



## Notes from the Second Meeting of the *ad hoc* HELCOM Platform on sufficiency of measures (SOM Platform 2-2019)

16-17 September 2019, Helsinki, Finland

### Table of contents

Introduction .....	2
Agenda Item 1 Adoption of the Agenda .....	2
Agenda Item 2 Approach to analyse sufficiency of measures .....	2
Agenda Item 3 Progress of topic teams and HELCOM ACTION project .....	4
Agenda Item 4 Preparation of thematic BSAP UP workshops in spring 2020 .....	7
Agenda Item 5 Next steps .....	9
Agenda Item 6 Notes from the Meeting .....	9
Annex 1. List of participants .....	11
Annex 2. Sessions at existing expert group meetings and extraordinary workshops that will contribute to the SOM analysis in autumn 2019 .....	13
Annex 3. Proposal for an approach for evaluating proposed new actions for the updated BSAP .....	14

## Notes from the Second Meeting of the *ad hoc* HELCOM Platform on sufficiency of measures (SOM Platform 2-2019)

16-17 September 2019, Helsinki, Finland

### Introduction

0.1 The Second Meeting of the *ad hoc* HELCOM Platform on sufficiency of measures (SOM Platform 2-2019) was held on 16-17 September 2019 at the HELCOM Secretariat premises in Helsinki, Finland. All Contracting Parties except for European Union and Russia, as well as CCB as Observer, took part in the meeting. The list of participants is contained in **Annex 1**.

0.2 The Meeting was chaired by Mr. Urmas Lips, Chair of SOM Platform.

0.3 Mr. Rüdiger Stempel, HELCOM Executive Secretary, welcomed the participants to Helsinki.

0.4 Ms. Ulla Li Zweifel, Project Manager for BSAP update, Ms. Susanna Kaasinen, Project Manager, Ms. Heini Ahtiainen, Project Coordinator and Mr. Luke Dodd, Project Researcher at the HELCOM Secretariat, acted as secretaries of the Meeting.

### Agenda Item 1 Adoption of the Agenda

Documents: 1-1

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

### Agenda Item 2 Approach to analyse sufficiency of measures

Documents: 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-5

2.1 The Meeting took note of the information from relevant HELCOM meetings held since the last meeting of the SOM Platform as well as the ongoing work on the update of BSAP (document 2-1, **Presentation 1**).

2.2 The Meeting took note that HOD 56-2019 endorsed the approach for analysing sufficiency of measures and its use to support the BSAP update.

2.3 The Meeting took note of the dates of sessions of existing expert group meetings and workshops that will contribute to the SOM analysis by answering to expert surveys in autumn 2019 (**Annex 2**).

2.4 The Meeting invited the Secretariat to ask EU for information on BLUE2 project.

2.5 The Meeting took note of the description of the SOM model, the assumptions made, and how the available information governs the units and methodology of the SOM approach as a whole (document 2-2, 2-2-Att.1, **Presentation 2**).

2.6 The Meeting took note of the proposed methodology for step 4 of the SOM approach, estimating the effect of measures, and for step 6, linking reduced pressures with improvement in state components (**Presentation 3**).

2.7 The Meeting took note that experts will be asked to evaluate the relative effectiveness of all measure types affecting a specific activity-pressure pairing and then estimate the percent reduction in pressure from the most effective measure type. The percent pressure reduction for the most effective measure type will then be used to estimate the percent reduction for all measure types, based on their relative effectiveness. Data from literature will be used to supplement the effectiveness data from the expert

elicitation. The Meeting took note that that there can be two or more measure types that are equally effective, which can be handled in the analysis.

2.8 The Meeting took note that the measure types are more general than the actual measures and the experts will have an opportunity to see examples on which measures have been grouped to the measure types when answering the surveys. The link between step 1 and step 4 is that the listed measures from step 1 (document 3-1) will be categorized as measure types for use in step 4. The measures will be grouped by the ACTION project, and topic teams will have the opportunity to check the lists and give feedback before the expert surveys are implemented.

