



| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Document title | Follow-up of existing HELCOM actions |
| Code | 8J-4 |
| Category | CMNT |
| Agenda Item | 8J – Baltic Sea Action Plan (BSAP) |
| Submission date | 15.4.2019 |
| Submitted by | Secretariat |
| Reference | HOD 55-2018 Paragraph 4.70 |

Background

The STATE AND CONSERVATION 9-2018 meeting reviewed the existing actions from the Baltic Sea Action Plan and Ministerial Declarations 2010 and 2013 that have not been implemented yet and made initial remarks on how they could be taken forward or the need to clarify the actions.

This document includes information on progress on and proposals on how to proceed for remaining joint actions, and proposals on clarification of some of the national actions.

In the case that existing actions are not implemented by 2021 they will be transferred to the updated BSAP. An initial categorization of not yet accomplished actions has been made to indicate the need for possible rephrasing in case of transfer to the updated BSAP. Actual rephrasing will be initiated at a later stage.

Action requested

The Meeting is invited to:

- take note of the progress on joint actions and make further plans as needed for their implementation,
- consider and discuss the proposed categorization of actions regarding needs for rephrasing in case of transfer to the updated BSAP.

Follow-up of existing HELCOM actions

The below sections are divided by joint and national actions under the State and Conservation Group that have not been fully implemented yet.

For the remaining joint actions, the progress since STATE&CONSERVATION 9-2018 is provided as well as proposed plans for further implementation.

The follow-up of existing agreements has also identified the need to clarify some actions to ensure a common understanding on the intention of the action and coherent reporting on accomplishment by countries. In the below sections a proposal on clarification of the national actions have been made.

Actions have also been categorized according to their need for rephrasing in case of transfer to the updated BSAP. In this regard it should be noted that Contracting Parties have agreed to, as a first priority, make an effort to achieve already agreed HELCOM actions (HELCOM Ministerial Declaration, paragraph 14). If however the existing actions from the BSAP and Ministerial Declaration from 2010, 2013 and 2018 are not fully implemented by 2021, they will be transferred to the updated BSAP. In case of transfer, rephrasing of the actions may be needed to ensure that they are up to date. Any major changes will be approved by HOD. A proposal for the categorization of not yet implemented actions with regard to need for rephrasing has been made according to the following:

- Category 1) The actions can remain with current formulation
- Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same
- Category 3) Major changes might be needed. In this regard it should be noted that the updated BSAP should maintain the ambition level of agreed objectives and actions (HELCOM Ministerial Declaration, paragraph 20). When rephrasing of such actions is initiated guidance will be provided to the Working Group.

In the below sections proposals for categorization has been made for several joint actions that were identified as not likely to be accomplished by 2021. Proposed categorization according to need for rephrasing has also been done for national actions.

Joint actions

Progress on joint actions since STATE AND CONSERVATION 9-2018

1) Plans for implementation of not yet implemented joint actions

| Action (origin) | Comments by S&C 9-2018 | Progress |
|---|---|---|
| Partly accomplished | | |
| Establish a set of indicators including technical standards which may be used for monitoring ambient and impulsive underwater noise in the Baltic Sea (MD 2013) | <p>Ongoing process by HELCOM EN Noise.</p> <p>Reflection: Threshold values to be developed in close cooperation with other fora, e.g. EU TG Noise. Agreement on threshold values may not be in place by 2021.</p> <p>Proposal: discussion in Gear to establish a common understanding on how to take the work on threshold values forward, to be later specified in the ToR for the EN Noise and request EN Noise to provide estimate of resource</p> | The ToR for the EN Noise (2018-2021) indicates: <i>“Continuing regional work in developing scientifically sound threshold values for underwater noise that are consistent with GES for species and habitats identified as sensitive to noise in the Baltic Sea and (in particular) to further work on the HELCOM input to the process of establishing environmental targets for underwater noise, in close coordination with work undertaken by Contracting</i> |

