



Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission

Fifth Meeting of the Working Group on Reduction of Pressures from the Baltic Sea Catchment Area

PRESSURE 5-2016

Warsaw, Poland, 25-27 October 2016

Document title	Information on the outcomes of recent HELCOM meetings
Code	2-1
Category	INF
Agenda Item	2 - Matters arising from other HELCOM work
Submission date	18.10.2016
Submitted by	Secretariat
Reference	

Background

This document contains extracts from the HELCOM HOD (HOD 50-2016) and STATE&CONSERVATION 4-2016. The document also contains selected topics from workshops and project meetings relevant to the Pressure group and not addressed in the outcomes of the other meetings:

- HELCOM BalticBOOST Theme 3 Workshop (BalticBOOST Theme 3 WS 1-2016), held in Copenhagen, Denmark, 2-3 June 2016;
- 2nd HELCOM TAPAS Workshop to support the development of the Baltic Sea Pressure and Impact index (TAPAS Pressure Index WS 2-2016), held in Helsinki, Finland, 6-7 September 2016;
- 2nd BalticBOOST Workshop on HOLAS II hazardous substance assessment (BalticBOOST HZ WS 2-2016), held in Copenhagen, Denmark, 13-14 September 2016;
- 2nd HELCOM TAPAS Workshop to develop the economic and social analyses within HOLAS II (TAPAS ESA WS 2-2016), held in Tallinn, Estonia, 8-9 September 2016;
- Meeting of the Heads of Delegation (HOD 50A-2016), held in Helsinki, Finland, 23 September 2016;
- 4th Meeting of the HELCOM expert network on hazardous substances (EN-HZ 4-2016), held as an on-line meeting, 23 September 2016;
- 6th Meeting of the Project for the development of the second holistic assessment of the Baltic Sea (HOLAS II 6-2016), held in Helsinki, Finland, 4-6 October 2016;

The results achieved by the RedCore DG, PLC-6 project and expert group on dredging activities in the Baltic Sea are presented in the documents submitted to the related items of the meeting agenda. The documents were elaborated at the following meetings:

- 12th meeting of the Reduction Scheme Core Drafting Group (RedCore DG 12-2016) held in Gothenburg, Sweden, 22 April 2016;
- 13th meeting of the Reduction Scheme Core Drafting Group (RedCore DG 13-2016), held in Helsinki, Finland, 5 September 2016;
- 11th meeting of the Sixth Baltic Sea Pollution Load Compilation (PLC-6 11-2016), held in Silkeborg, Denmark, 17-19 May 2016;
- 12th Meeting the Sixth Baltic Sea Pollution Load Compilation Project (PLC 6 12-2016), held in Helsinki, Finland, 14-16 September 2016;
- 2 online meetings of the expert group on dredging activities in the Baltic Sea.

The complete outcomes are available in the [HELCOM Meeting Portal](#).

Action requested

The Meeting is invited to take note and make use of the presented information as appropriate.

Information on the outcomes of recent HELCOM meetings

HOD 50-2016

4.63 The Meeting appreciated the work done and the progress achieved by the Pressure Group in the last 2 years and thanked the Chair for efficient work.

Priorities for the EU chairmanship.

2.2 The Meeting took note of and welcomed the priorities of the EU Chairmanship of HELCOM starting 1 July 2016 (document 2-1) and took note of the nomination of Ms. Marianne Wenning, Director of ENV C Quality of Life, Water and Air, and Mr. Matjaž Malgaj, Head of Unit ENV C.2 Marine Environment and Water Industry as Chair and Vice-Chair of HELCOM for the period of 1.7.2016 – 30.6.2018

The priorities of the EU Chairmanship are published on [the HELCOM WEB page](#).

Next Ministerial meeting

3.3 The Meeting considered potential topics for the next Ministerial Meeting and was of the opinion that the results of HOLAS II will be a major outcome of HELCOM and should provide valuable discussion points for the Ministers, including evaluating the efficiency of measures.

3.4 The Meeting concluded that the year 2018 for the next Ministerial Meeting should be the latest timing and took note that some Contracting Parties would prefer the second half of 2018 due to some other commitments and as updated HOLAS II would be then ready. The Meeting decided to continue the discussion at HOD 51-2016 on the exact timing and to further elaborate on what could be possible concrete outcomes of the Ministerial Meeting.

Marine litter

4.65 The Meeting took note of the information on current activities within OSPAR to follow up implementation of the RAP ML and prioritization of measures and timelines in HELCOM if needed. The Meeting emphasized the need to coordinate the activities between HELCOM and OSPAR.

Sewage sludge.

4.68 The Meeting took note that the EU will be looking on the issue of modern technology for sewage sludge handling as a part of the commitment undertaken in circular economy package (concerning Fertilizer Regulation).

4.78 The Meeting considered the draft HELCOM Recommendation on Sewage Sludge Handling (document 4-5) and took note of study reservations by Germany and Poland as well as by Sweden that further work is needed to ensure regional added value of the Recommendation. The Meeting welcomed that Germany will provide a suggestion for improving the text of the document within three weeks after HOD 50-2016. The Meeting invited Poland to clarify her position as soon as possible.

4.79 The Meeting requested PRESSURE 5-2016 to consider the further elaborated draft of the Recommendation.

Hazardous substances

Krasnyi Bor

4.72 The Meeting took note of the information presented by Russia on the study visit to the toxic waste landfill Krasnyi Bor and tentative action plan (document 4-28).

4.73 The Meeting thanked Russia including the administration of St. Petersburg for the visit and open discussion on the site and related environmental problems and highlighted the importance of further developing plans to prevent environmental risks.

- 4.74 The Meeting took note that Finland is willing to expend co-operation with Russia in the field of toxic waste management and has suggested topics for this co-operation.
- 4.75 The Meeting took note that Russia will provide the information on current activities on the landfill, progress achieved and future planning including a road map towards remediation of the landfill and removal of the HELCOM hot spot for the next meeting of PRESSURE.
- 4.76 The Meeting considered the observations and preliminary conclusions after the study visit to Krasnyi Bor toxic wastes dumpsite presented by CCB (document 4-26). The Meeting pointed out the high importance of comprehensive and regularly updated information on the state of the environment around the landfill as well as on progress and solutions implemented or planned for implementation to prevent environmental risks posed by the site.
- 4.77 The Meeting requested the Pressure Group to follow up progress at the Krasnyi Bor landfill as well as to consider the risks posed by similar sites around the Baltic Sea.

Pharmaceuticals

- 4.89 The Meeting approved in principle the draft Status report on pharmaceuticals (document 4-17) and its publishing in the Baltic Sea Environment Proceedings (BSEP).
- 4.90 The Meeting took note of the comment by CCB that the Status report has to be followed by elaboration of measures addressing reduction of input of pharmaceuticals into the environment.

Input of nutrients.