2.9 The Meeting took note of the assumption that the measure types will be assessed to have the same effectiveness for the whole Baltic Sea, but the effect will only be taken into account in the area where the measure is implemented, e.g. in the waters of a specific country expressed as % of the basin. The Meeting also took note that the Baltic Sea Impact Index could be used for the scaling of the impacts.

2.10 The Meeting recalled that some topics will only address reduction in pressures e.g. litter, input of nutrient, non-indigenous species, underwater noise, and not assess the response in state variables.

2.11 The Meeting recalled that for the assessment of response in biodiversity elements only the most significant pressures will be assessed.

2.12 The Meeting discussed the possibility to have an additional step for weighting the contribution of litter items to the activities and the total load, e.g. reducing marine litter from plastic bags which can be reduced efficiently but is a relatively small part of all marine litter. This could be done for e.g. the top 10 items. The Meeting noted that the structure of many measures concerning the topic is focused on managing the pressure by item rather than sector or activity. The SOM Litter Topic Team and ACTION WP6 were invited to consider the feasibility of this proposal. The outcome of the discussion will be made available through the SOM Platform workspace.

2.13 The Meeting discussed that in the updated questionnaire (presented late in document 2-5) the experts are asked how much all the significant pressures should be reduced to reach good state of the Baltic Sea and that the same percent reduction will be used for all those pressures. The Meeting took note that this is a simplification as the analysis would be too complicated if the experts were to evaluate how much each pressure should be reduced.

2.14 The Meeting took note of how survey results will be treated and used in the SOM model (document 2-3, **Presentation 4**).

2.15 The Meeting discussed the uncertainty in the analysis and the need for transparency regarding the background and number of the experts have answer the surveys. The Meeting suggested to add a question to the survey on the experience the expert has.

2.16 The Meeting took note of the pros and cons of the SOM model and discussed the assumptions of the model. The Meeting took note of the view by Denmark that the SOM model is primarily relying on expert opinions, which is entailed with bias.

2.17 The Meeting took note that the probability for reaching good status will be estimated separately for each state component (e.g. species, species group or habitat) by using the state variables included in the model. Uncertainty related to the effectiveness of measures on reducing pressures and required reduction in pressures to improve environmental status will be assessed within the SOM model and represented in the results, which will be in the form of distributions. Overall certainty and reliability of the final model outputs will be discussed when interpreting the results. The Meeting was of the view that it is important to reflect the uncertainty in the final results. How to interpret the results should be discussed at the next SOM Platform meeting.

2.18 The Meeting supported the use of the methodology for steps 4 and 6 at upcoming HELCOM workshops and meetings in autumn 2019.

2.19 The Meeting agreed to inform national experts that they can contact the Secretariat or partners of ACTION project WP6 to get support and clarification when filling in the expert surveys requested to support

the SOM analysis. The Meeting furthermore agreed to encourage experts, at the national level, to respond to the surveys, online or at dedicated meetings as agreed for the respective topics.

### **Agenda Item 3      Progress of topic teams and HELCOM ACTION project**

Documents: 3-1, 3-2, 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, 3-6, 3-7, 3-8, 3-9, 3-10

3.1            The Meeting recalled that topic teams were established for topics addressed by the SOM Platform to contribute with the required data and information for the SOM analyses.

3.2            The Meeting took note of the gathering of information of existing measures on national, regional and global level and the ongoing review through national contacts point to the SOM Platform (document 3-1 and 3-10). The purpose is to compile a measure catalogue with qualitative measure descriptions which allows identifying measure types as the basis for the SOM-analysis.

3.3            The Meeting took note that it is important to provide initial lists of national measures **by 15 September / 15 October** in order to allow the autumn workshops to progress the work. The Meeting noted that the Contracting Parties can report more measures after these deadlines and requested the Secretariat to facilitate this by including the list of measure types in the measure catalogue and allowing Contracting Parties to identify relevant measure types in relation to the national measures.

