



Notes from the Third Meeting of the ad hoc HELCOM Platform on sufficiency of measures (SOM Platform 3-2020)

24-26 March 2020, online

Introduction	2
Agenda Item 1 Adoption of the Agenda	2
Agenda Item 2 SOM approach: data collection, integration and uncertainties, projection of human activities	2
Agenda Item 3 Preliminary results of the SOM analysis.....	5
Agenda Item 4 Results from HELCOM ACTION project.....	6
Agenda Item 5 Preparation of thematic BSAP UP workshops in spring 2020	6
Agenda Item 6 Evaluation of the effectiveness and costs of new measures.....	8
Agenda Item 7 Next steps	8
Agenda Item 8 Notes from the Meeting	9
Annex 1. List of participants	10

Notes from the Third Meeting of the ad hoc HELCOM Platform on sufficiency of measures (SOM Platform 3-2020)

Introduction

- 0.1 The Third Meeting of the ad hoc HELCOM Platform on sufficiency of measures (SOM Platform 3-2020) was held on 24-26 March 2020, online. All Contracting Parties, as well as Observer EurEau, 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 Ms. Susanna Kaasinen, Ms. Heini Ahtiainen, Mr. Luke Dodd and Ms. Jannica Haldin, HELCOM Secretariat, acted as secretaries of the Meeting.
- 0.4 The Meeting elected Mr. Max Vretborn, Sweden, as the Vice-Chair of SOM Platform.

Agenda Item 1 Adoption of the Agenda

Documents: 1-1-Rev.1

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

Agenda Item 2 SOM approach: data collection, integration and uncertainties, projection of human activities

Documents: 2-1, 2-2

- 2.1 The Meeting recalled that HOD 56-2019 endorsed the overall approach for analysing sufficiency of measures (SOM) and its use to support the BSAP update and that the method was presented in more detail to HELCOM SOM Platform 2-2019 which supported its use for the sufficiency of measures analysis.
- 2.2 The Meeting recalled the overall SOM approach and took note of the updates to the SOM methodology (document 2-1, **Presentation 2-1**).
- 2.3 The Meeting took note of the status of data collection and number of responses to the expert surveys by survey type, country and topic.
- 2.4 The Meeting took note of the survey problem caused by an error in the survey software, which means that expert responses for the effectiveness of measures survey need to be complemented via additional data collection.
- 2.5 The Meeting took note that even though the last date of answering to the expert surveys was set to end of February, the surveys are still open and responding is possible.
- 2.6 The Meeting took note of the comments by Germany and Denmark that several experts did not participate to the surveys or were hesitant towards them due to concerns about the scientific robustness of the methodology. The Meeting took note of the suggestion by Germany and Denmark that the results on effectiveness of measures should be carefully reviewed for their uncertainty and their fitness for use.
- 2.7 The Meeting took note that the results of the SOM analysis will be presented in a transparent way that shows the uncertainty and confidence of the assessment so that the results can be correctly used in BSAP UP and national work. The Meeting took note that most results are given as probability distributions which include the uncertainty of the estimates, and experts' confidence in their responses is presented together with the results. The Meeting suggested to clarify the description of assumptions, uncertainty and confidence in the SOM model in document 2-1.
- 2.8 The Meeting recalled that the SOM approach, including the approach for steps 4 (effectiveness of measures) and 6 (pressure-state linkages) has been approved by SOM Platform 2-2020. The Meeting also

took note that the SOM topic workshops on hazardous substances, fish and benthic habitats conducted in autumn 2019 did not oppose the general approach but discussed the level of detail and precision of values in the surveys, with differing opinions among experts.

2.9 The Meeting took note of the comment by Denmark that their experts have concerns on lacking a peer review for the analysis.

2.10 The Meeting took note of the clarification that in the HELCOM processes, review is organized through the HELCOM SOM Platform and Working Group meetings.

2.11 The Meeting took note of the comment by Sweden that the SOM method will show the uncertainties, which are larger for some topics than for others, and it would be more important to embark on the discussion on how to use the results.

2.12 The Meeting suggested that document 2-1 should clearly describe the end results of the analysis and to what end and how they can be used.

2.13 The Meeting took note of the clarification that the SOM analysis is not a stand-alone decision-making tool but provides supportive background information for identifying gaps and need for further actions.

