



Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission

Intersessional Meeting of the Working Group on the State
of the Environment and Nature Conservation

STATE & CONSERVATION
13D-2021

Online, 28 January 2021

Outcome of the intersessional Meeting of the Working Group on the State of the Environment and Nature Conservation (STATE & CONSERVATION 13D-2021)

Introduction

0.1 In accordance with the decision by STATE&CONSERVATION 13C-2020, the intersessional meeting of the State and Conservation WG (STATE & CONSERVATION 13D-2021) on LIFE MPA project proposal was held as an online Meeting on 28 January 2021.

0.2 The Meeting was attended by delegations from Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Lithuania, Russia and Sweden. The List of Participants is contained as **Annex 1**.

0.3 The Meeting was chaired by Ms. Marie-Louise Krawack (Denmark), co-Chair of the State & Conservation Working Group. Ms. Jannica Haldin, HELCOM Professional Secretary and Ms. Laura Kaikkonen, HELCOM Associate Professional Secretary, acted as secretaries of the Meeting.

Agenda Item 1 Adoption of the Agenda

1.1 The Meeting adopted the Provisional Agenda, as contained in document 1-1.

Agenda Item 2 Draft structure and content of the project

2.11 The Meeting considered the draft structure and content of proposed HELCOM LIFE MPA project (document 2-1), as presented by the Secretariat.

2.12 The Meeting took note that there are plans to commence the work with OECMs already in early 2022, prior to the possible start of the LIFE project. Should this be the case, any tasks associated with this work will be removed from the proposal.

2.13 The Meeting took note of comment from Finland, that in light of ongoing work with the preparation of a LIFE IP project in Finland, it is important to account for any synergies within the IP project and the HELCOM MPA LIFE proposal. In addition, this may limit the possibility of Finnish participation in the LIFE MPA project as the relevant expert resources will already be reserved for the IP project. A review of synergies and participation cannot, however, be done before the beginning of April, but after that there will be more information.

2.14 The Meeting considered the workflows between project tasks and work packages (document 2-2 Att.1).

2.15 The Meeting suggested to add a bubble in the conceptual figure of the WPs in WP4 on 'management tools' and invited the Secretariat to produce an updated version of the figure (document 2-2 Att.2)

2.16 The Meeting took note that the project timelines proposed by the Secretariat have been elaborated to ensure synergies with both the planned HELCOM red list work and the HOLAS III processes, as well as the provisional target years for actions proposed in the updated BSAP, whenever possible.

2.17 The Meeting took note that the duration of tasks presented in the Gantt chart are largely arbitrary and that some of the timelines for tasks will likely have to be amended based on more detailed information from the partners involved in the tasks.

2.18 The Meeting took note that within the current proposal for timelines, the year 2024 is a bit crowded, and many tasks peak during that year. It was suggested that it may be beneficial to even out the tasks within from 2024, wherever possible.

2.19 The Meeting invited the Secretariat to improve and specify the information in the chart by identifying who will be carrying out the tasks (Secretariat or Partners) and how many tasks will be running simultaneously. As many of the tasks will be carried out by the Secretariat, this will not put so much pressure on the external partners in terms of simultaneous tasks. The Meeting invited the Secretariat to amend the figures and circulate the modified workflow figures to the group for review before sending them to potential partners.

2.20 The Meeting took note of a comment that the timelines could be amended to better engage partners more evenly throughout the full duration of the project more evenly. Meeting took note that in the current chart the final year 2027 functions as a buffer to account for possible changes in the task timelines following consultation with the possible partners.

2.21 The Meeting took note that due to the varying needs of expertise within the tasks, and the flow of deliverables from across tasks, different partners/expertise will likely be needed at different points in the project which in turn will mean that not all partners are likely to be engaged in the work for the full duration of the project.

2.22 The Meeting emphasized that, in light of this, it valuable to ensure that partners feel ownership of the work packages in which they are involved; that each wok package has its own concrete and clear deliverables and events (functioning as dedicated sub-projects) and that it is made clear how the deliverables from one WP link to the rest of the work, so as to create continuity and ownership of the project as a whole, also for partners who would participate only in parts of the work. A major Stakeholder Conference should be included at the end of the project, where all deliverables and their contribution towards the overall objective of the project are showcased.