3.4            The Meeting discussed how to deal with such measures as action plans that have not yet been concretized to real measures and how to assess their effectiveness. The Meeting noted that both topic action plans and species management plans will likely be placed into their own measure types where the uncertainty caused by e.g. unknown plan contents can be properly recognized.

3.5            The Meeting took note of the clarification that the Contracting Parties are invited to fill in the country-wise columns in the measure lists and add additional national measures adopted after 2016 or that have been implemented recently and are expected to have a time-lag in response of the state after a reduction in pressure has been realized.

3.6            The Meeting took note of the work on non-indigenous species, as presented by the Secretariat, and the updated work plan (document 3-3 rev 1, **Presentation 5**). The Meeting noted that the SOM analysis is carried out on the Baltic-wide scale and focused on 'no introductions' of non-indigenous species and the control of pathways to introduction. Main pathways for introductions are based on a data driven approach using existing studies and information from the AquaNIA database. Natural spread of NIS is not included in the analyses.

3.7            The Meeting took note that there is a monitoring time-lag due to the time required to detect introduction of NIS but that this time-lag is not considered in the model.

3.8            The Meeting took note of the view of Germany that it would be preferable to run the model based on vectors rather than activities i.e. to be able to distinguish input from shipping through biofouling and ballast waters. The Meeting noted that these vectors are frequently both listed as potential vectors for introductions via shipping in the AquaNIS database that has been used to derive the pathways for introduction of NIS and that the issue is proposed to be considered qualitatively following the model outcome.

3.9            The Meeting took note that the Maritime Working Group will be invited to nominate experts for evaluating the effectiveness of NIS measures.

3.10          The Meeting took note of the work on marine mammals, waterbirds and migratory fish and the updated work plan (document 3-4, **Presentation 6**).

3.11          The Meeting noted that four separate species of mammals will be analysed (Grey seal, Ringed seal, Harbour seal, Harbour porpoise) linked to the indicator on trend and abundance for seals and according to the spatial scale established for the indicator. Harbour porpoise trend and abundance will be analysed for two populations as presented in HOLAS II.