2.14 The Meeting recalled that originally it was planned to run the SOM model with two alternative BAU scenarios where HELCOM agreements would either be implemented or not. However, it turned out that there are not many measure types that could be included in such alternative scenarios and the results would not be significantly different in the two scenarios.

2.15 The Meeting took note that the implementation area for a measure type is assumed to be the national proportion of the HELCOM sub-basins if not specified otherwise. There are some exceptions for spatially restricted measures, where the measure clearly covers only a part of the area, e.g. MPAs.

2.16 The Meeting took note that information on time lags comes from the expert surveys on pressure-state linkages and ACTION WP5. Currently, the data from this question is not included in the results but can be added there.

2.17 The Meeting took note of the question by Denmark on TAPAS sensitivity scores mentioned in Document 2-1 and took note of the clarification that TAPAS sensitivity scores are not used in the SOM analysis.

2.18 The Meeting took note that the range of the BAU end year (2030-2035) does not matter much when running the SOM model compared to having a single end year.

2.19 The Meeting took note that the MSFD measures are included in the SOM analysis. However, these measures are often related to, e.g. feasibility studies or research or are otherwise unclear in their effect. As agreed by SOM Platform 1-2019, research measures and some administrative measures (i.e. monitoring, coordination, developing indicators, setting targets, developing information systems/tools etc.), which have no direct effect on environmental status, are excluded from the analysis.

2.20 The Meeting took note that the joint impacts of measures cover overlaps (including thematic overlaps between measure types and several measures being under a measure type), chain effects and invited the Secretariat to clarify the presentation of joint effects in the different documents.

2.21 The Meeting discussed how to deal with topics that do not have a GES threshold or core indicators, e.g. underwater noise. Topics with no GES threshold are evaluated in terms of a specific improvement in the state component. For topics for which the analysis stops at the pressure level, the results can be given as the projected pressure reductions from existing measures. This is an important issue to highlight in the results. The Meeting pointed out that it should be decided topic per topic what information to include in the main results report and what to include in the supplementary reports and this should be discussed with the topic teams.

2.22 The Meeting took note that the lists linking existing measures to measure types will be circulated to the SOM Platform national contact points with a commenting deadline of three weeks.

- 2.23 The Meeting took note of the clarification that the SOM model runs at the sub-basin level. However, the spatial resolution of the data depends on the component/step and topic. For some components, the data is on the Baltic Sea level or on more aggregated area units than sub-basins. Presentation of the results will reflect the spatial resolution of the data.
- 2.24 The Meeting invited the SOM Platform to send possible comments to document 2-1 to the Secretariat (Heini.ahtiainen@helcom.fi; luke.dodd@helcom.fi) **by 1 April 2020**.
- 2.25 The Meeting agreed on the methodology for using the expert-based and literature-based data in the SOM model, the (updated) SOM model structure and the methodology on joint effects pending the study reservations by Denmark and Germany to be clarified at the next GEAR meeting.
- 2.26 The Meeting took note of the information on the development of human activities (step 5 in the SOM analysis) (document 2-2, **Presentation 2-2**).
- 2.27 The Meeting pointed out that it should be made clear in the documents 2-1 and 2-2 that the scenarios on changes in human activities will be incorporated in the SOM model before the effects of measures, so that the measures can also impact increased or decreased activities.
- 2.28 The Meeting took note that the inclusion of different scenarios takes into account the uncertainties that are part of making future projections. The current situation with COVID-19 and its possible implications to development of human activities is not reflected in the document, as there is no information on the long-term effects it may have on the economy or activities. The Meeting suggested to put the projections into context by stating that it is difficult to assess the most likely scenario given the current situation.
- 2.29 The Meeting took note that the qualitative national level data has not been used for the quantitative scenarios for the development of human activities. National data has been requested via EN ESA but it has mostly been used to check the validity of the regional data. The quantitative scenarios are based on regional projections, with the exception of fishing and aquaculture, for which past development was used, and wastewater treatment and disposal, for which projections on population development, urbanization and connectivity to wastewater collection systems were used. The available information does not provide sufficient information for sub-basin level scenarios.
- 2.30 The Meeting took note that the activity-pressure contributions are taken into account when considering the impacts of development in human activities on different pressures. The link between activities and pressures is linear but not proportionate (i.e. a 5% increase in an activity does not mean that the pressure increases 5%).
- 2.31 The Meeting took note of the comment by Poland that projections indicated under ESA for MSFD Initial Assessment update are not valid anymore due to the ban on cod fishing introduced in mid-2019 and that forecasts for Baltic fisheries are rather bad, and that there should be more emphasis on the role of ICES Advise in determining fishing quotas. The improvements of wastewater treatment in Poland will contribute to improving the state of transitional and coastal waters.
- 2.32 The Meeting suggested to use the term “sewage water to wastewater treatment” instead of wastewater treatment to describe this activity. The Meeting took note that the effect of improving wastewater treatment is shown in the effect of measures part of the SOM analysis, and step 5 covers only the changes in the extent of the activities.
- 2.33 The Meeting agreed on the methodology of incorporating development of human activities to the SOM model. The Meeting supported that regional data will be used for the scenarios on development of human activities. The Meeting took note that Denmark can agree on the approach in principle but will send comments to the Secretariat (heini.ahtiainen@helcom.fi; laura.hoikkala@helcom.fi) **by 1 April 2020**.
- 2.34 The Meeting took note of the next steps and revised timetable of the SOM analysis. Following the postponement of the BSAP UP workshops to the autumn and need for additional data collection on effectiveness of measures, it is planned that the next version of the results is ready in June and validation of data takes place intersessionally in June-September.

