



## Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission

Working Group on the State of the Environment and Nature  
Conservation

STATE & CONSERVATION  
10-2019

Hamina, Finland, 6-10 May 2019

---

<b>Document title</b>	Template for reporting on the level of implementation of the actions under Rec. 37/2
<b>Code</b>	3N-10
<b>Category</b>	DEC
<b>Agenda Item</b>	3N – Development and implementation of Recommendations
<b>Submission date</b>	15.4.2019
<b>Submitted by</b>	Germany
<b>Reference</b>	

---

### Background

State & Conservation 9-2018 agreed to initiate reporting on the implementation of the actions under the [HELCOM Recommendation 37/2 “Conservation of Baltic Sea species categorized as threatened according to the 2013 HELCOM red list”](#).

National reporting on HELCOM Recommendations is currently under way for the Baltic Sea Action Plan Update. However, as the timetable for the BSAP UP reporting is more compressed than the timetable normally use for reporting under State and Conservation, STATE&CONSERVATION 9-2018 decided there is a need to set up a long term reporting scheme, including reporting template for Recommendation 37-2, which covers the full recommendation (not only national actions) and which can be used also outside of the BSAP UP process.

This document contains a draft template prepared by Germany and the Secretariat in order to provide information on the level of implementation of the recommended actions under Recommendation 37/2 for future reporting on the Recommendation.

### Action requested

Contracting Parties are invited to:

- provide comments and input to the draft report template content.
- consider and provide guidance on how regional actions should be included (questions 7 and 8, highlighted in yellow)
- approve the template for use in the future reporting of the Recommendation.
- agree on a schedule for reporting on the Recommendation with the aim to harmonize reporting intervals and content with EU and other reporting obligations.

Draft template for reporting on HELCOM Recommendation 37/2  
 “Conservation of Baltic Sea species categorized as threatened according to  
 the 2013 HELCOM red list”

Entries are made by the Contracting Party:

- |                                  |                                    |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Denmark | <input type="checkbox"/> Lithuania |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Estonia | <input type="checkbox"/> Poland    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Finland | <input type="checkbox"/> Russia    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Germany | <input type="checkbox"/> Sweden    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Latvia  |                                    |

1. Is the inventory of existing and planned national and regional conservation-, recovery-, and/or action plans (document X-X) up-to-date?

- yes  
 no

If no, please elaborate on what information is missing?

---

1.1 Have additional activities been determined that are needed to mitigate the identified pressures and/or impacts on HELCOM threatened species?

- yes, namely \_\_\_\_\_  
 no activities needed  
 under consideration (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Are programmes and/or measures nationally in place to support the development or amendment of conservation-, recovery- and/or action plans for HELCOM threatened species? If yes, please specify if the actions have been carried out in cooperation with neighbouring countries or relevant bodies?

- yes, namely \_\_\_\_\_  
 not in cooperation       in cooperation  
 with: \_\_\_\_\_  
 no  
 under consideration (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

1.2 Have the above mentioned plans been implemented or are they expected to be implemented?

- yes, implemented  
 expected to be implemented by \_\_\_\_\_  
 no  
 not relevant

- 
- 2 Have national legislation or other instruments been introduced and/or updated to provide for effective protection of relevant HELCOM threatened species in all their life stages in the Baltic Sea sub-regions where they are threatened? If yes, what types of legislation/instruments have been put in place?
- yes, by legislation
- yes, by other instruments, namely \_\_\_\_\_
- no
- under consideration (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 3 Has the HELCOM list of threatened species been included in Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA)?
- yes
- no
- under consideration (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.1 In relation to EIA procedures, is there knowledge exchange on the occurrence of species categorized as threatened according to the HELCOM red list?
- yes
- no
- not relevant
- 3.2 In relation to EIA procedures, have human-induced pressures and/or impacts on species categorized as threatened according to the HELCOM red list been documented?
- yes
- no
- not relevant
- 3.3 Based on the information received through EIA processes, are you nationally in a position to decide on appropriate measures to avoid or limit and mitigate the relevant pressures and/or impacts on species categorized as threatened according to the HELCOM red list?
- yes
- no
- not relevant
- 3.4 Have you received reliable data through national EIA processes to support the restriction or prohibition of activities that may significantly affect, destroy or damage populations or habitats of HELCOM threatened species?
- yes
- no
- not relevant
- 4 Are there any sites selected as new or expanded MPAs, such as sites of particular ecological significance for their different life stages (e.g. habitats of sessile species, feeding grounds, moulting/haul-out sites, nursery and resting areas), for the conservation of HELCOM threatened species?
- yes, namely \_\_\_\_\_
- no
- under consideration
- 5 Have areas of ecological significance, such as migration corridors for individual or groups of HELCOM threatened species, been identified and/or mapped?
-

- yes, namely \_\_\_\_\_
- no
- under consideration (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

6 Have national measures been taken to reduce transboundary pressures and/or impacts on HELCOM threatened migrating species?

- yes, namely \_\_\_\_\_
- no
- under consideration

7 Have other international organizations and/or bodies been encouraged to promote and strive for taking all appropriate measures in areas of their specific competence, such as in fisheries management or shipping, in order to reduce pressures and/or impacts on HELCOM threatened species?

- yes, namely \_\_\_\_\_
- no
- under consideration (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8 Have actions been taken to improve the data exchange on HELCOM threatened species between HELCOM and other international and national bodies?

- yes, namely \_\_\_\_\_
- no
- under consideration (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8.1 Have regular systematic investigations and/or monitoring of the abundance, distribution, diversity and ecology of HELCOM threatened species or the pressures and/or impacts that are causing threats to these species been considered?

- yes, namely \_\_\_\_\_
- no
- under consideration (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8.2 Have actions been taken to raise awareness about the HELCOM list of threatened species amongst stakeholders and the general public?

- yes, namely \_\_\_\_\_
- no
- under consideration (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Have a permanent dialogue and knowledge exchange between HELCOM and relevant stakeholders, such as recreational and commercial fishermen, been established?

- yes, namely \_\_\_\_\_
- no
- under consideration (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

9. Are there any special difficulties (e.g., legal, administrative, practical) in the implementation of recommended actions? If yes, please specify.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

10. Please provide information on reasons for lacking implementation and/or consideration for implementation of recommended actions.

\_\_\_\_\_