| Action (origin) | Comments by S&C 9-2018 | Progress |
|--|---|--|
| | requirements for developing threshold values. | <i>Parties in other relevant fora including EU TG Noise, UNEP Regional Seas Programme and IMO</i> ". Request EN Noise to provide estimate of resource requirements for developing threshold values. |
| Accomplished | | |
| Develop by 2015 a new HELCOM Recommendation on conservation plans for habitats and biotopes which are at risk of extinction (MD 2013) | A proposal for adoption on <i>'Conservation and Protection of Marine and Coastal Biotopes, Habitats And Biotope Complexes Categorized as Threatened According to the HELCOM Red Lists'</i> will be submitted to HOD 55-2018. | HELCOM Recommendation 41/1 adopted at HELCOM 40-2019. |
| Partly accomplished | | |
| Reach the target set by the HELCOM 2010 Moscow Ministerial Declaration that at least 10% of the marine area in all sub-basins of the Baltic Sea including the EEZ areas beyond territorial waters is covered by MPAs where scientifically justified (MD 2010/Rec 35/1) | State and Conservation 9-2018 Meeting invited the Secretariat to intersessionally provide calculations for the total area (HELCOM MPA's and N2000) coverage of MPA's by sub-basin and based on these calculations compile a list of those sub-basins with a total coverage of less than 10%, as well as identify the countries bordering the respective sub-basins. The results of this work are to be shared with the State and Conservation Working Group by 15 February 2019. The Meeting agreed that the relevant Contracting Parties will collate any additional information regarding spatial protection in the respective areas and present this at State and Conservation 10-2019 for further discussion. | The Secretariat provide calculations for the total area (HELCOM MPA's and N2000) coverage of MPA's by sub-basin and based on these calculations compile a list of those sub-basins with a total coverage of less than 10%, as well as identify the countries bordering the respective sub-basins. The results of this work was shared with the State and Conservation Working Group on 15 February 2019. Relevant Contracting Parties were invited to provide any additional information regarding spatial protection in the respective areas and present this at State and Conservation 10-2019 for further discussion. |
| Partly accomplished | | |
| Ensure that HELCOM MPAs inter alia provide specific protection to those species, habitats, biotopes and biotope complexes included in the HELCOM Red Lists, as agreed in the HELCOM 2013 Copenhagen Ministerial Declaration, by considering these in the site selection procedure (MD 2013/Rec 35/1) | Reflection: The HELCOM MPA database does not necessarily provide a full overview of protected species/habitats, e.g. species may also be indirectly protected through habitats. Also, a clarification is needed on whether it is sufficient that red-listed species/habitats reside in MPAs or if there should be specific protection in place to meet the aim of the action. It was also noted that protection on red-listed species is used as criteria | The Secretariat prepared an overview, including a preliminary linkage of red listed species to red listed habitats (document 3N-8 to this meeting). The document was shared with TG MPA on 15 February for further discussion with in the Task Group. The TG concluded that the prepared tables include all needed information. They agreed that information on EU habitat |

| Action (origin) | Comments by S&C 9-2018 | Progress |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>used in the assessment of ecological coherence; i.e. when ecological coherence has been reached also this action will be accomplished.</p> <p>Proposal: TG MPA to be requested to look into possibility to link species-habitats in the MPA database.</p> | <p>directive (HBD) and EU bird directive should be included to the information of all HELCOM redlisted species, thus combining the two last sheets of the excel document. The TG further agreed that any possible species on HELCOM Red List that do not fall into any redlisted biotopes should be identified.</p> <p>The TG agreed that the edited excel document will be presented to the STATE & CONSERVATION 10-2019 meeting with a concluding summary, to be prepared by the Secretary, including e.g. information on the redlisted species that are not included in any redlisted biotope.</p> <p>Some form of target or at least stepping stones are needed, indicating when this action can be considered as accomplished.</p> |
| Partly accomplished | | |
| <p>Implementation of the HELCOM Ballast Water Road Map – adjust HELCOM monitoring programme to obtain reliable data on non-indigenous species/ to link the port surveys and monitoring to shore-ship communication systems (BSAP)</p> | <p>Guidelines for non-indigenous species by extended Rapid Assessment Survey (eRAS) are included in the HELCOM Monitoring Manual and the agreed port survey protocol (HELCOM/OSPAR Joint Harmonised Procedure) is implemented by some countries.</p> <p>Proposal: S&C 10-2019 to inform on national implementation of monitoring guidelines for NIS.</p> | <p>S&C 10-2019 to inform on national implementation of monitoring guidelines for NIS.</p> |
| Not accomplished | | |
| <p>Identify the socio-economic and biological impacts of marine litter, also in terms of toxicity of litter (2013)</p> | <p>Proposal: highlight in the ToR of EN Marine Litter that biological impacts of marine litter could in a first step include a review existing knowledge.</p> <p>Reflection: Such review should be carried out in cooperation with EU TG Marine Litter. May not be accomplished</p> | <p>Specified in the ToR of EN Marine Litter (2019-2021): <i>“Consider the development and establishment of biological indicators to predict for the impacts of marine litter in the Baltic Sea area.”</i></p> |