- 4.64 The Meeting requested to include into the agenda of PRESSURE 5-2016 the issues related to the internal load.
- 4.69 The Meeting decided to postpone decision on the timeframe for the PLC-8 assessment as 2021 for monitoring and the assessment in 2023.
- 4.81 As mandated by HELCOM 37-2016, the Meeting adopted the Recommendation on waterborne pollution input assessment as HELCOM Recommendation 37-38/1 and the Recommendation on monitoring of airborne pollution input as HELCOM Recommendation 37-38/2 (document 4-11, Annex 5 and 6 respectively).
- 4.82 The Meeting adopted the draft procedures for releasing the reported PLC water data and accepting the filled-in and consolidated dataset as part of the steps to elaborate PLC products (document 4-6, Annex 7).
- 4.83 The Meeting took note of the current status of the PLC annual and periodic data reporting (document 4-19) and noted with regret the delayed time schedule for delivering PLC-6 and updated MAI/CART assessments.
- 4.70 The Meeting agreed that the workshop dedicated to MAI/CART assessment methodologies will be organized in February 2017 when the recent assessment results are as ready as possible.
- 4.87 The Meeting agreed on the Concept Note for the Seventh Baltic Sea Pollution Load Compilation (PLC-7) project, including its objectives, tasks and final products (document 4-14) and requested the Pressure WG to develop the PLC-7 project proposal for consideration by HOD 51-2016.

HOD 50A-2016

- 2.3 The Meeting decided to organize a high-level segment during the next meeting of the Helsinki Commission (HELCOM 38-2017), to be held on 28 February 2017.

2.4 The Meeting discussed a variety of possible topics to be addressed by the high-level segment. Such could be the recent positive developments in the maritime sector; eutrophication, climate change impact; internal load; hazardous substances and pharmaceuticals; agriculture and marine litter which is also in the agenda of many other international forums.

STATE&CONSERVATION 4-2016

Joint Session (J)

Agenda Item 3J Follow-up of HELCOM agreements and activities

3J.5 The Meeting noted that Estonia has started the review of Recommendation 24/10 'Implementation of Integrated Marine and Coastal Management of Human activities in the Baltic Sea Area', noted the proposed amendments and agreed to discuss the review of Recommendation 24/10 at STATE & CONSERVATION 5-2016.

3J.9 The Meeting took note of the review of Recommendation 29/2 'Marine litter within the Baltic Sea region' (document 3J-1), as presented by the Secretariat and agreed that Recommendation 29/2 will be superseded by Recommendation 35/1 once the HELCOM monitoring guidelines for marine litter on beaches have been developed and included in the HELCOM Monitoring Manual.

Agenda Item 4J HELCOM indicators and assessments

4J.1 The Meeting took note of the status of development of HELCOM core indicators (document 4J-15), presented by the Secretariat.

4J.2 The Meeting welcomed that Sweden is willing to support the development of the indicators 'Cumulative impact on benthic biotopes', 'Biomass ratio of opportunistic and perennial macroalgae' as well as 'Harbor porpoise distribution and abundance'.

4J.3 The Meeting welcomed that Germany will look into the possibility to take the Lead on the indicator 'Diatoms/dinoflagellates index' to be clarified at HOLAS II 5-2016.

4J.4 The Meeting considered the revised HELCOM core indicator on '**Populations trends and abundance of seals**' (document 4J-11), presented by Sweden, noting that the changes of the core indicator report are of editorial character.

4J.5 The Meeting took note that Germany could in principle agree to content of the document but that due to ongoing national consultations the German study reservation on the indicator cannot be lifted at this time.

4J.6 The Meeting furthermore noted the information from Germany that for seal indicators the national position is to use the HD assessment as far as possible also for the MSFD reporting purposes and that a way on how to combine the two approaches is also considered.

4J.7 The Meeting noted the view by Sweden that applying HD indicators in a regional status assessment of marine mammals is considered to be difficult as there is no alignment of targets and methods for the HD indicators between countries in the Baltic Sea region. Furthermore, Sweden recalled that HD-MSFD harmonization for assessment of abundance and distribution of seals is ongoing in the BalticBOOST project.

4J.8 The Meeting recalled that Denmark has requested the indicator to be adjusted to Danish waters and that a Danish expert has commented the draft report. Denmark is not in a position to lift the study reservation at this time. Denmark will clarify the study reservation when the revisions to the indicator are final.

- 4J.9 The Meeting took note of the request from Finland to reflect in the report that the method of counting of ringed seals is different depending on ice conditions and noted that 2015 data on ringed seal abundance is available and that the evaluation will be updated at the next meeting of the Seal Expert Group (SEAL 10-2016).
- 4J.10 The Meeting underlined the importance to clarify remaining substantial national issues well in advance of SEAL 10-2016 and STATE & CONSERVATION 5-2016, e.g. by convening online meetings as needed.
- 4J.11 The Meeting considered the revised GES proposal for HELCOM core indicator '**Distribution of Baltic seals**' (document 4J-10), presented by Sweden.
- 4J.12 The Meeting noted the proposal from the Seal EG to base the GES definition for distribution of ringed seal on current ice conditions, i.e. only available haul out sites should be taken into account in the assessment. The Meeting noted that with the proposed amendments Finland has lifted the study reservation on GES for distribution of ringed seals.
- 4J.13 The Meeting noted that Germany for the same reasons as argued for the abundance indicator is not in a position to lift the study reservation. Comments and proposed changes to the document have been compiled by German experts and submitted to the Lead Country during the Meeting.
- 4J.14 The Meeting noted that Denmark is not in a position to lift the study reservation on the indicator, however Denmark will clarify the study reservation when the revisions to the indicator are final. A Danish expert has commented the draft report.
- 4J.15 The Meeting considered the revised proposal on HELCOM core indicators '**Nutritional status of marine mammals**' and '**Reproductive status of marine mammals**' (document 4J-9), presented by Sweden.
- 4J.16 The Meeting noted the clarification by Sweden and the proposal to first seek to agree on using the indicators as core indicators in the whole Baltic Sea area, while the proposal presented in the document, i.e. to only use the indicators in northern, central and eastern Baltic Sea, should only be considered if such agreement cannot be reached.
- 4J.17 The Meeting noted the view by Finland that the indicators are good indicators for the population status of seals in the whole Baltic area and the wish to seek for a compromise solution for the indicators so that they can be used in HOLAS II.
- 4J.18 The Meeting took note that Germany is not in a position to lift the study reservation on the core indicator. German experts have reviewed the documents and welcome that they have improved, however, the general concerns on the indicators remain i.e. whether they can be considered as good indicators of the health status of Baltic seals.
- 4J.19 The Meeting recalled the request to adjust the indicator to Danish waters and that Denmark is not in a position to lift the study reservation. Denmark also considers it challenging to get enough data from healthy seal populations for the indicator since only data from by-caught and stranded animals will be used in Denmark.
- 4J.20 The Meeting encouraged Lead country Sweden and the Seal Expert Group health team to find a solution and noted that Germany, as Lead country for the Seal expert group health team, is prepared to continue the discussion with a view to arrive at an agreement.
- 4J.21 The Meeting considered the progress update on the indicator '**Zooplankton mean size and total stock**' (document 4J-4), presented by the Secretariat.
- 4J.22 The Meeting recalled that the method for calculating GES was agreed at HOD 48-2015 while at that time the calculations were not made for all sub-basins. At the annual meeting of ZEN-ZIIM in 2015 GES values were calculated for some subbasins and they will be finalized by the next meeting of the ZEN-ZIIM project, planned for September/October 2016. The project has identified problems with access to data in the Southwestern areas of the Baltic Sea and not all countries have representatives in the project. The Meeting stressed the importance of making data available to the ZEN ZIIM project and national representation at the next meeting.

