical-smart purchasing strategies, substitution and awareness raising campaigns (*new proposal, submitted on 12 August*)**

Session on litter

- **Ban (phasing-out) on non-degradable shot wads and information campaigns targeted at hunters (updated on 10 August)**

The Excel table (2-1-Att.1-Rev.2) 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”.

Baltic Sea Regional Nutrient Recycling Strategy

HELCOM Ministerial Meeting 2018 committed to elaborating by 2020 a Baltic Sea Regional Nutrient Recycling Strategy that aims for reduced nutrient inputs to and eutrophication of the Baltic Sea. The Ministerial Meeting further decided to develop, as a follow-up to the Strategy, possible nutrient recycling measures to be included in the updated Baltic Sea Action Plan. The elaboration of the strategy is ongoing parallel with the update of the BSAP. HOD 56-2019 endorsed the vision and objectives for the Baltic Sea Regional Nutrient Recycling Strategy and as a next step to find measures to meet the objectives of the strategy, HELCOM Workshop on nutrient recycling measures was organized on 5-6 February 2020 in Helsinki, Finland. The participants of the workshop came up with a long list of potential measures under each objective and sub-objective of the strategy. One of the objectives, Objective 3. “Safe nutrient recycling”, is related to hazardous substances.

The HELCOM Agri group that is leading the work, in cooperation with Pressure Working Group, agreed that the aim is to find under each of the six objectives of the strategy a measure that could be included in the updated BSAP. There could be still other measures that are only included in the strategy. Based on the results of an expert prioritization that took place via correspondence, the drafting group on the nutrient recycling strategy selected 1-3 alternatives for each objective as priority measure that could be included in the updated BSAP, highlighting the need to further rephrasing and merging of the proposals in the further drafting. The proposals are presented in the attached document. For the objective “Safe nutrient recycling” there is only one proposal.

The drafting group noted that some measures proposed for the strategy were also submitted as synopses, although the exact formulation might slightly differ.

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;
- take into account the proposal by the nutrient recycling strategy drafting group on measures related to nutrient recycling when considering the 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]

Possible nutrient recycling measures to be included in BSAP

Based on the expert prioritization, the nutrient recycling strategy drafting group proposed the following measures for inclusion in the updated BSAP for each objective. The drafting group acknowledged that proposals below are given in the original wording of the HELCOM Workshop on nutrient recycling measures in February and pointed out that they will be rephrased or merged later in the process. For some objectives, the drafting group proposed three alternatives that could be the prioritised measure for inclusion in the BSAP. The final selection will be made at later stages, taking into account outcomes of the BSAP UP workshop as well as merging and rephrasing of the proposals.

- Alternative proposals for Objective 1. Baltic Sea as a model area for nutrient recycling:
 - Enhance fertilization planning and optimization according to crop need instead of amount of nutrients
 - Support the use of recycled nutrients in agriculture including manure storages and transport of manure
 - Support taking best available technologies in use for efficient nutrient recycling, e.g. alternative sewage treatment to facilitate higher P availability
- Alternative proposals for Objective 2. Reducing environmental impacts
 - Promote organic farming and organic fertilizers
 - Promote new technologies for removal and recovery of nutrients from WWTPs
 - Advice and assist farmers in sustainable farming (e.g. soil tests, data, information etc.)
- Proposal for Objective 3. Safe nutrient recycling
 - Avoid unnecessary use of antibiotics and other pharmaceuticals
- Alternative proposals for Objective 4. Knowledge exchange and awareness raising
 - Include education on nutrient recycling in agricultural universities and colleges
 - The drafting group noted that universities have freedom in deciding on their education and also that other levels of education could be considered in the rephrasing.
 - Open a best practice information and collaboration platform
- Proposal for Objective 5. Creating business opportunities
 - Create economical tools and incentives for making organic fertilizers to be more attractive than mineral fertilizers
 - The drafting group noted that also other tools than economic ones could be considered.
- Alternative proposals for Objective 6. Improving policy coherence
 - Create a strategy for a holistic view on sustainable food system including nutrient recycling across sectors
 - HELCOM should set limits for the use of mineral fertilizers and not only manure
 - The drafting group noted the importance of the issue but highlighted the need for rephrasing the proposal.
 - Enhance cooperation between sectors (agriculture, WWT, businesses) so that they speak “the same language”