- 3.12 The Meeting discussed that the exclusion of the nutritional status and reproductive rate for grey seals will affect the status of the population considerably. The Meeting noted that the primary reason for excluding these indicators is the incremental work load associated with the use of additional state variables in the analysis. A response underlined that the most recent Core Indicator Reports for HOLAS II for seal populations have taken into account all available data (including nutritional status and reproductive rate) and should be used. The Meeting noted that without a lead country, additional seal indicators were not likely to be included. The Meeting recalled that the abundance of 10.000 individuals of each seal species in each management unit is a limited reference level.
- 3.13 The Meeting noted that five separate species groups of birds in two seasons (breeding season, wintering season) will be analysed on the scale of the Baltic Sea based on the core indicator structure.
- 3.14 The Meeting welcomed the information that Finland has offered to lead a Topic Team on migratory fish. The Meeting noted that all topic details are open for the Topic Team to consider but based on early discussions salmon, sea trout and eel will likely be assessed for more than one sub-basin groupings.
- 3.15 The Meeting took note of the work of the Topic Team on marine litter and the updated work plan as presented by Estonia (document 3-7). The Meeting noted that litter is considered as a single pressure and that six geographic areas will be used based on grouping of HELCOM sub-basins.
- 3.16 The Meeting took note of the work of the Topic Team on coastal fish communities and commercial fish and the updated work plan as presented by Sweden (document 3-8). The Meeting noted that the analyses will take place at the same scale as key pressures for coastal fish, i.e. by grouping sub-basins as relevant. The role of fisheries regulations in the state of coastal fish communities will be evaluated. The Meeting also noted the stock-based approach for commercial fish.
- 3.17 The Meeting took note of the work of the Topic Team on underwater noise and the updated work plan as presented by Denmark (document 3-5, **Presentation 7**). The Meeting noted that three sub-pressures are considered: continuous noise in the 63 and 125 Hz bands (large ships); continuous noise in the 2 kHz band (shipping and recreational boats); and impulsive noise with peak energy below 10 kHz. Five areas, based on grouping of sub-basins, will be used to estimate the contribution of different activities to each noise sub-pressure.
- 3.18 The Meeting took note that since there is no GES defined for underwater noise the results of the SOM analysis will provide information on how much the pressure can be reduced by current measures but not if a good state is reached.
- 3.19 The Meeting took note of the work of the Topic Team on hazardous substances and the updated work plan as presented by Denmark (Document 3-2, **Presentation 8**). The SOM analysis will focus on mercury, TBT, PFOS and diclofenac. Information on other substances, such as dioxins and PBDEs, will also be collated where possible, but not included in the model.
- 3.20 The Meeting took note that although some of the substances in the analysis have been banned, possible sources still exists. Thus, the analysis will follow the SOM approach and is focused on current measures.
- 3.21 The Meeting noted that diclofenac is included as a substance representative of emerging substance and that PFAS is included in the measures list, representing a broader category of substances into which PFOS falls, though the focus of the SOM model is on PFOS as there is more available data.
- 3.22 The Meeting recalled that the HELCOM ACTION Project, co-funded by EU and coordinated by HELCOM, works closely with the HELCOM SOM Platform focussing on four major topics: by-catch (WP1), impacts on the seafloor (WP2), Marine Protected Areas, MPAs (WP3) and input of nutrients (WP4). Work Package 6 (WP6) of the ACTION project is developing proposals on the methodology to analyse sufficiency of measures (document 3-9, **Presentation 9**).
- 3.23 The Meeting took note that WP1 is currently focused on data collation, including from CCTV as well as AIS and log book data which will be completed by end of this year. During the discussion it has been pointed out that there is a lack of data on by-catches especially of birds and mammals, in particular by

bottom-set fishing with boats up to 12 m in length, which covers a very large part of fisheries in the Baltic Sea. An estimation of by-catch figures based on high risk areas modelled in the project in conjunction with evaluated AIS data is therefore considered reasonable in order to bridge the data gap. The Meeting also took note that when setting the high-risk areas in the model for harbour porpoises and birds, the temporal and spatial variation of the population will be taken into account. Partners of WP1 participated in the OSPAR-HELCOM by-catch Workshop.

3.24 The Meeting took note that WP2 is collating available information on impacts on the seabed, from HELCOM and elsewhere, and that the report will be finalized by end 2019. With regard to restoration of habitats a draft list of restoration measures is ready and comments and national input is welcomed, in particular regarding information on effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the measures. WP2 furthermore evaluates the results of displacing fishing effort to certain areas, thereby reducing the total areas fished, since initial disturbance of benthic habitats has been showed to be the most damaging pressure. In the discussion this approach has been welcomed, but at the same time it has been pointed out to consider that in most cases respective regulations are only possible within the CFP and that the processes involved can take a very long time.

3.25 The Meeting noted that WP3 is evaluating the contribution of MPAs to achieving good status through assessing management effectiveness. The assessment builds on a framework developed by World Conservation Council under IUCN and covers criteria related to planning, management, and conservation results. To carry out the assessment a questionnaire will be sent out to State and Conservation contacts during September.

3.26 The Meeting noted that WP4 builds on the use of information from PLC, atmospheric deposition (EMEP), and information on scattered dwellings. One of the tasks of WP4 is to follow-up existing measures through case studies in catchment areas where trends are measurable (downwards or upwards).

3.27 The Meeting took note of the analysis of comparing EU Water Framework Directive targets and the HELCOM Maximum Allowable Inputs by ACTION WP4 (**Presentation 10**). According to the initial results, the estimated nutrient loads corresponding to WFD GES targets are in many cases larger than the HELCOM MAI per country and sub-basin. The Meeting took note of the analysis as a useful tool for policy planning.