4J.23 The Meeting took note that Poland is working on calculations of GES and indicator evaluations according to the agreed procedure and that the results will be presented to the ICES/PICES Zooplankton Production Symposium, on 9-13 May 2016, Bergen, Norway, based on data from Gotland, Bornholm and Gdansk basins. The Meeting noted the view of Poland that the procedure needs to be updated for coastal waters.

4J.24 The Meeting took note of two ongoing national research projects in Germany in which zooplankton data is collected and the indicators are tested and that Germany is willing to share the data with the indicator Lead and ZEN-ZIIM project.

4J.25 The Meeting took note of the proposal by Sweden to discuss more closely with Finland about the calculations of the indicator in the Northern Baltic Proper in order to provide guidance to ZEN ZIIM regarding the significant difference between values for the coastal and offshore areas in this assessment unit.

4J.26 The Meeting noted that Denmark will look into the possibility to participate in the 2016 ZEN-ZIIM meeting and provide data for the GES boundary calculation.

4J.27 The Meeting considered the GES boundary proposal on hazardous substances (document 4J-6, **(Presentation 3)**), as proposed by the Expert network for hazardous substances and presented by the Secretariat.

4J.28 The Meeting expressed a general concern regarding the use of food safety thresholds values for assessment under Descriptor 8 and noted the proposal by Germany and Latvia that such threshold values should only be used for MSFD Descriptor 9.

4J.29 The Meeting took note that Sweden shares the concern but also finds that the proposals in document 4J-6 follow the guidance provided in the MSFD context and the Swedish view that Descriptor 8, which includes pollution effects, can also be considered to address risks to human health.

4J.30 The meeting took note of the view by Germany that the EQS values have currently not been suitably adjusted for use in the marine offshore areas, and that further work on developing the targets should ensure input from experts in the marine environment to the relevant EU working groups.

4J.31 The Meeting agreed to include a reflection in the HOLAS II report regarding the use of food safety values in environmental assessment, as well as on the use of thresholds generally considered to be set at too low a level, e.g. PBDE in biota for human health protection.

4J.32 Taking note of a general study reservation on the proposed GES-boundaries by Germany, the Meeting endorsed the proposed GES boundary values as presented in document 4J-6 and Annex 3, with the following remarks:

- regarding the use of foodstuff threshold values from the EC directive 1881/2006 for Cd and Pb in offshore waters, it is still to be decided whether these values are to be used for Descriptor 9 only
- the study reservation by Sweden on GES proposal for Cd and Pb in offshore waters which can be lifted when conversion factors for the biota matrix have been developed
- the study reservation by Denmark on proposed GES boundaries for TBT concentration measured in sediments based on the QS as the methodological detection limit is often above the threshold level

4J.33 The Meeting noted that the proposed GES boundaries (**Annex 3**) will be submitted for adoption at HOD 50-2016 and urged the Contracting Parties to clarify their position on the still open issues raised in paragraph 4J-31 in advance of that meeting.

4J.34 The Meeting took note that the EN on Hazardous Substances has proposed to consider a number of additional substances as the basis for HELCOM indicators or for inclusion as trends in HOLAS II in addition to the core indicators, namely DDEs (DDT), HCB, HCH, and total oil concentration in water based on spectrofluorometry.

Development of the second holistic assessment of the Baltic Sea (HOLAS II)

4J.55 The Meeting took note of the development of a hazardous substance assessment tool for HELCOM HOLAS II (document 4J-8, **Presentation 5**), presented by the Secretariat and developed by NIVA Denmark as Lead partner WP 2.1 of the EU co-financed BalticBOOST.

4J.56 The Meeting noted that the tool is based on the integrated assessment tool CHASE 2.0, building on the CHASE tool used in HOLAS I and further developed by the HARMONY project, and that it will be modified as needed for HOLAS II.

4J.57 The Meeting noted that the tool builds on the integration of indicators within four compartments (water, sediment, biota and biological effects) and that in the current version of the tool OOA is used between the four compartments. The Meeting noted that the BalticBOOST project will test the OOA approach between indicators as well as the use of the CHASE tool in both coastal and open waters, and use of core indicators only as well as complementing the core indicators with additional indicators. For coastal waters the project will also compare the test results with WFD assessment results, pending that WFD assessment results are made available by the Contracting Parties.

4J.58 The Meeting recalled that the current four compartments were defined in the development of the CHASE tool in the HARMONY project and that their use in the testing of the tool was supported by the [HELCOM BalticBOOST workshop on hazardous substance assessment tool](#) (BalticBOOST HZ WS 1-2016).

4J.59 The Meeting noted the concern raised by Germany on the use of bioeffects compartment in the tool since Germany is of the view that the bioeffect indicators should be supplementary indicators.

4J.60 The Meeting noted that some countries wish to consider further the use of the four compartments. The Meeting recognized that further comments to the structure of the assessment tool need be provided as soon as possible, preferably by the HOLAS II 5-2016 meeting (26-28 April 2016), so that BalticBOOST project can continue the testing and development according to the time-table of the project.

4J.61 The Meeting noted that the results of testing will be available for discussion at the planned HELCOM workshop in September 2016. The Meeting recalled that the workshops convened under BalticBOOST are 'HELCOM workshops' and that participants are expected to represent national views.

4J.62 The Meeting requested that background documentation should be made available well in advance of the workshop to enable collecting national views and preparation prior the workshop and suggested that preferably also members of State and Conservation would attend the workshop. The Meeting agreed that the outcome of the workshop should be circulated for intersessional commenting by State and Conservation to facilitate preparation of the project report to STATE & CONSERVATION 5-2016.

4J.63 The Meeting took note of the work plan for development of a pressure and impact index for HELCOM HOLAS II (document 4J-12), presented by SYKE, Finland, Lead partner of Theme 1 of the HELCOM coordinated EU co-financed project TAPAS.

4J.64 The Meeting noted that the project will test the assessment for the whole Baltic Sea if data layers are available.

4J.65 The Meeting requested HOLAS II 5-2016 to define dates for planned workshops related to HOLAS II work such as under BalticBOOST and TAPAS with the aim to identify possibilities to arrange some of the workshop back-to-back at the same location in order reduce travel efforts of experts.

Agenda Item 6J**Session on underwater noise**

6J.1 The Meeting took note of the progress and upcoming work of the BalticBOOST project on underwater noise (document 6J-1, **Presentation 6**).