Agenda Item 3 Preliminary results of the SOM analysis

Documents: 3-1, 3-2

3.1 The Meeting took note of the proposal for a generic SOM topic report structure (document 3-1) and invited the SOM Platform to provide comments to the document to the Secretariat (heini.ahtiainen@helcom.fi; luke.dodd@helcom.fi) **by 15 April 2020**.

3.2 The Meeting considered the first interim results of the SOM model using benthic habitats and non-indigenous species as examples (document 3-2, **Presentation 3-2**) and took note that the numeric results are not final, but they will change as more data, topics and interactions across topics and the development of human activities will be added to the SOM model.

3.3 The Meeting took note that the aim of document 3-2 is to illustrate the potential results from the SOM analysis and their presentation, as well as gather feedback and development ideas.

3.4 The Meeting discussed how the results can be used and presented in the further BSAP update process. The Meeting pointed out that there are two uses for the results that need to be considered: the analyses supporting the BSAP UP workshops and overall supporting information for the BSAP update.

3.5 The Meeting made the following comments regarding the results and presenting them:

- The mathematics behind the use of certainty evaluations to define the probability distributions for the effectiveness of measure types should be examined to check the treatment of values truncated at 0 or 100. Potential alternative assumptions could be explored, e.g. limiting the range of effectiveness to two times the average effectiveness or two times (100 – the average effectiveness).
- For the effectiveness of measure types, it would be good to show both the probability distributions and the mean effectiveness with confidence intervals.
- The current presentation of impacts with bubbles is not understandable enough and should be changed.
- Explanations, interpretation, discussion and conclusions of the results should be added after the full results of the SOM model are available.
- Estimating the effect of new measure types based on the effectiveness of existing measure types requires careful consideration.

3.6 The Meeting invited the ACTION project to take into account the comments when providing the results to the BSAP UP workshops.

3.7 The Meeting took note that the number of experts that have replied to each survey element (question) are not yet visible but will be included in the final report. Overall background information of respondents will be presented together with the results, as in document 3-2. Individual responses will not be linked to personal information of experts.

3.8 The Meeting took note that there are no plans to have separate workshops for the experts that have answered to the surveys to discuss how they have interpreted the survey questions, but the results will be discussed at the BSAP UP workshops.

3.9 The Meeting invited SOM Platform to send possible further comments to document 3-2 to the Secretariat (heini.ahtiainen@helcom.fi; luke.dodd@helcom.fi) **by 8 April 2020**.

3.10 The Meeting proposed that EN ESA will also discuss how to present the results.

3.11 The Meeting agreed that there is still a need for further discussion on how to present the results as part of the BSAP update background material.

Agenda Item 4 Results from HELCOM ACTION project

Documents: 4-1, 4-2

4.1 The Meeting took note of an overview of how the topics covered within the ACTION project (i.e. the more technical work packages on by-catch, benthic habitats/seafloor, marine protected areas, inputs of nutrients, and natural time lags) are incorporated into the SOM analysis and methodology (document 4-1).