3.28 The Meeting took note of the clarification that the results from this specific activity, comparing HELCOM and WFD targets, will not be used in the SOM model but is an additional exercise that can be used to support the BSAP update.

3.29 The Meeting took note that Germany will clarify the situation with riverine targets. Germany furthermore requested that results of the ACTION project are presented and discussed at PLC meetings.

3.30 The Meeting discussed that there are differences in how GES values for rivers have been set for different countries and noted that this is an important issue for further consideration.

3.31 The Meeting took note of the information by ACTION WP5 on the exceptions reported by countries for not reaching good environmental status by 2020 according to the MSFD (**Presentation 11**). In most cases, countries have not specified when GES can be achieved, and the level of details differ considerably between country reports.

3.32 The Meeting invited ACTION project to keep GEAR WG informed of the progress of the project and present WP5 results to the next GEAR meeting.

3.33 The Meeting suggested that climate change should not be intermingled with the assessment on how natural process in the Baltic sea affect the achievement of GES, but rather maintained as an independent aspect so that different components contributing to natural lags can be clearly defined and comprehended.

3.34 The took note of the information to incorporate ACTION technical work packages into SOM analysis as of front-end input (data and quantitative information) or back-end input (review of results) (document 3-9, **Presentation 12**).

- WP1: ACTION partners are invited to upcoming meetings of EG MAMA and JWG Bird to participate in expert-based evaluations and can also provide validation of the information provided by experts.

- WP2: ACTION partners are invited to the workshop on benthic habitats convened at the upcoming meeting of EN Benthic to participate in the expert-based evaluation and can also review input provided through SOM analyses.
- WP3: ACTION partners are invited to upcoming biodiversity related workshops. The WP can provide a descriptive review of SOM output based on WP3 findings
- WP4: A front-end numeric approach will be used to fulfil step 3 i.e. information on contribution of point sources, atmospheric deposition and diffuse sources to the input of nutrients. The effectiveness of measures (step 4) will be partly based on quantified load reduction potential while measures related to agriculture will be guided by data and supported by expert-based evaluations.
- All WPs will provide proposals on new measures.

3.35 The Meeting took note that quantifying the effectiveness of agricultural measures is complicated due to the variability of the effect of individual measures according to their spatial distribution. The Meeting took note that the reporting on HELCOM Palette of agri-environmental measures could form the basis for the measure types list for agriculture. The Meeting proposed that the measure types should be shared with SOM Platform representatives through the dedicated workspace to allow for a national check of the measure types before application in the SOM approach.

3.36 The Meeting took note that the HELCOM Group to draft the regional principles and risk assessment framework for management of internal nutrient reserves (*ad hoc* Group MINUTS) is dealing with sea-based measures and that a pre-requisite for such measures is that external load reductions are achieved.

3.37 The Meeting invited the Secretariat to make a joint calendar for data requests of SOM Platform and ACTION project to facilitate national coordination.

#### **Agenda Item 4 Preparation of thematic BSAP UP workshops in spring 2020**

Documents: 4-1, 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, 2-4

4.1 The Meeting recalled that, in the latter part of spring 2020, a set of thematic BSAP UP workshops will be held where combined contributions to support a selection of new actions and measures for the updated BSAP will be evaluated (document 4-1, **Presentation 13**).

4.2 The Meeting took note of the information on an international nitrogen conference on 3-8 May 2020 in Berlin. The Meeting also took note that there is a planned HELCOM-OSPAR workshop for the week 25-29 May 2020 and an underwater noise related conference on the same week.

4.3 The Meeting agreed to propose the following topics and dates for the BSAP UP workshops:

- Hazardous substances, litter (2 days on week 11-15 May 2020)
- Eutrophication (1,5 days on week 11-15 May 2020)
- Maritime activities, underwater noise, non-indigenous species, response actions (2 days in the period 18-20 May 2020)
- Biodiversity, loss and disturbance to the seabed, extraction of species (including by-catch, hunting), spatial measures (MPA, MSP) (3 days in the period 25-29 May 2020)

4.4 The Meeting regretted that the eutrophication, hazardous substances and marine litter related workshops need to take place concomitantly with State & Conservation and suggested that they could be organized at the same location to facilitate participation of experts that take part in S&C.