2.23 The Meeting agreed to have an additional box in the excel file on cross-cutting issues, e.g. stakeholder conference that do not fall under specific tasks.

2.24 The Meeting took note that there is always the possibility of not finding suitable partners for all the tasks. It will thus be important to account for this in the workflows within the tasks, in case certain tasks will not be included due to lack of suitable partners and expertise, so as not to compromise the overall outcomes of the project.

2.25 The Meeting took note of a suggestion to outline the core tasks for which expertise is needed and without which subsequent work planned in the project cannot take place. The Meeting recognized that these tasks should be prioritized and, should no partners be found for these tasks, project staff needs to be secured at the Secretariat to perform them. The Meeting welcomed the offer from Sweden to look into securing possible partners for prioritized tasks for which expertise has not yet been identified.

2.26 The Meeting supported the suggestion to group the project tasks under larger thematic areas to have a more general view of the main deliverables and the expertise needed for these. These themes could further be used to divide the tasks under thematic teams made up of multiple partners. The Meeting took note that in planning their LIFE IP project, Finland has been building 'competence profiles' for potential partners to map out what kind of expertise will be needed and invited the Secretariat to explore the possibility to use profiling also for the LIFE MPA work .

2.27 The Meeting took note of the Draft Technical Note on Criteria and Guidance for Protected Areas Designations (document 2-3) and noted that still not a final document and parts of it are likely to change.

2.28 The Meeting acknowledged that in light of the differing timelines of the LIFE application process and the timelines for the BD strategy, it is necessary to work with whatever information is currently available for the concept note.

2.29 The Meeting took note of parallel processes supporting protected area designations, including the update of the zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the latest public version of which is available [via this link](#). The Meeting took note that overall the draft is still open, and as such only more general themes should be picked up for inclusion in the concept note drafting, so as to link the project to the framework without risking that the linkages are outdated.

2.30 The Meeting took note that, based on the mandate from STATE&CONSERAVTION 13-2020, the Secretariat has been in touch with IUCN & FAO to organise a Regional Workshop on OECMs in the Baltic Sea in late 2021 or early 2022. WCPA and FAO are currently preparing a joint draft proposal for the workshop, based on the BSAP and the proposed content of the MPA LIFE proposal. The overall aim of the workshop is to establish a common understanding of OECMs on the Baltic, drawing on the experiences from countries that have started the process, and reviewing and discussing the guidance for identifying OECMs, and its application.

2.31 The Meeting took note that ICES is organizing a workshop on OECMs in March, focused on working on case studies in the North Atlantic (document 2-4). Registration is currently officially closed, but HELCOM representatives are invited to nominate experts by contacting the ICES Secretariat representative listed on the ICES website, should they wish to nominate participants. The main focus of the workshop will be on fisheries related measures.

Agenda item 3 Identifying partners and possible leads for relevant tasks

3.1 The Meeting reviewed the proposal work packages 4 and 5 to identify partners for these tasks.

3.2 The Meeting suggested that some of the work related to tasks on regional legislation could be undertaken through the standard HELCOM procedures, e.g. Working Groups (S&C), keeping in mind however, not to overburden the WGs.

3.3 The Meeting further took note that some of the information required for the tasks under WP4 could be collated through the MPA database.

3.4 The Meeting took note that the tasks related to habitat restoration may not fall under this call, as LIFE also has a specific program for projects focused only on restoration. For now, these tasks will be kept in the proposal, and then need to amend the proposal will be reviewed when more details on the LIFE call are available.

3.5 The Meeting invited the Secretariat to amend the proposal based on the comments from the meeting as presented in this outcome.

3.6 The Meeting recalled the decision by STATE & CONSERVATION 13C-2020 to mandate the Secretariat to start exploratory communication with possible identified partners, alternatively looking for partners where no possible partners have been identified and to take note of the progress of communication with possible partners.

3.7 The Meeting took note that due to ongoing work with identifying partners for the two remaining work packages, and preparation of the proposal and the workflows, communication with external partners had not yet been established but will commence shortly.