4.2 The Meeting invited the SOM platform to send possible comments to the document to the Secretariat (owen.rowe@helcom.fi) **by 15 April 2020**.

4.3 The Meeting took note of the progress and results from ACTION work packages 1-5 (document 4-2) and invited the SOM platform to send possible comments to the document to the Secretariat (owen.rowe@helcom.fi) **by 15 April 2020**.

Agenda Item 5 Preparation of thematic BSAP UP workshops in spring 2020

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

5.1 The Meeting recalled that SOM Platform 2-2019 agreed to develop criteria for the consideration of new actions for the updated BSAP that are to be applied at the BSAP UP thematic workshops.

5.2 The Meeting took note of the endorsed criteria for evaluation of new actions at BSAP UP workshops and considered the suggestions by Denmark and Germany and noted that, due to postponing the BSAP UP workshops to late August/early September some of the proposals are no longer relevant (document 5-1).

5.3 The Meeting recalled that to support the selection of new measures and actions for the updated Baltic Sea Action Plan, an invitation to submit synopses on potential new HELCOM actions was sent to the Contracting Parties, HELCOM subsidiary bodies, international projects and HELCOM Observers.

5.4 The Meeting took note of the submitted synopses and their initial categorization (document 5-3).

5.5 The Meeting took note of the clarification by the Secretariat regarding the foreseen relationship between supporting documents and the updated BSAP. Supporting documents in this context include existing HELCOM documents, as well as documents which are to be adopted alongside the updated BSAP, which contain agreement on actions and/or measures e.g. HELCOM Recommendations, roadmaps, topic specific action plans, strategies etc. Such documents will function as concrete support for implementing and achieving the overall visions and objectives of the updated BSAP. Overall HOD 57-2019 agreed that such documents will remain as separate documents and not be merged with the main BSAP document. These supporting documents complement the BSAP document by offering the possibility to:

- allow for a higher level of specificity in outlining the planned work, setting targets and timelines etc. for a given topic,
- provide a more dynamic format for implementation, as they can be amended and updated as deemed necessary throughout the BSAP period,
- allow for continuity of work as some types of supporting documents e.g. HELCOM Recommendations, are not timebound.

5.6 The Meeting noted further that HOD 57-2019 however agreed that the updated BSAP should include strategic decisions and central points from the RAPs and underlined that the follow-up of the RAPs should also be established when said RAP is adopted. This is also valid for other supporting documents.

5.7 The Meeting took note that the document on criteria for the evaluation of synopses indicates that the criteria will only be applied for measures with a measurable effect in the environment and discussed whether all synopses, e.g. those related to knowledge and data, should at all be addressed by the workshops

or only considered by Working Groups. The Meeting agreed that the BSAP UP workshops should consider all the submitted synopses but focus on the measures with measurable impact

5.8 The Meeting took note of the draft proposal for how to organize the BSAP UP workshops (document 5-2, **Presentation 5-2**) and that due to the possibility that COVID-19 related travel restrictions could still be in place in May, the timing of the workshops has changed as follows:

- Hazardous substance and litter: August 24th – 25th, 2020
- Eutrophication: August 26th – 27th, 2020
- Biodiversity, loss and disturbance to the seabed, extraction of species (including by-catch, hunting), spatial measures (MPA, MSP): 31st – Sept. 2nd (lunchtime), 2020
- Maritime activities, underwater noise, non-indigenous species, response actions: Sept 2nd (afternoon) – Sept 4th, 2020

5.9 The Meeting considered the organization and format for the BSAP UP workshops.

5.10 The Meeting recalled that the overlap with existing measures will be considered as part of the technical review by the Working groups.

5.11 The Meeting suggested that also people working with the national programmes of measures could be encouraged to be nominated as national representatives in the workshops.

5.12 The Meeting also suggested that additional material such as PLC reports or State of the Baltic Sea report could be provided to the workshop participants. Suitable supplementary material could be considered by the topic teams.

5.13 The Meeting supported that the suitable breakout groups for the workshops, especially the biodiversity workshop, could be discussed by the Working Groups.

5.14 The Meeting discussed and agreed on the prior analyses for the BSAP UP workshops as presented in document 5-2.

5.15 The Meeting discussed the length and strength of language of the summaries of the evaluation, e.g. should they state if the proposed action is supported/prioritized or not and agreed that the workshops should include in the summary of evaluation if the measure is prioritized/supported or not.