4.5 The Meeting took note that the synopses on potential new measures for the updated BSAP (document 4-2), as agreed by HELCOM 40-2019, will be available by end of 2019 and will provide a central input to the BSAP UP workshops.

4.6 The Meeting took note of the proposal on an approach for the selection of new actions for the updated BSAP (document 4-3) as presented by Sweden.

4.7 The Meeting agreed that jointly agreed criteria for the consideration of new actions for the updated BSAP will be important to support the planned thematic workshops and that such criteria should be presented for consideration by HOD 57-2019.

4.8 The Meeting supported the three-step approach presented in document 4-3 including an initial technical review by Working Groups, the application of criteria for consideration of new actions at the thematic BSAP UP workshops (the criteria themselves are still under discussions and not agreed at the meeting), and the evaluation of cost-effectiveness on the prioritized new actions as proposed by the thematic workshops.

4.9 The Meeting took note of the updated schematic figure (**Annex 3**) presented at the meeting which accommodates comments by Latvia in document 4-4 by clarifying that the thematic workshops are not expected to carry out a cost-effectiveness analysis – this will be done in step 3 –, but that costs have been proposed as a separate criterion that could be considered by the thematic workshops. The Meeting acknowledged that while the thematic workshops will take place prior to the cost-effectiveness analysis, the process will not need to be linear and it will be possible to review the list of proposals received through the synopses at a later stage and to consider the outcome of workshops and cost-effectiveness analysis together in autumn 2020.

4.10 The Meeting considered the proposed criteria for selecting new actions as presented by Sweden (document 4-3) and the comments provided by Latvia prior to the meeting (document 4-4).

4.11 The Meeting agreed that the role of criteria is guidance to provide a qualitative description at the thematic workshops while also requesting a qualitative summary indicating priority of the actions (e.g. high-medium-low). The Meeting furthermore agreed that the BSAP UP workshops should be carried out from scientific point view and not consider policy related issues.

4.12 With regard to the proposed criteria in documents 4-3 and 4-4, the Meeting made the following initial remarks:

- All criteria should be concrete and not overlap with other criteria
- The list of criteria should be reasonably short
- Effectiveness of measures should be one of the criteria assessed at the thematic workshops, also to support the cost-effectiveness analysis (cf. para 4.21)
- Different views were expressed whether costs should be a criterion for the thematic workshops
- Evaluation of multiple environmental effects of measures should consider both negative and positive environmental effects
- The criteria should be used to provide a qualitative evaluation of the measure
- Climate change aspects could be considered separately
- Analysis made prior to the workshop can clarify if the proposals match the main gaps according to the results of the SOM analysis and/or the main activities contribution to pressures
- Relevance for HELCOM, i.e. if the measures is best suited for implementation of third party, is required for purpose of the BSAP update and could be assessed prior to the workshops but should not be used as a criterion at the thematic workshops
- Different views were expressed as to whether to use socio-economic impacts as a criterion during thematic workshops or as a consideration in the cost-effectiveness analyses.

4.13 The Meeting took note of the clarification that in the SOM analysis both national and regional measures will be considered since the analysis aims at being as broad as possible. The final selection of actions for the updated BSAP may however result in a selection of regionally oriented measures.



4.14 The Meeting recognized that the SOM analysis only addresses the six main pressures on the state variables and thus relevant proposals on measures could turn up that are not fully addressed in the outcome of the SOM analysis.

4.15 The Meeting agreed that the synopses on proposed new actions will as a first step be reviewed by the relevant HELCOM Working Groups at their spring meetings in 2020 or intersessionally as needed. The Meeting agreed the Secretariat and the Chair will elaborate on the guidance of the technical review by the Working Groups in spring 2020 and share it with the SOM Platform representatives.