| Action (origin) | Comments by S&C 9-2018 | Progress |
|---|---|---|
| | by 2021. Socio-economic impacts is not a topic under the mandate of S&C. | |
| Not accomplished | | |
| Evaluation of the effectiveness of existing technical measures to minimise by-catch of harbour porpoises (BSAP) | <p>Reflection: To be considered in cooperation with ASCOBANS (by-catch group), ICES by-catch group, HELCOM Fish, EG Marine mammals. The evaluation need to be based on areas with higher populations of harbour porpoise (i.e. western Baltic Sea).</p> <p>Proposal: As a first step request harbour porpoise team of EG marine mammals to identify which technical measures are available.</p> | <p>As a first step request harbour porpoise team of EG marine mammals to identify which technical measures are available. The next EG MAMA meeting takes place in September 2019, the experts will be invited to report on this topic to the meeting.</p> <p>The HELCOM ACTION project will also assess measures to reduce by-catch e.g. use of pingers and implementation of spatial fishery management measures</p> |
| Partly accomplished | | |
| Carry out the monitoring of the progress towards achieving the agreed goals and to gain an inventory of marine litter in the Baltic Sea as well as scientific sound evaluation of its sources (MD 2013) | Ongoing by EN Marine Litter. | Ongoing by EN Marine Litter. Fanplesstic-Sea project ("Initiatives to remove microplastics before they enter the sea") started in Jan. 2019, aims at providing information on sources on microplastics in the Baltic Sea. |
| Partly accomplished | | |
| Develop common indicators and associated targets related to quantities, composition, of marine litter, including riverine inputs, in order to gain information on long-term trends (MD 2010/2013) | Ongoing process through EN Marine Litter. Likely to continue beyond 2021. | Ongoing process through EN Marine Litter. Likely to continue beyond 2021 |
| Not accomplished | | |
| Take decisive action to work towards a favourable conservation status of the harbor porpoise based on implementation of the CMS (Convention on Migratory Species) ASCOBANS (Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans in the Baltic, | Reflection: To be considered in cooperation with Jastarnia/ASCOBANS. Currently the evaluation under the Habitats Directive is done jointly for the two populations of harbour porpoise in the Baltic Sea; consider making assessments separately for the two populations. | As a first step request EG Marine mammals to define "favourable conservation status" (e.g. threshold value), considering also IUCN red-list criteria. The next EG MAMA meeting takes place in September 2019, the experts will be invited to discuss this topic at the meeting. |

| Action (origin) | Comments by S&C 9-2018 | Progress |
|--|---|---|
| North East Atlantic, Irish and North Seas) Jastarnia Plan for the harbor porpoise in the Baltic Sea, in particular by addressing the pressing problem of by-catch (MD 2013) | <p>Red list assessments could help; FCS only compatible with not being a red-listed species. The HELCOM red-list assessment distinguishes between two populations.</p> <p>Proposal: As a first step request EG Marine mammals to define "favourable conservation status" (e.g. threshold value), considering also IUCN red-list criteria.</p> | |
| Future target year (2020) | | |
| Ensure when selecting new areas, that the network of HELCOM MPAs is ecologically coherent and takes into account connectivity between sites including for example migration routes, species mobility and areas of special ecological significance such as spawning areas | <p>Proposal: Identify data needs to fulfil the criteria used in HELCOM when assessment ecological coherence. Consider development of sub-criteria e.g. coverage of genetic diversity. Improvement of habitat maps needed to evaluate e.g. connectivity. Could be discussed in a first step at workshop arranged by Finland on habitat and biotope mapping, mapping methods, habitat and species modelling and production of relevant maps. Not likely accomplished by 2020.</p> | No progress prior to STATE&CONSERVATION 10-2019 |