5.16 The Meeting discussed should the workshops indicate if there are synopses that have not be positively evaluated in their current form but could from the basis for a modified action and agreed that this should be done.

5.17 The Meeting discussed when should applicability for the updated BSAP be considered. One such aspect is whether the proposals are suitable for a regional agreement. The Meeting agreed that this is a very relevant question and should be prepared beforehand for the workshops.

5.18 The Meeting agreed on the template for summarizing the outcome of discussions at the workshops as presented in document 5-1.

5.19 The Meeting pointed out that an important task of the workshops is to consider the synopses and suggest how to move forward with their possible shortcomings and develop them further by, where possible, complementing the missing information.

5.20 The Meeting agreed to continue preparing guidance for the implementation of criteria at the workshops based on the draft included in Annex 2 of document 5-2 via correspondence. The Meeting agreed that Secretariat will make a first draft **by the end of April 2020** and the Chair, Finland, Germany, Latvia and Sweden, as well as other interested parties, will provide comments **by end of May 2020**.

Agenda Item 6 Evaluation of the effectiveness and costs of new measures

Documents: 6-1

- 6.1 The Meeting recalled that update of the new Baltic Sea Action Plan will be supported by analyses which estimate the sufficiency of existing and new measures and analyses the cost-effectiveness of new measures in achieving the good environmental status of the Baltic Sea.
- 6.2 The Meeting took note of the description of the approach for the cost-effectiveness analysis and the steps involved (document 6-1, **Presentation 6-1**).
- 6.3 The Meeting discussed the development of the approach for evaluating the effects and costs of new measures.
- 6.4 The Meeting took note that Finland has a website regarding MSFD and WFD where additional data on the costs of measures could be found.
- 6.5 The Meeting took note that there is no plan to make accompanying interviews to complement the cost-effectiveness analysis due to the lack of resources but the expertise in the EN ESA will be utilized.
- 6.6 The Meeting took note that different types of costs will be recorded and taken into account in the analysis. However, many of the synopses are missing data that could help determine the different cost types.
- 6.7 The Meeting took note that cost categories are used to ease international comparisons, although monetary costs are preferred when available.
- 6.8 The Meeting took note that the cost-effectiveness analysis is focused on the costs for the whole Baltic Sea region and not the costs of individual countries, but information on costs from different countries will be utilized to estimate the regional costs, and cost estimates may be transferred across countries if needed with appropriate adjustments. If possible, cost estimates should be delivered in a format useful for estimating national costs.
- 6.9 The Meeting took note that the analysis on the cost-effectiveness of individual measures can be made for some measures, but the main focus is on estimating the cost-effectiveness of sets of measures since there are measures that affect different pressures and state variables.
- 6.10 The Meeting took note that the interim results of the cost-effectiveness analysis is planned to be submitted to the autumn Working Group meetings.
- 6.11 The Meeting took note that Denmark highlighted the importance of having reliable estimates of cost and effectiveness of new measures three months in advance of the HOD meeting in December in order to undertake a political process prior to the HOD meeting.
- 6.12 The Meeting agreed that the ACTION project should go over the synopses and highlight what type of information is missing that would be needed for the cost-effectiveness analysis. The BSAP UP workshops could help to identify the missing information and this could be part of the guidance for the workshops.

Agenda Item 7 Next steps

Documents: None

- 7.1 The Meeting recalled that the next step will be preparing the guidance for the BSAP UP workshops (c.f. para 5.20). The Meeting invited the Secretariat to share the preliminary list of documents to be submitted to the workshops in the workspace.
- 7.2 The Meeting invited the ACTION project to share with the SOM platform the results of the SOM analysis and cost-effectiveness as soon as they become available.

7.3 The Meeting agreed that the fourth meeting of the SOM platform (SOM Platform 4-2020) will be organized online on 15 September 2020. The focus of the meeting will be on follow-up of the BSAP UP workshops and giving guidance for the Working Groups on handling the results of the cost-effectiveness analysis.

7.4 The Meeting considered the possibility to organize the fifth meeting of the SOM Platform in November 2020 after the Working Group meetings. The focus of the fifth meeting could be the discussion on the final results of the SOM analysis as well as the lessons learned and potential future development of the SOM approach.