6J.5 The Meeting requested the Contracting Parties to provide feedback on the criteria for identifying noise sensitive species, on the proposed list of priority species, on the compilation map, available national data or projects that could support the development of the maps on biological sensitive areas, on the

provisional draft programme of the HELCOM workshop on underwater noise on 5-6 October 2016 as well as on the possibility to host the workshop **by 6 May 2016** to the Secretariat (marta.ruiz@helcom.fi).

6J.2 The Meeting took note of the proposed regional monitoring programme of ambient noise based on output from the BIAS project (document 6J-2-Rev.1, **Presentation 7**), presented by Ms. Emilia Lalander, representative of Lead partner of WP 4 of BalticBOOST, FOI. The Meeting noted that the proposal is based on two alternative monitoring programmes proposed based on yearly minor assessment in a few prioritized locations and major assessment every e.g. 6 years. More information is available via the [BIAS project's website](#).

6J.6 The Meeting supported the continuation of the ongoing monitoring. The Meeting agreed that there is a need to have a monitoring programme on ambient noise, however that it is too early to decide on specific monitoring locations. The Meeting agreed to consider the issue at the upcoming State and Conservation meeting.

Monitoring and assessment session (MA)

Agenda Item 2MA Revision of HELCOM monitoring

2MA.5 The Meeting recalled that State and Conservation 3-2015 considered proposed modifications to the borders of HELCOM assessment units (document 2MA-8), and agreed to the proposed changes pending a clarification that the changes do not affect the MAI/CART assessment. The Meeting took note that the issue had been addressed at the last PLC6 meeting that advised not to change the borders, however that specific reasons to this position had not been provided. The Meeting invited Denmark, Finland and Sweden to contact their PLC contacts for further clarification.

2MA.17 The Meeting considered the draft guidelines for biological effect monitoring – imposex and intersex (document 2MA-5), presented by Lead Country Sweden.

2MA.18 The Meeting endorsed the guidelines in principle, taking note of a study reservation by Germany to be clarified by **29 April 2016** to the Secretariat (ullali.zweifel@helcom.fi).

2MA.22 The Meeting considered the draft guidelines for determination of nitrite, nitrate and total nitrogen (document 2MA-8, 2MA-9, 2MA-10). The Meeting noted that only minor revisions have been made compared to the existing guidelines in the COMBINE manual. The Meeting noted the proposal by Germany to include more details on the handling of samples.

2MA.31 The Meeting discussed the review process for monitoring guidelines together with proposals on how the guidelines can be updated as contained in document 2MA-1. The Meeting took note of the following information and progress on guidelines that will be addressed at STATE & CONSERVATION 5-2016:

-
- Germany plans to start the revision process on contaminants in water, sediment and biota early this summer. The Expert network in hazardous substance will take part of the development according to their Terms of Reference;
- ...
- regarding monitoring of 'Ambient noise' the Meeting recalled that proposed guidelines by the BIAS project where presented to STATE & CONSERVATION3-2015.

2MA.35 The Meeting agreed to update the general text in the Monitoring Manual regarding monitoring of underwater noise to reflect the current knowledge and ongoing monitoring and invited the EN-Noise to revise the text.

Agenda Item 3MA**Environmental monitoring and data**

3MA.3 The Meeting noted that in Latvia contaminants data are submitted to EMODNET. The Meeting noted that ICES can transfer data from EMODNET if all the quality elements required by the COMBINE reporting format are fulfilled. The Meeting noted that Latvia will investigate if this is the case and contact the ICES Data Centre for clarification on this issue.

3MA.12 The Meeting welcomed the development of simplified reporting formats and data views from the ICES Data Centre (document 3MA-2), noting that such simplified reporting formats have already been developed for contaminants and biological effects, and are being developed for phytoplankton and zooplankton data. The Meeting noted that the simplified reporting format can be used as the main reporting format if desired.

Agenda Item 4MA**Progress of relevant HELCOM projects and assessments**

4MA.1 The Meeting took note of the draft status report on pharmaceuticals in the Baltic Sea region as included in document 4MA-2.

4MA.3 The Meeting welcomed the compilation and supported the publication of the report pending revisions according to comments provided by Contracting Parties.

4MA.6 The Meeting supported the continued development of the pre-core indicators on 'Diclofenac concentration' and 'Estrogenic-like chemicals and effects,' however noting that monitoring to support their evaluation will not be available for HOLAS II.

4MA.10 The Meeting considered how to initiate the agreed HELCOM actions for further consideration on 'Micropollutants in effluents from wastewater treatment plants' included in document 4MA-1(, 4N-3, 2N-2)-Rev.1.

4MA.11 The Meeting took note of the information from Sweden on a recent publication on techniques for removal of micropollutants in sewage treatment plants. The report is currently only available in Swedish and does not cover information from all the Contracting Parties. According to the report micropollutants encompass a broad group of compounds including e.g. pharmaceuticals, biocides, pesticides and flame retardants.

4MA.12 The Meeting welcomed the action and was of the view that State and Conservation could primarily contribute to step 1 of the action i.e. Compilation and assessment of available information and data of micropollutants of concern for the Contracting Parties in the Baltic Sea. The Meeting invited the Pressure Working Group to consider a possible contribution from State and Conservation in this regard.

4MA.13 The Meeting considered steps 2 (compile information from CPs treatment techniques) and 3 (summary report on advanced treatment techniques) and the proposal by Sweden to use the Swedish report as a starting point for implementation of these steps and to complement the information through the distribution of a questionnaire to the Contracting Parties. The Meeting supported in principle the proposal but was of the view that these steps are primarily in the remit of the Pressure Working Group and that this proposal should also be brought to the attention of Pressure.

BalticBOOST Theme 3 WS 1-2016*The WP 3.1 objectives, approach and the state of play*

24. In WP 3.1 relevant pressures and activities affecting the seafloor have been identified and the Impact of non-fishery has been reviewed based on literature. Currently around 270 pressure/impacts on habitats and species have been recorded. The relationship between pressure and state will be tested in case studies.

26. The test cases will be carried out on two scales:

- a. local scale at sites where monitoring data is available e.g. sand extraction sites.
- b. broader spatial scale where several pressures are acting and where general patterns between state and pressures will be evaluated.

Case study on non-fishery pressures in Mecklenburg

46. Kai Hoppe, representative for the WP 3.1 partner IOW, Germany, presented a concept for a case study on non-fishery pressures in Mecklenburg. (**Presentation 6**).
49. The currently investigated case study area includes wind farm construction sites and sites of sediment extraction. As concerns extraction of sand and gravel, data on e.g. tonnes material extracted is available but that precise information on the extraction sites is sometimes restricted. Detailed information on the type of gravel (grain size) for the case study was for examples retrieved separately through information from geological surveys.
51. The preliminary results from the case study areas show that loss of seabed habitat from construction, dredging/dumping and sand and gravel extraction is small if assessed against broad scale habitats (EUNIS level 3) but can be large for finer biotope types or specific sediment types.
52. The Meeting noted that in general, the damage to the seabed from construction seem to be small and short lived, damage from dredging and dumping seem to be small and continuous, and commercial sand and gravel extraction seem to be small if done properly but has a growing demand and may eliminate certain types of finer-scale substrate patches, which also likely have specific biological characteristics.