Joint actions: categorization for joint actions identified as likely to remain in the updated BSAP by STATE AND CONSERVATION 9-2018

| Action (origin) | Comments from State and Conservation 9-2018 | Categorization/Need for rephrasing |
|---|--|--|
| Partly accomplished | | |
| Already initiated revision of the HELCOM monitoring programmes be finalized by 2013 and that it results in cost-effective joint monitoring, which fully supports the indicator-based assessment approach and monitoring of the implementation of the HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan, and is in line with other international | <p>Overall the task is continuous.</p> <p>Cost-efficiency has not yet been considered. Monitoring to follow-up implementation of measures is still in need of further development.</p> | <p>- Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same</p> <p>The revision of the monitoring programmes was one specific task and that also will be finalized. That part should be assessed as accomplished when ready.</p> <p>Then a new action on monitoring could be formulated.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| monitoring and reporting requirements (MD 2010) | | |
| Partly accomplished | | |
| Protect seabirds in the Baltic Sea, taking into consideration migratory species (MD 2013) | <p>Bird protective measures in place and the action can therefore be considered as partly accomplished.</p> <p>To safeguard flyways has not been accomplished.</p> <p>Proposal: follow-up the action through HELCOM Rec 34E-1 which includes more specific targets and agreements with regard to the protection of seabirds.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible category 3) Major changes might be needed. In this regard it should be noted that the updated BSAP should maintain the ambition level of agreed objectives and actions (HELCOM Ministerial Declaration, paragraph 20). When rephrasing of such actions is initiated guidance will be provided to the Working Group. - - Changes should be in line with, but not limited to HELCOM Rec 34E-1, as the Recommendation does not have concrete actions or targets. Concrete action related to birds, considering the needs of breeding, migratory and wintering birds need to be developed. |
| Partly accomplished | | |
| Reach the target set by the HELCOM 2010 Moscow Ministerial Declaration that at least 10% of the marine area in all sub-basins of the Baltic Sea including the EEZ areas beyond territorial waters is covered by MPAs where scientifically justified (MD 2010/Rec 35/1) | <p>State and Conservation 9-2018 Meeting invited the Secretariat to interessionally provide calculations for the total area (HELCOM MPA's and N2000) coverage of MPA's by sub-basin and based on these calculations compile a list of those sub-basins with a total coverage of less than 10%, as well as identify the countries bordering the respective sub-basins. The results of this work are to be shared with the State and Conservation Working Group by 15 February 2019. The Meeting agreed that the relevant Contracting Parties will collate any additional information regarding spatial protection in the respective areas and present this at State and Conservation 10-2019 for further discussion.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same |
| Partly accomplished | | |
| Ensure that HELCOM MPAs inter alia provide specific protection to those species, | Reflection: The HELCOM MPA database does not necessarily provide a full overview of protected | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>habitats, biotopes and biotope complexes included in the HELCOM Red Lists, as agreed in the HELCOM 2013 Copenhagen Ministerial Declaration, by considering these in the site selection procedure (MD 2013/Rec 35/1)</p> | <p>species/habitats, e.g. species may also be indirectly protected through habitats. Also, a clarification is needed on whether it is sufficient that red-listed species/habitats reside in MPAs or if there should be specific protection in place to meet the aim of the action.</p> <p>It was also noted that protection on red-listed species is used as criteria used in the assessment of ecological coherence; i.e. when ecological coherence has been reached also this action will be accomplished.</p> <p>Proposal: TG MPA to be requested to look into possibility to link species-habitats in the MPA database.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Secretariat prepared an overview, including a preliminary linkage of red listed species to red listed habitats (document XX to this meeting). The document was shared with TG MPA on 15 February for further discussion with in the Task Group. The TG concluded that the prepared tables include all needed information. They agreed that information on EU habitat directive (HBD) and EU bird directive should be included to the information of all HELCOM redlisted species, thus combining the two last sheets of the excel document. The TG further agreed that any possible species on HELCOM Red List that do not fall into any redlisted biotopes should be identified. - The TG agreed that the edited excel document will be presented to the STATE & CONSERVATION 10-2019 meeting with a concluding summary, to be prepared by the Secretary, including e.g. information on the redlisted species that are not included in any redlisted biotope. - Some form of target or at least stepping stones are needed, indicating when this action can be considered as accomplished. |