4.16 The Meeting agreed that the countries will send comments in writing to Sweden and Latvia regarding the proposed criteria in documents 4-3 and 4-4 **by 27 September**, that Sweden and Latvia will make a joint updated proposal **by 11 October** and circulate it to SOM Platform for comments that are to be sent **by 25 October**. Additional consultation steps will be considered as needed with the aim to present the criteria to HOD 57-2019.

4.17 The Meeting discussed the possibility to use a numeric approach to combine the results applying the criteria (document 4-4) and proposed to use a qualitative approach initially and to consider development of a numeric approach only if there will be a long list of proposed new measures to consider at the workshops. Some countries did not support a numeric approach.

4.18 The Meeting took note of the cost-effectiveness analysis of new measures, including guidance for providing cost data (document 2-4, **Presentation 15**).

4.19 The Meeting took note of the clarification that the cost-effectiveness calculations will be conducted in the ACTION project but that contributions on data on the costs and effectiveness of measures will be needed from countries, SOM Platform topic teams, or other parties that suggest the new measures. The Meeting took note that all information on the costs, also qualitative data, is valuable for the calculation.

4.20 The Meeting discussed the possibility of conducting quantitative cost-effectiveness analysis and took note that semiquantitative or quantitative assessment will be possible using existing data and methodology.

4.21 The Meeting took note that the request to provide information on available data on effectiveness of measures is included in the synopses. The Meeting pointed out, however, that the information included in the synopses might not be sufficient for the analysis and that expert-based evaluation might be needed also. The Meeting noted that it may be necessary to address experts with a survey in order to get information on effect of measures and also proposed the use of the thematic workshops in spring 2020 to come to provide estimates of effectiveness of measures.

## **Agenda Item 5      Next steps**

Documents: none

5.1 The Meeting agreed that the 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the SOM Platform will be held on 24-26 March 2020 and will focus on inter alia:

- discussing and initiating the interpretation of the results of the first run of the SOM analysis
- planning for the thematic workshops in spring 2020
- considering tentative priori analyses, carried out by the Secretariat of ACTION project based on the synopses and proposed new measures
- continuing the development of the cost-effectiveness analyses.

## **Agenda Item 6      Notes from the Meeting**

Documents: 6-1

6.1 The notes from the Meeting were finalized after closure of the Meeting and circulated for approval by the participants in writing.