Recommendations from the workshop

56. The Meeting proposed to strive to get hold of data from the EIAs carried out in association to the activities. Already published reports could give a better basis for physical impacts of constructions and this information (available mostly for the near-shore areas) could then be transferred to offshore areas. Theme 3 has already applied this approach to several pressures in the review of grey literature.
57. The Meeting suggested that the non-fishery pressures will likely have some effect on benthic communities, on a more detailed level of habitat classification, and that this could be investigated during the work.

Case study Vuosaari harbour Finland

58. Henrik Nygård, representative for the Lead Partner SYKE, Finland, presented a case study from the Vuosaari harbour in Helsinki, Finland (**Presentation 7**).
59. The area was constructed in early 2000s when a marine area was filled and the harbour and its shipping channels were dredged, the dredged material was disposed in separate areas, and sand was extracted from near-by extraction sites for the land fill in the harbour. Monitoring data is available from nearby monitoring stations (0.2-2.5 km distance from the harbour), showing immediate increase in turbidity after initiation of the construction as well as a continuous elevated level still remaining in 2015, likely resulting from the ship traffic.
60. The benthic quality indicator BBI did not show clear responses to the construction and the analysis of BBI and water turbidity showed only limited correlation. The BBI was furthermore analysed in relation to a distance from the area of sand extraction showing no correlation. Lowest BBI was however generally measured at the start up period of the sand extraction activity, when turbidity was highest, and thereafter improving.

Recommendations from the workshop

61. The Meeting proposed not only to use indicators associated with GES boundaries when assessing impacts since for specific pressures, e.g. siltation, specific species can be more sensitive than others. Also, the tentative effect on macrophytes should be further explored if data is present. This proposal applies to all case studies.

TAPAS Pressure Index WS 2-2016

Main activities and conclusions from the Workshop

*The HOLAS II assessment of human activities and pressure and the role of the Baltic Sea Pressure and Impact Index**Presentations*

3. Leena Laamanen, Secretariat, presented the list of spatial pressure layers that will be included in the BSII, and the underlying data sets of human activity and pressure (**Presentation 2, Document 3**). With reference to Annex 1 of Document 3, in total 45 data sets are currently ready for the upcoming approval

process and 35 are in preparation via the work of research projects and relevant expert groups. In some cases, the data sets will be aggregated further for use in the BSII, as discussed further in relation to document 4 below.

Recommendations on the work to develop spatial data sets

9. Specific comment to Doc 3 Annex 1: The classification of “Input of seismic waves” should be corrected, it should be moved from “input of other forms of energy” to “input of sound”.

Development of the BSPI/BSII in the HELCOM TAPAS project: how to improve the spatial data sets on pressures

Presentation

16. Samuli Korpinen, representative of Lead Partner SYKE, presented the proposed methodology for how to aggregate individual spatial data sets in order to obtain the aggregated pressure layers to be used in the BSII, and the proposal for improving spatial and temporal aspects of the pressure layers (**Presentation 4, Document 4rev2**).

Recommendations to the development work regarding pressure layers for use in the BSII

24. For aggregating spatial data sets with the same metric, aggregation by addition is generally preferred.
25. For aggregating spatial data sets based on different metrics in the source data sets, the proposal from the TAPAS project to apply weights prior to aggregation was supported, and tentatively considered appropriate e.g. for compiling data sets to represent physical disturbance, biological disturbance and input of contaminants. The workshop noted that the process on how the weight classes are assigned should be documented.
26. When the source data sets represent the distribution of a human activity, it was noted that the data set can have different weight classes in different aggregated pressure layers, as several pressures may be associated with the same human activity.
27. The Workshop supported the proposal to apply buffer zones and gradients to data sets on human activities where this is motivated. The buffer will should be applied in order to refine the pressure layers in cases where these are derived from maps of human activities. If direct spatial information on the concerned pressure is available, this will be used instead.
28. The workshop questioned the proposal to use satellite information to represent the spatial distribution of nutrient loading. It was proposed that for nutrients a combined approach could be tested so that satellites are used in order to see the direction of the plumes and then this will be combined with measurements in the sea in order to estimate the intensity. Concentrations in offshore areas should be used to estimate the distribution of the nutrient pressure.
29. The workshop did not support to weight down the intensity of nutrient and marine litter due to wave exposure since exposure cannot be expected to generally cause a dilution of nutrients or marine litter. For other pressures (such as suspended organic matter or silt), accounting for wave exposure could potentially be relevant, provided that the relationship can be substantiated by literature.
31. The workshop furthermore noted the following:
- d. For nutrient loading, nitrogen and phosphate should be used as separate spatial layers. It should be considered further how this distinction should be reflected also in the sensitivity scores.

Setting the sensitivity scores

Presentations

32. Ciarán Murray, representative of TAPAS partner NIVA, presented the expert questionnaire that will be used to set sensitivity scores for the Baltic Sea Impact Index (**Presentation 5, Document 7**).
33. The TAPAS Expert survey to set sensitivity scores was submitted to Contracting Parties for further distribution of national experts on 29 August with a deadline for the replies by 30 September. The first results from the expert survey could be expected in mid-October, provided that a sufficient number of replies have been obtain by the deadline 30 September.

Recommendations on clarifications needed to the TAPAS expert survey

34. The workshop tested the expert survey and provided feedback on how to run the survey, and proposed to provide the following corrections and clarification to the survey (point 35 – 36).

Recommendations on how to interpret the results from the survey

Referred to definition of impact type and distance (point 37-41).

Recommendations on how to combine survey based and literature based estimates of sensitivity scores

44. The workshop supported using the LiACAT tool (literature based cumulative effects assessment tool) as far as possible in HOLAS II, particularly referring to its strengths with respect to traceability and in showing impact chains, but recognised that aspects relating to user-friendliness and time for data entering should be improved in order to enable a wider use. It should also be considered how to develop outputs from LiACAT in order to translate the results into sensitivity scores. A simplified manual and work-flow will be developed for that purpose.

BalticBOOST HZ WS 2-2016

Presentation of the hazardous substance integration tool (CHASE)

Recommendations from the workshop

14. The workshop recommended countries to test and familiarize themselves with how the CHASE tool works. This could either be done through the [ShinyApps](#), using either the provided test data set can be used or a national data set, or by downloading the R script from [GitHub](#).
15. The workshop recommended that the CHASE tool should be fed with indicator result values based on the upper 95th confidence limit instead of an average, as this would make the assessment more robust. If the 'OSPAR MIME R-script' is applied to the HELCOM core indicators as the indicator assessment protocol, it was noted that the upper 95th confidence limit value is considered to provide the representative value of a station, and that both the upper 95th confidence limit values and average values are calculated through the script and are thus available to be fed into the tool. The [assessment method](#) and [test results for the HELCOM area](#) are available online.
16. The workshop recommends that BalticBOOST WP 2.1 lead partner completes a test for the bio-effect compartment using the weighted average approach.
17. The workshop recommends that the BalticBOOST WP 2.1 lead partner update the confidence criteria from 2010, and that the confidence score for thresholds should be the same for all commonly agreed GES boundaries. The workshop further recommends that it should be tested how the confidence will be affected by the lack of one component or element.