| <i>Not accomplished</i> | | |
| <p>Identify the biological impacts of marine litter, also in terms of toxicity of litter (2013)</p> | <p>Proposal: highlight in the ToR of EN Marine Litter that biological impacts of marine litter could in a first step include a review existing knowledge.</p> <p>Reflection: Such review should be carried out in cooperation with EU TG Marine Litter. May not be accomplished by 2021. Socio-</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same - Add target year and possible steps towards accomplishment, e.g. a review of existing knowledge. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | economic impacts is not a topic under the mandate of S&C. | |
| Not accomplished | | |
| Evaluation of the effectiveness of existing technical measures to minimise by-catch of harbour porpoises (BSAP) | <p>Reflection: To be considered in cooperation with ASCOBANS (by-catch group), ICES by-catch group, HELCOM Fish, EG Marine mammals. The evaluation need to be based on areas with higher populations of harbour porpoise (i.e. western Baltic Sea).</p> <p>Proposal: As a first step request harbour porpoise team of EG marine mammals to identify which technical measures are available.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same <p>The HELCOM ACTION project will also assess measures to reduce by-catch e.g. use of pingers and implementation of spatial fishery management measures. Use the resulting information, the technical measures covered and the spatial coverage of the assessment, when considering if the action needs to be amended or specified.</p> |
| Partly accomplished | | |
| Carry out the monitoring of the progress towards achieving the agreed goals and to gain an inventory of marine litter in the Baltic Sea as well as scientific sound evaluation of its sources (MD 2013) | Ongoing by EN Marine Litter. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same |
| Partly accomplished | | |
| Develop common indicators and associated targets related to quantities, composition, of marine litter, including riverine inputs, in order to gain information on long-term trends (MD 2010/2013) | Ongoing process through EN Marine Litter. Likely to continue beyond 2021. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category 1) The actions can remain with current formulation |
| Not accomplished | | |
| Take decisive action to work towards a favourable conservation status of the harbor porpoise based on implementation of the CMS (Convention on Migratory Species) ASCOBANS (Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans in the Baltic, North East Atlantic, Irish | <p>Reflection: To be considered in cooperation with Jastarnia/ASCOBANS. Currently the evaluation under the Habitats Directive is done jointly for the two populations of harbour porpoise in the Baltic Sea; consider making assessments separately for the two populations.</p> <p>Red list assessments could help; FCS only compatible with not being a</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same - Specify to account for the two different populations and their varying management and conservation needs. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>and North Seas) Jastarnia Plan for the harbor porpoise in the Baltic Sea, in particular by addressing the pressing problem of by-catch (MD 2013)</p> | <p>red-listed species. The HELCOM red-list assessment distinguishes between two populations.</p> <p>Proposal: As a first step request EG Marine mammals to define “favourable conservation status” (e.g. threshold value), considering also IUCN red-list criteria.</p> | |
| <i>Future target year (2020)</i> | | |
| <p>Ensure when selecting new areas, that the network of HELCOM MPAs is ecologically coherent and takes into account connectivity between sites including for example migration routes, species mobility and areas of special ecological significance such as spawning areas</p> | <p>Proposal: Identify data needs to fulfil the criteria used in HELCOM when assessment ecological coherence. Consider development of sub-criteria e.g. coverage of genetic diversity. Improvement of habitat maps needed to evaluate e.g. connectivity. Could be discussed in a first step at workshop arranged by Finland on habitat and biotope mapping, mapping methods, habitat and species modelling and production of relevant maps. Not likely accomplished by 2020.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same - Could be specified e.g. using the list of identified gaps in the latest coherence assessment, as well as information |