## Annex 1. List of participants

Name	Organization	Representing	Email address
<b>Urmas Lips</b>	Tallinn University of Technology	Chair	urmas.lips@taltech.ee
<b>Nathia Brandtberg</b>	Ministry of Environment and Food	Denmark	nathb@mfvm.dk
<b>Jakob Tougaard</b>	Aarhus University	Denmark	jat@bios.au.dk
<b>Martin M. Larsen</b>	Aarhus University	Denmark	mml@bios.au.dk
<b>Ole R. Eigaard</b>	Technical University of Denmark	Denmark	ore@aqua.dtu.dk
<b>Rene Reisner</b>	Ministry of the Environment	Estonia	rene.reisner@envir.ee
<b>Raul Ilisson</b>	Ministry of the Environment of Estonia	Estonia	Raul.Ilisson@envir.ee
<b>Inga Lips</b>	Tallinn University of Technology	Estonia	inga.lips@taltech.ee
<b>Soile Oinonen</b>	Finnish Environment Institute	Vice-Chair of SOM Platform, Chair of EN ESA	soile.m.oinonen@ymparisto.fi
<b>Samuli Korpinen</b>	Finnish Environment Institute	Finland	samuli.korpinen@ymparisto.fi
<b>Liisa Saikkonen</b>	Finnish Environment Institute	Finland	liisa.saikkonen@ymparisto.fi
<b>Vivi Fleming-Lehtinen</b>	Finnish Environment Institute	Finland	Vivi.fleming-lehtinen@ymparisto.fi
<b>Jan Ekeboom</b>	Ministry of the Environment	Finland	Jan.ekeboom@ym.fi
<b>Andrea Weiss</b>	German Environment Agency	Chair of GEAR	andrea.weiss@uba.de
<b>Dieter Boedeker</b>	German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation	Vice Co-Chair of STATE & CONSERVATION	dieter.boedeker@bfn.de
<b>Ann Kristin Forstmann</b>	Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency	Germany	AnnKristin.Forstmann@bsh.de
<b>Dirk Osiek</b>	German Environment Agency	Germany	Dirk.osiek@uba.de
<b>Kristine Pakalniete</b>	AKTiivs Ltd.	Latvia	kristinepa@apollo.lv
<b>Daiva Semėnienė</b>	Center for Environmental Policy	Lithuania	daiva@aapc.lt
<b>Aneta Karasek</b>	Ministry of Maritime Economy and Inland Navigation	Poland	Aneta.Karasek@mgm.gov.pl
<b>Lars Sonesten</b>	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	Chair of PRESSURE	Lars.Sonesten@slu.se
<b>Norbert Häubner</b>	Swedish Agency for Water and Marine Management	Co-Chair of STATE & CONSERVATION	norbert.haubner@havochvatten.se
<b>Lena Bergström</b>	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	Sweden	lena.bergstrom@slu.se
<b>Linda Rydell</b>	Swedish Agency for Water and Marine Management	Sweden	linda.rydell@havochvatten.se
<b>Max Vretborn</b>	Swedish Agency for Water and Marine Management	Sweden	max.vretborn@havochvatten.se

<b>Maria Linderöth (online)</b>	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency	Sweden	maria.linderöth@naturvardsverket.se
<b>Mikhail Durkin (online)</b>	Coalition Clean Baltic	Observer	mikhail.durkin@ccb.se
<b>Rüdiger Stempel</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	rudiger.stempel@helcom.fi
<b>Jannica Haldin</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	jannica.haldin@helcom.fi
<b>Dmitry Frank-Kamenetsky</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	dmitry.frank-kamenetsky@helcom.fi
<b>Markus Helavuori</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	markus.helavuori@helcom.fi
<b>Ulla Li Zweifel</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	ullali.zweifel@helcom.fi
<b>Susanna Kaasinen</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	susanna.kaasinen@helcom.fi
<b>Heini Ahtiainen</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	heini.ahtiainen@helcom.fi
<b>Luke Dodd</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	luke.dodd@helcom.fi
<b>Owen Rowe</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	owen.rowe@helcom.fi
<b>Marta Ruiz</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	marta.ruiz@helcom.fi
<b>Laura Hoikkala</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	laura.hoikkala@helcom.fi
<b>Henri Jokinen</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	henri.jokinen@helcom.fi
<b>Aaron Vuola</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	aaron.vuola@helcom.fi
<b>Manuel Sala Perez</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	manuel.salaperez@helcom.fi
<b>Riku Varjopuro</b>	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	riku.varjopuro@helcom.fi

## Annex 2. Sessions at existing expert group meetings and extraordinary workshops that will contribute to the SOM analysis in autumn 2019

The following sessions at existing expert group meetings and extraordinary workshop will contribute to the SOM analysis in autumn 2019:

- Mammals: 26-27 September, back-to-back with EG MAMA 13-2019, (24-26 September), Helsinki, Finland
- Birds: 3 October linked to HELCOM-OSPAR-ICES JWG Bird, 2019, (30 September-4 October), Tartu, Estonia
- Hazardous substances: workshop 22 October 2019, Brussels, prior to Pressure 11-2019
- Fish: workshop 4-6 November 2019, Warsaw, Poland.
- Benthic habitats: 14 November incorporated in the agenda of EN-BENTHIC 3-2019, (14-15 November 2019), Helsinki, Finland

## Annex 3. Proposal for an approach for evaluating proposed new actions for the updated BSAP