Evaluation of results from the BalticBOOST WP 2.1 test outputs and case studies

Recommendations from the workshop

35. To improve the decision base the workshop furthermore recommended that additional coastal test cases should be made before the end of September by the BalticBOOST WP 2.1. Poland will submit the needed WFD assessment details by 23 September, based on which a test should be made. Lithuania will provide average concentration values in addition to the information already delivered to be used for the test. German tests will be made based on the delivered assessment details. Danish data sets will be used to develop a coastal example. Clear disclaimers are to be added to all the presented test tables stating that the results are tests and not to be considered as assessments.
36. The workshop recommends that if the WFD second cycle assessment results in the coastal area are used in HOLAS II they are not shown in the same map as CHASE assessments of the offshore area as the results are not comparable. It was furthermore proposed that if the WFD second cycle assessment results are used in HOLAS II, then the matrices used in the monitoring should be indicated as this differs between countries and affects the comparability of the results across national borders.
37. The workshop recommends completing the regional compilation of the WFD second cycle assessment results, by including the assessment results for the countries from which they are still missing.
38. The workshop recommends that HELCOM should make an assessment of the hazardous substance assessment for the whole HELCOM area that allows for comparison of status between the coastal- and the offshore area, i.e. using the same assessment method in the entire area, noting the draft of the revised EU commission decision on GES proposes that also the EU MSFD covers the both the coastal and the offshore areas.

39. The workshop therefore recommends that the CHASE tool is applied for both the coastal and the offshore assessment units. The workshop discussed the possibility to use 'all available data', (implying core indicators, priority substances, the three agreed additional substances (HCB, DDE, Cu) as well as other available monitoring data). The workshop supported in principle this approach, however recognizing that currently the agreement is to use data reported to COMBINE and extracted for the core indicators for the HOLAS II assessment and that inclusion of data from other sources needs to be agreed and technically solved. Furthermore an agreement will be needed for the additional threshold values to be used.
40. The workshop recommends that a minimum list of core indicators and relevant matrices per assessment unit should be established and that the CHASE assessment is only applied for those assessment units where the minimum requirements are met. Such minimum requirements will be proposed by BalticBOOST project and included in the submission of proposed hazardous substance assessment approach for HOLAS II to State and Conservation 5-2016.
41. The workshop recommends that the list of substances included in a CHASE assessment are clearly indicated, since the result of the CHASE assessment will be affected by the substances included.
42. The workshop recommends that in cases where values below the Limit of Quantification are encountered in the assessment data, then half of the nominal value should be used. The approach is in accordance with 2009/90/EC. For substances, such as dioxins, where a sum is used the LOQ is so high that half the LOQ is above the EQS and in such cases 0 should be used in the assessment calculations.
43. The workshop recommends the BalticBOOST WP 2.1 lead partner to carry out a test of calculating the bio-effect compartment using the same classification scale as in the biodiversity tool. Based on the test outputs it should be considered how the bio-effect compartment and indicators should be included in the assessment.
44. The workshop recommends HELCOM to strive in the future for the use of same indicators and matrices between assessment units, to ensure comparability of results.

[Presentation of the progress on developing a hazardous substance assessment system through a HELCOM workspace](#)

46. The [Widget](#) that allows viewing data currently available in COMBINE when extracted using the core indicator extraction table has been updated based on the latest available extraction table.

[Considerations on the visual outputs of the tool](#)

48. The workshop discussed the importance of the visualization of the hazardous substances assessment results in HOLAS II. The workshop was of the opinion that it is important to provide information on which substances contribute the most to the CHASE integrated contamination score in the respective assessment units and that it could e.g. be appropriate to provide a ranking of the substances based on their contamination ratio for each assessment unit.
49. Furthermore the meeting noted that it would be relevant to show both the integrated- and the indicator specific status assessments in the final HOLAS II assessment and that it would be helpful if the chemical status sections of HOLAS II would follow the same visual identity as the other sections of the assessment report.

TAPAS ESA WS 2-2016

The aim of the Workshop was to contribute to the development of a regional framework for economic and social analyses in the Baltic Sea, with a particular focus on the analysis of the cost of degradation¹. More specifically, the workshop aimed to:

- share information and discuss ongoing national work relating to analyses of cost of degradation
- discuss baseline scenarios for the cost of degradation analysis
- propose a cost of degradation approach for HOLAS II purposes.

¹ Cost of degradation (CoD) is defined as the consequences to human well-being from the degradation of the marine environment, and it can be assessed based on the benefits forgone or damages resulting from not achieving good environmental status (GES). Thus, CoD analysis requires information on the gap between the baseline scenario and the GES, as the benefits forgone are assessed for this difference.

The workshop furthermore discussed a plan for the use of marine waters analyses for HOLAS II purposes (re: HELCOM TAPAS ESA WS 1-2016), related the economic and social analyses to the HOLAS II assessments of environmental status and pressures, and discussed a potential roadmap for how to conduct further economic and social analyses with HOLAS II

Main activities and conclusions from the Workshop

TAPAS economic and social analysis and HOLAS II

Presentations

2. Contracting parties provided information (tour de table) on national progress in reporting, for which EU member states are expected to submit their reviews on cost of degradation (CoD) of the marine environment and the use of marine waters (UMW) in 2018.

Update on the approach for the use of marine waters

Presentations

7. Heidi Tuhkanen, HELCOM Secretariat presented the planned regional use of marine waters analyses (**Document 2, Presentation 4**), with an analysis of regional data that could be available for use by HOLAS II (Annex 3) and an update on potential economic indicators to use (Annex 4)². The development work is based on examples from Finland and Estonia, but the resulting analyses will have regional coverage in selected economic sectors.