3.8 The Meeting took note of the content of the “information package” prepared for possible partners (document 3-1).

3.9 The Meeting suggested testing the information package on external partners to get feedback on the contents of the introductory package. The Meeting agreed that the Secretariat will circulate a ‘test run’ within the Secretariat and within potentially interested partners to request feedback.

3.10 The Meeting agreed to add information on internal timelines (e.g. when partners need to commit to being involved) to the information package.

3.11 The Meeting supported the suggestion to establish contact with the Biogeographical process to enquire regarding national LIFE contact points towards which question can be directed, and if possible, potentially organize a Q&A session with a BGP representative in the early stages of the process, as many potential partners will likely have the same questions related to the application process and financing.

3.12 The Meeting reviewed the list of national contacts for the project and included contact points for Sweden and Denmark.

Agenda Item 4 Concept note

4.1 The Meeting took note that there has been no significant progress on the concept note since the previous intersessional meeting on the proposal.

4.2 The Meeting invited the Secretariat to work on the concept note drawing on the contents of the contents of the NADEG document and CBD guidance, keeping in mind that both of these documents are subject to changes.

4.3 The Meeting took note that the draft concept note will serve as part of the communication package for HODs, together with the other documents. The Meeting agreed that further review for the concept note will be done intersessionally and that, in line with previous decisions, HOD will be contacted in early March. The Meeting further took note that HOD approval for carrying out with the application process will be sought intersessionally.

Agenda Item 5 Further work

5.1 The Meeting recalled that STATE & CONSERVATION 13C-2020 suggested to organize a review of the draft concept note by State and Conservation WG, and agreed to aim to secure HOD approval for the process prior to mid-March and supported the possibility to secure resources targeted at preparing the LIFE project.

5.2 The Meeting took note that the preparation of the LIFE proposal was mentioned in the outcomes of the State & Conservation 13-2020 which was presented to HOD 59-2020.

5.3 The Meeting discussed the need for the next meeting and suggested to organize a short check-up meeting before the application period starts (regarding e.g. identified partners and need for filling gaps).

5.4 The Meeting further discussed the possibility to invite participants from potential project partners to the meeting in order to clarify any questions at an early stage. The Meeting agreed to organize the meeting in two parts, divided into a closed session for State & Conservation members, and an open session including possible project partners.

5.5 The Meeting invited the Secretariat to circulate a doodle poll to find a date for the next meeting, potentially in the beginning of March.

5.6 The Meeting took note of a presentation on ongoing work in Sweden on marine protected areas, including a prototype of the online platform used for visualization of spatial conservation measures within biotopes and marine regions in Sweden ([Presentation 1](#)) and congratulated Sweden on the impressive work.

Agenda Item 7 Outcome of the Meeting

7.1 A draft outcome was prepared by the Secretariat and adopted via correspondence.

Annex 1. List of participants

Name	Name of organization	E-mail address
Contracting Parties		
Denmark		
Marie-Louise Krawack	Ministry of Environment and Food	makra@mim.dk
Estonia		
Georg Martin	Estonian Marine Institute	georg.martin@ut.ee
Nele Saluveer	Environmental Board of Estonia	nele.saluveer@keskkonnaamet.ee
Finland		
Lasse Kurvinen	Parks & Wildlife Finland	lasse.kurvinen@metsa.fi
Penina Blankett	Ministry of Environment	penina.blankett@ym.fi
Germany		
Dieter Boedeker	Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)	dieter.boedeker@bfm.de
Gesine Lange	Consultant for the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)	gesine.lange@nabu.de
Lithuania		
Gabija Garnyte	Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Lithuania	gabija.garnyte@am.lt
Sweden		
Urban Pettersson	Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management	urban.pettersson@havochvatten.se
Russia		
Maxim Antipin	Ministry of natural resources of the Russian federation	merops@mail.ru
Aleksey Tomilin	Information-Analytical Centre for Protected Areas	tomilin.aleksey@gmail.com
HELCOM Secretariat		
Jannica Haldin	HELCOM Secretariat	jannica.haldin@helcom.fi
Laura Kaikkonen	HELCOM Secretariat	laura.kaikkonen@helcom.fi