Categorization of national actions with regard to need for rephrasing in case of transfer to the updated BSAP

| Action | Comment from S&C 9-2018 | Categorization/Need for rephrasing |
|--|---|---|
| Partly accomplished (7/9) | | |
| Develop biological effects monitoring to facilitate a reliable ecosystem health assessment | Estonia: pilot monitoring on biological effects carried out through projects. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - Category 3) Major changes might be needed. In this regard it should be noted that the updated BSAP should maintain the ambition level of agreed objectives and actions (HELCOM Ministerial Declaration, paragraph 20). When rephrasing of such actions is initiated guidance will be provided to the Working Group. - Needs specification on what kind of monitoring and preferably deadlines or interim targets. |
| Partly accomplished (4/6) | | |
| Finalisation of national management plans for grey seals | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category 1) The actions can remain with current formulation |
| Partly accomplished (4/6) | | |
| Implementation of national management plans for grey seals | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category 1) The actions can remain with current formulation |
| Partly accomplished (2/4) | | |
| Finalisation of national management plans for ringed seals | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category 1) The actions can remain with current formulation |
| Partly accomplished (1/4) | | |
| Implementation of national management plans for ringed seals | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category 1) The actions can remain with current formulation |
| Partly accomplished (1/3) | | |
| Protect the ringed seal in the Gulf of Finland, including to significantly reduce by-catch and to improve the understanding of the other direct threats on the seals, and urge transboundary co-operation between Estonia, | Estonia: monitoring of ringed seals is ongoing in the Gulf of Riga project. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category 1) The actions can remain with current formulation |

| Action | Comment from S&C 9-2018 | Categorization/Need for rephrasing |
|--|--|--|
| Finland and Russia to support achieving a viable population of ringed seals in the Gulf | | |
| Partly accomplished (2/9) | | |
| Designate new sites as HELCOM MPAs where ecologically meaningful especially in offshore area beyond territorial waters [counting from 2014 – when rec 35/1 was adopted] | Finland (currently reporting as “accomplished”) will check and come back. | - Category 1) The actions can remain with current formulation |
| Partly accomplished (0/9) | | |
| Develop and apply by 2015 management plans or measures for all existing HELCOM MPAs | Denmark: All HELCOM MPAs have management plans | Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same Minimum amendment is update of target year. |
| Partly accomplished (2/9) | | |
| Implementation of non-lethal mitigations measures for seals-fisheries interactions (HELCOM Recommendation 27-28/2) | Germany/Denmark/Sweden: Ongoing national projects on e.g. seal-safe fishing gear. | - Category 1) The actions can remain with current formulation |
| Partly accomplished (2/9) | | |
| Develop long-term management plans by 2012 for protecting, monitoring and sustainably managing coastal fish species, including the most threatened and/or declining, including anadromous ones, according to BSEP109 | German/Poland: programme for reintroduction of sturgeon. HELCOM action plan for reintroduction of sturgeon. Finland: Ongoing since plans for salmon, seatrout, and eel is in place. National plans linked to CFP could be considered for migratory species. Development of new management plans should be made based on the newest red-list assessment. | Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same. Minimum amendment required is update of target year. |
| Future target year | | |
| Take measures so that by 2020, regionally, a) the loss of all red listed marine habitats and biotopes in the Baltic Sea will be halted | Not possible to assess by 2020 (no new red-list assessment planned within the time-frame). Targets tentative established through new Recommendation on ‘ <i>Conservation and Protection of Marine and Coastal Biotopes, Habitats And Biotope Complexes Categorized as</i> | Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same Minimum amendment required is update of target year. Add targets from e.g. |

| Action | Comment from S&C 9-2018 | Categorization/Need for rephrasing |
|--|--|--|
| | <i>Threatened According to the HELCOM Red Lists'</i> | recommendations wherever possible. If possible add concrete information on when this can be considered achieved. Is it when there has been no negative change of any species on the Red list between assessments? If so then should the action be amended so that it specifies that the positive trend needs to be maintained and the status improved? |
| Future target year | | |
| Take measures so that by 2020, regionally b) red listed marine habitats and biotopes have largely recovered, and that degradation and fragmentation have been significantly reduced, the progress of which will be measured with a core indicator to be produced | Not possible to assess by 2020 (no new red-list planned within the time-frame). As above. | Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same Minimum amendment required is update of target year. Add targets from e.g. recommendations wherever possible. Add deadline for when core indicators should be in place. |
| Future target year | | |
| Establish management plan or measures for every new MPA within five years after its designation. [<i>first target year 2019 – five years after adoption of Rec 35/1</i>] | It was noted that should a revision of the Recommendation at some point be considered the five year period should be reconsidered and be extended. | Category 2) Specification is needed e.g. smaller changes, adding deadline, but the action will basically remain the same. Reporting to database should be included. When the MPA database is updated, it should be amended so that the information can be used to follow up on the action. |