Recommendations for the further work on use of marine waters analyses

8. The regional use of marine waters analyses conducted in TAPAS will cover the following aspects, with the aim that the results will be included in the HOLAS II reporting system (as parts of the printed report or supplementary material):
 - a. Socio-economic statistics using economic indicators is shown together with human activities data (spatial data or trends, as appropriate). The analyses will apply a mixed approach focusing on marine accounting but also including the ecosystem approach.
 - b. Benefits derived from the use of the marine environment, dependence of the sectors on the state of the marine environment and activities trends are described in qualitative terms, but quantitative information is used when possible. Information on future trends could potentially be obtained from national strategies for sectorial developments.
 - c. The analyses will focus on sectors that use marine waters as a source/sink, those that are dependent on the state of the marine environment, and those deriving significant benefit from the use of marine waters.
 - d. The presentation will be done so that it is possible to connect the human activities deemed relevant to the Baltic Sea in HOLAS II and to MSFD Annex III and when applicable refer to the [Nomenclature of economic activities \(NACE\)](#) using NACE codes, which are by nature harmonised across countries in terms of methodologies.
9. The workshop discussed the possibility to also include additional sectors in the HOLAS II report and agreed that the TAPAS project will;
 - focus on the key sectors as described above,
 - assess the possibility of adding indicators represented by NACE codes to a broader set of sectors and human activities
 - propose preliminary examples of potential indicators and their definitions for at least the key sectors, and more broad set of sectors if possible, and
 - circulate the proposal for commenting within the HELCOM ESA network with the objective to facilitate an increased coverage of sectors included in the final HOLAS II report.
10. For sectors where regional scale analyses are not possible, for example due to data deficiencies or characteristics of the sector, the TAPAS project will propose preliminary guiding principles for how to conduct the analyses, which will be submitted for consideration by other parties in the HELCOM ESA

² 'Extraction of minerals (rock, metal ores, gravel, sand, shell)' and 'Waste treatment and disposal' are among the activities relevant for BS region ESA.

network, with the aim to support as coherent marine strategies and related reporting as possible. The proposal will describe the preferential approach for selected marine sectors.

11. The workshop briefly discussed how to deal with environmental externalities in order to provide a more holistic picture of the economic gains from the sectors / activities and proposed that the TAPAS project should explore whether and how this might be possible in an example activity or sector.

Proposal for the cost of degradation approach

Presentations

12. Heini Ahtiainen, HELCOM Secretariat, presented a proposal for the regional cost of degradation assessment (Document 2, **Presentation 5**), including results for eutrophication, biodiversity and food webs, and non-indigenous species, building on existing studies.

Recommendations for the further cost of degradation analyses

13. The regional analyses of cost of degradation in TAPAS will be conducted as follows:
 - a. Use the thematic approach combined with the ecosystem approach
 - b. Use baseline and target scenarios specified in existing valuation studies, assuming that they correspond reasonably well to those of the HOLAS II/MSFD, and thus give value estimates that can be used in the assessment of not reaching GES
 - c. Examine CoD separately for each descriptor/descriptor group of GES (grouping overlapping descriptors when appropriate)
 - d. Assess the CoD in monetary terms if possible (economic valuation studies are available), and if not, quantitatively or qualitatively
 - e. Use international valuation studies if possible to ensure comparability across countries
 - f. Use benefit transfer across countries when needed to obtain a regional estimate of CoD
 - g. Assess the suitability of the studies in the CoD analyses.
14. The workshop discussed how the results from the CoD analyses in the TAPAS project could be included in the HOLAS II report and proposed as follows:
 - a. Values that are rounded up will be used as indicative estimates per descriptor in the report for those descriptors where data is available: tentatively D1+4, D2, D5, and could also be compared to some other value in order to give perspective (for example as % of the comparative value).
 - b. Underlying approaches used in the analysis could be presented as a thematic/methodological report as supplementary material, which also outlines the original data sources and methods for how the estimates were arrived at.
 - c. Results for the different descriptors should be presented separately, as summing them may lead to errors related to double-counting
 - d. Additional information on ecosystem services could be provided in future (illustrations, graphs, maps, qualitative assessments)
 - e. It should be made clear that monetary estimates from the UMW and CoD are not directly comparable, and this should be considered when presenting results to avoid misinterpretation.
 - f. Estimates will be shown as intervals (ranges).
15. Within HOLAS II the CoD estimates provided could be supplemented and updated when new results become available, and the TAPAS project will propose a recommended way forward for how this could be achieved.

EN-HZ 4-2016

Agenda Item 2 Development of a proposal for the core indicator 'Metals' GES boundary

3. The Secretariat presented proposals and comments received on the GES boundary by countries with remaining study reservations (Document 2-1).
4. The Meeting noted that one of the countries with a remaining study reservation Denmark, did not submit proposals or comments but did inform prior to the meeting that Denmark is currently working on clarifying their study reservation, and that the Danish reservation is of a more general/political nature and therefore, the planned scientific and technical discussions regarding these GES boundaries can continue in HELCOM.

5. The Meeting agreed on a principle level that the same GES boundary should be applied in the coastal and the offshore assessment units, and that the lead (Pb) and cadmium (Cd) threshold values should be derived using the same approaches.
6. The Meeting agreed that the Cd and Pb threshold values agreed for sediment in the coastal assessment units should also be applied in the offshore assessment units.
8. The Meeting agreed that the OSPAR BAC values for Pb and Cd for fish liver and mussels can be used as tentative secondary GES boundaries in HELCOM, being aware that these OSPAR BAC values are proxy BACs of unknown origin. The Meeting agreed that the optimal approach would be to calculate these BAC values for the HELCOM area using COMBINE data, and agreed to attempt completing this calculation before the submission dead line of 14 October to State and Conservation 5-2016.
- 10 The meeting agreed that at this time any data that has been submitted to COMBINE without information on the basis will be excluded from the calculation. The meeting agreed that it should be considered if the 10th percentile would be a more appropriate threshold value than the 15th percentile, and agreed that the methods applied in OSPAR and the WFD CIS methods should be considered as guidance.
11. The Meeting agreed to submit a new 'Metal' core indicator GES boundary proposal to State and Conservation 5-2016 as detailed in **Annex 2**.

Agenda Item 3 MIME R-script as core indicator assessment protocol

13. The Meeting concluded that the OSPAR assessment method can be used for the core indicators related to concentration of contaminants and agreed that the script should be modified so that the HELCOM threshold values are applied.
15. The Meeting agreed that the Co-Chairs and the Secretariat will draft a proposal to be submitted to State and Conservation 5-2016 detailing the assessment method for the concentration based core indicators. The Meeting was of the opinion that the proposal should reflect the benefits of the 'MIME R-script' compared to alternative methods that have been considered, and that it has been found to be a well developed and adopted method for assessment of biota and sediment, and that it will allow for development of comparable results between the HELCOM and OSPAR regions as well as a common way of evaluating data between indicators within the HELCOM region. In order to provide a complete description of the data that will be assessed using the 'MIME R-script' it was concluded that also the extraction table should be included in the proposal.

Agenda Item 5 Future work and any other business

17. The Meeting agreed to come back and agree on a date for the next meeting of the network when the national data submissions to COMBINE have been completed, and a clear picture is available on the needed verification and data checks.

HOLAS II 6-2016

Agenda Item 3 Timeline and way forward for the HOLAS II assessments

3.1 The Meeting took note of the presentation by the Secretariat on the updated timeline for the HOLAS II project (document 3-1, Presentation 1). The Meeting noted that the integrated thematic assessments on biodiversity, eutrophication, hazardous substances and the application of the BSP II approach will be carried out in January-February 2017 and are planned to be evaluated by Contracting Parties through a set of HELCOM workshops tentatively scheduled in March 2017. The first version of the 2nd HELCOM holistic assessment will be considered for endorsement by State and Conservation 6-2017, tentatively held in second half of May 2016, and for approval at HOD 52 to be held 20-21 June 2017.