Agenda Item 8 Notes from the Meeting

Documents: 8-1

8.1 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	Representing	Name of organization	Email address
Urmas Lips	Chair of SOM Platform	Tallinn University of Technology	urmas.lips@taltech.ee
Nathia Brandtberg	Denmark	Ministry of Environment and Food	nathb@mfvm.dk
Jakob Tougaard	Denmark, Chair of EN Noise	Aarhus University	jat@bios.au.dk
Martin M. Larsen	Denmark	Aarhus University	mml@bios.au.dk
Rene Reisner	Estonia	Ministry of the Environment	rene.reisner@envir.ee
Raul Ilisson	Estonia	Ministry of the Environment	raul.ilisson@envir.ee
Marek Nurmik	Estonia	Ministry of the Environment	marek.nurmik@envir.ee
Jacques Delsalle	European Union	European Commission - DG Environment	jacques.delsalle@ec.europa.eu
Jan Ekebom	Finland	Ministry of Environment	jan.ekebom@ym.fi
Liisa Saikkonen	Finland	Finnish Environment Institute	liisa.saikkonen@ymparisto.fi
Jaakko Mannio	Finland, Chair of EN Hazardous substances	Finnish Environment Institute	jaakko.mannio@ymparisto.fi
Samuli Korpinen	Finland	Finnish Environment Institute	samuli.korpinen@ymparisto.fi
Tin-Yu Lai	Finland	Finnish Environment Institute	tin-yu.lai@ymparisto.fi
Kari Hyytiäinen	Finland	University of Helsinki	kari.hyytiainen@helsinki.fi
Andrea Weiss	Germany, Chair of GEAR	German Environment Agency	andrea.weiss@uba.de
Dieter Boedeker	Germany, Co-Vice Chair of State & Conservation	BfN, Branch Isle of Vilm	dieter.boedeker@bfn.de
Kristine Brüggemann	Germany	Consultant for Federal Agency of Nature Conservation	kristine.brueggemann@tiho-hannover.de
Ann Kristin Forstmann	Germany	Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency	annkristin.forstmann@bsh.de
Kristine Pakalniete	Latvia	AKTiiVS Ltd. - Economic Research and Consultancy for Water and Biodiversity protection	kristinepa@apollo.lv
Daiva Semėnienė	Lithuania	Center for Environmental Policy	daiva@aapc.lt
Jone Vitauskaite	Lithuania	Center for Environmental Policy	jone@aapc.lt
Agata Swiecka	Poland	Ministry of Maritime Economy and Inland Navigation	agata.swiecka@mgm.gov.pl
Paulina Bodurka	Poland	Ministry of Maritime Economy and Inland Navigation	paulina.bodurka@mgm.gov.pl

Nina Oding	Russia	Closed Joint Stock Company “International Centre for Social and Economic Research “Leontief Centre” (CJSC ICSE “Leontief Centre”)	oding@leontief.ru
Elena Belova	Russia	Closed Joint Stock Company “International Centre for Social and Economic Research “Leontief Centre” (CJSC ICSE “Leontief Centre”)	belova@leontief.ru
Lars Sonesten	Sweden, Chair of PRESSURE	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	Lars.Sonesten@slu.se
Norbert Häubner	Sweden, Co-Chair of State & Conservation	Sweden Agency for Marine and Water Management	norbert.haubner@havochvatten.se
Linda Rydell	Sweden	Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management	linda.rydell@havochvatten.se
Max Vretborn	Sweden, Vice-Chair of SOM Platform	Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management	max.vretborn@havochvatten.se
Paula Lindell	HELCOM Observer	EurEau	paula.lindell@hsy.fi
Heini Ahtiainen	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	heini.ahtiainen@helcom.fi
Luke Dodd	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	Luke.dodd@helcom.fi
Susanna Kaasinen	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	susanna.kaasinen@helcom.fi
Jannica Haldin	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	jannica.haldin@helcom.fi
Dmitry Frank-Kamenetsky	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	dmitry.frank-kamenetsky@helcom.fi
Markus Helavuori	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	markus.helavuori@helcom.fi
Jana Wolf	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM	Jana.Wolf@helcom.fi
Owen Rowe	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	owen.rowe@helcom.fi
Marta Ruiz	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	marta.ruiz@helcom.fi
Laura Hoikkala	HELCOM Secretariat	HELCOM Secretariat	laura.hoikkala@helcom.fi