Agenda Item 4 Development of integrated assessment tools for biodiversity and hazardous substances

4.1 The Meeting took note of the development of the hazardous substances assessment tool under the BalticBOOST project, as presented by the Secretariat and BalticBOOST partner NIVA Denmark, and the recommendations from the [HELCOM workshop BalticBOOST HZ WS 2-2016 \(documents 2-4 and 4-2\)](#).

4.3 The Meeting took note that CHASE 3.0 is currently being updated through the BalticBOOST project based on the guidance provided through the two HELCOM workshops on developing the hazardous substances assessment. In comparison to CHASE 2.0, some main updates are: 1) the bio-effect compartment

will be assessed by weighted averaging of the indicators not using chemical score 2) the confidence assessment will be revised so that it is carried out in analogy with the biodiversity (BEAT) and eutrophication (HEAT) assessment tools 3) the tool is coded in R with the aim to integrate the code in a semi-automated assessment system.

4.5 The Meeting recalled that test cases have been carried out using the CHASE tool based on proposals from at the first HELCOM BalticBOOST workshop on the hazardous substance assessment tool (HELCOM BalticBOOST HZ WS 1-2016) and as further discussed and agreed by HOLAS II 5-2016 and State and Conservation 4-2016. The tests included to evaluate the outcome of the One-Out-All-Out approach (OOAO) vs the integrated CHASE assessment tool, as well as the use of different sets of indicators. Specifically the tests on indicators included use of 1) HELCOM core indicators only, 2) core indicators + three additional substances (HCB, DDE, Cu) and 3) 'all available substances' corresponding to core indicators + HCB, DDE, Cu + other hazardous substances monitored by the Contracting Parties including the WFD chemical status. The 'three additional substances' have been proposed by Contracting Parties through the data call on WFD assessment results on hazardous substances and their use in HOLAS II and discussed and considered by the HELCOM EN on hazardous substances, The inclusion/exclusion of the HELCOM core indicator on radionuclides was also tested.

4.9 The Meeting discussed the proposal of the workshop to use the CHASE tool also for the assessment of coastal waters. This proposal is based on the view of the workshop that WFD assessments are not comparable between countries (see HELCOM BalticBOOST HZ WS 2-2016, document 2) while the CHASE tool will support a coherent assessment of coastal waters as well as a coherent assessment between coastal and offshore waters in HOLAS II. The Meeting was of the view that such decision will require additional test cases on the use of the CHASE tool compared with WFD assessment results in coastal waters.

4.10 The Meeting noted that in the preparation for State and Conservation 5-2016, which is to endorse the tool, additional test cases based on Danish, German, Lithuanian and Polish data will be carried out by the lead partner NIVA Denmark to support the decision. Finland, Latvia, Poland furthermore agreed to submit the requested WFD assessment results, preferably as shapefiles, to complete the compilation of WFD assessment results in coastal waters.

Agenda Item 5 Economic and social analyses

5.1 The Meeting took note of the presentation by the Secretariat on the proposal for a framework for the socioeconomic analyses in HOLAS II (**document 5-1, Presentation 5**).

5.2 The Meeting took note that for the 'use of marine waters' approach economic data is gathered for different sectors, e.g. on production value, profits, number of employees, value added. The selection of human activities and sectors for the analysis in TAPAS is fisheries, aquaculture, tourism and leisure activities, energy production, and transport. Testing of the framework in the TAPAS project is based and harmonized data from Eurostat, trans-national studies and NACE codes applied to Estonia and Finland. In the case that statistics have limited relevance, guidelines will be proposed on how they could be modified to be more relevant. Such guidance was welcomed by the European Commission to consider how Eurostat statistics could be developed to meet the requirements of use of marine waters analysis.

5.7 The Meeting discussed the confidence in the cost of degradation analyses and proposed that it should be explored if confidence assessment in the cost of degradation analysis could apply a similar approach as used for evaluating confidence in the assessment in the integrated status assessment tools (BEAT, HEAT, i.e. based on categories).

5.9 The Meeting agreed to aim for integrating the ESA results in the chapters of status and pressures on the marine environment of the summary report. If this way of presentation is not seen as appropriate when a fuller view of available results is evident, considering the need to give the results good visibility, a second option would be to give this information as a separate chapter. In the case no further external funding is available for continued ESA analysis in 2017, the TAPAS project report will be available as a source of reference.

5.10 The Meeting took note of the roadmap for further regional socioeconomic analyses beyond the TAPAS project as requested by HOLAS II 5-2016 (**document 5-2, Presentation 6**).

5.11 The Meeting discussed the proposed future activities of the roadmap, supported in general the continued future work of the ESA network, and noted that the activities beyond the TAPAS project and formalization of the ESA network will be further discussed by Gear Group.

Agenda Item 6 Assessment of pressures including the development of the Baltic Sea impact index

6.7 The Meeting took note of the presentation by the Secretariat on the update of human activities and pressure data to be used in the Baltic Sea Pressure and Impact Index (**document 6-2, Presentation 8**).

6.8 The Meeting took note of the presentation by the Secretariat on the proposed process to review and verify spatial datasets (**document 6-3, Presentation 9**). The data review is to be done through HELCOM Data and Map Service where the data and resulting maps are made available for access for HELCOM representatives only. Acceptance is requested for the datasets collected through data calls and datasets retrieved from open sources will be done through a dedicated HELCOM workspace. Comments on the dataset and maps should be provided directly to the Secretariat.

6.9 The Meeting agreed that the request on the approval process should be primarily addressed to the HOLAS II core team in copy to the Pressure and State and Conservation Working Groups.

6.10 The Meeting took note of the presentation by Samuli Korpinen, representative of TAPAS partner SYKE, on the development of the Baltic Sea Pressure and Impact Index (**document 6-4, Presentation 10**) and the recommendations from the second HELCOM TAPAS workshop on the BSPII (TAPAS Pressure Index WS 2-2016).

6.14 The Meeting concluded that using CHASE assessment results calculated per assessment unit as input data in the BSII assessment is the currently best available option.

6.16 The Meeting supported the proposal that for nutrients the relevant layer to include in BSII would be nutrient concentration layers (nitrogen and phosphorous) as a proxy for input. The Meeting noted that the core indicators are assessed per assessment units, and that for the purposes of the index calculation an integrated map based on station data would be preferable. The Meeting requested the TAPAS project to explore the use of the same data as for the HELCOM core indicators on nutrients in communication with EUTRO-OPER EXTENDED.

6.17 The Meeting agreed that information on input of nutrients by sub-basins provided by PLC-6 project in early 2017 will not be used in the BSII, however the information will be presented elsewhere in the HOLAS II report.

6.18 The meeting supported the proposed method to assess confidence in sensitivity scores obtained from literature.