



## Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission

Working Group on the State of the Environment and Nature  
Conservation

STATE & CONSERVATION  
15-2021

Online, 4-8 October 2021

---

<b>Document title</b>	Draft reporting template for RECOMMENDATION 35/1 SYSTEM OF COASTAL AND MARINE BALTIC SEA PROTECTED AREAS (HELCOM MPAs)
<b>Code</b>	3N-3
<b>Category</b>	DEC
<b>Agenda Item</b>	3N – Development and implementation of Recommendations
<b>Submission date</b>	9.9.2021
<b>Submitted by</b>	Finland
<b>Reference</b>	STATE & CONSERVATION 12-2020, para 5J-1

---

### Background

Referring to STATE & CONSERVATION 12-2020 the meeting agreed that lead country Finland will develop a reporting template for reporting on Recommendation 35/1. At STATE & CONSERVATION 13-2020, Finland presented information on observations concerning the possible content of the questionnaire and the Meeting agreed to come back to the discussion on the reporting template at STATE & CONSERVATION 15-2021 and invited lead country Finland to prepare a draft template for that meeting.

This document contains a draft template for the reporting of the recommendation 35/1. The draft presented here contains the different targets from the recommendation for reference. Once the content of the reporting template has been agreed upon, Finland will further edit the template in order to ease reporting.

The questions in the template are divided into three categories:

1. Questions directed towards Contracting Parties.
2. Questions suggested to be answered by the Secretariat. Included here to ensure that all the targets of the recommendation are covered by the questionnaire. These could be excluded from the template to be sent to the CPs.
3. Questions particularly in need for further discussion and input.

Finland would like to re-iterate the message, that when developing the HELCOM MPA database, with certain modifications, it could be used to a large degree for the reporting of this recommendation.

### Action requested

The Meeting is invited to:

- review and discuss the draft reporting template and provide input
- agree on the content of the reporting template
- agree on the timetable for reporting.

Draft reporting template for RECOMMENDATION 35/1 SYSTEM OF COASTAL AND MARINE BALTIC SEA PROTECTED AREAS (HELCOM MPAs)

Questions directed towards Contracting Parties

Questions suggested to be answered by the Secretariat

Questions particularly in need for further discussion and input

1. 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. In addition, where ecologically meaningful, coastal terrestrial areas can be included;

Has at least 10% of the marine area in all sub-basins of the Baltic Sea including the EEZ areas beyond territorial waters been covered by MPAs where scientifically justified.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information:

2. review whether new coastal and marine areas justify being selected as HELCOM MPAs, and to designate new sites as HELCOM MPAs where ecologically meaningful, especially in offshore area beyond territorial waters;

Have reviews of new HELCOM MPAs been made during this reporting period?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

Has new HELCOM MPAs been designated based on these during this reporting period?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

Has any of these been in the offshore area beyond territorial waters?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If No to any question above, please provide some further information:

3. 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 as well as in site management (for example by specific conservation and restoration measures including restoration of degraded ecosystems);

Has HELCOM Red Listed species, habitats and biotope complexes been considered in the site selection procedures?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information:

Has HELCOM Red Listed species, habitats and biotope complexes been considered in site management?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information:

4. 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;

Has ecological coherence been taken into account when selecting new HELCOM MPAs?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information:

Has connectivity between sites been taken into account when selecting new HELCOM MPAs?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information:

**Commented [A1]:** Should this be done on the whole network level or also locally? This could be done by the secretariat as part of future coherence analyses. The CP:s could then answer if the results from the analyses have been taken into account

5. make use of computer-based site selection tools such as MARXAN for a HELCOM-wide approach which maximizes the chance of creating a coherent network of HELCOM MPAs and at the same time minimizing the impact of pressures and conflicts with other interests;

Has computer-based site selection tools when developing the HELCOM MPA network?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information:

6. encourage Contracting Parties which are also EU Member States to designate when feasible all appropriate Natura 2000 sites as HELCOM MPAs, and to consider all Natura 2000 sites as well as other marine protected areas when evaluating the network of marine protected areas;

For CPs which are EU MS, have all appropriate N2000-sites been designated as HELCOM MPAs?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information:

Have all N2000 sites and national MPAs been considered when evaluating the network?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

7. encourage Contracting Parties which are also OSPAR Contracting Parties to designate, when appropriate, OSPAR MPAs as HELCOM MPAs in order to harmonize the networks where the conventions geographical scope overlap;

Have all appropriate OSPAR MPAs, been designated as HELCOM MPAs?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information:

Commented [A2]: Should this be done on the whole network level or also locally?

8. manage HELCOM MPAs effectively and to develop and apply by 2015 management plans or measures for all existing HELCOM MPAs, and to establish management plan or measures for every new MPA within five years after its designation, as agreed in the HELCOM 2013 Copenhagen Ministerial Declaration;

Had management plans or measures been developed and applied for all existing MPAs by 2015?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

Have management plans or measures been established for new HELCOM MPAs within five years after its designation?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If No to any question above, please provide some further information:

9. update the management plans when necessary and in accordance with other legal requirements with a maximum of 12 years intervals;

Have management plans been updated with 12 year intervals?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information on e.g. why update not deemed necessary:

10. harmonise the designation of neighbouring HELCOM MPAs in transboundary marine areas, and where appropriate to join forces between neighbouring states when setting up management plans or measures for such HELCOM MPAs

Has transboundary harmonisation been done concerning designation of HELCOM MPAs?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

Has transboundary harmonisation been done concerning management of HELCOM MPAs?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

11. assess the effectiveness of the management plans or measures of HELCOM MPAs by conducting monitoring, and where feasible scientific research programmes, which are directly connected to the conservation interests of HELCOM MPAs, including the placement of monitoring stations inside the MPAs (for those Contracting Parties which are also EU Member States this monitoring may be linked to the monitoring related to the implementation of relevant EU legislation);

Has monitoring been conducted in HELCOM MPAs to assess the effectiveness of management plans or measures?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information:

Have research programmes been conducted, where feasible, in HELCOM MPAs to assess the effectiveness of management plans or measures?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

12. include HELCOM MPAs as areas of particular ecological significance in coastal and maritime spatial planning processes and incorporate their management provisions in spatial plans and Integrated Marine and Coastal Management Strategies, respectively;

Have HELCOM MPAs been included into the coastal and maritime spatial planning processes?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

Have the management provisions been incorporated?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If No to any question above, please provide some further information:

13. update, when necessary, HELCOM MPA related guidelines and guiding documents in order to keep them in line with new knowledge and compatible with other international criteria, such as MSFD requirements, in particular those concerning spatial protection measures

Have the HELCOM MPA related guidelines and guiding documents been updated?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

14. apply the newest IUCN categorisation system when describing the HELCOM MPAs in order to allow for global comparisons of regional networks;

Has the newest IUCN categorisation system been applied when describing the HELCOM MPAs?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information:

15. perform identification, designation and legal protection of HELCOM MPAs according to HELCOMs criteria and guidelines and base all management plans or measures on relevant HELCOM publications such as "Planning and management of Baltic Sea Protected Areas: guidelines and tools" (BSEP 105). For EU Member States the respective EU requirements and guidelines are regarded as adequate for designating and managing HELCOM MPAs

Has identification, designation and legal protection of HELCOM MPAs been performed according to HELCOM criteria and guidelines?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information:

Have management plans or measures concerning HELCOM MPAs been based on HELCOM criteria and guidelines?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information:

For EU MSs, have EU requirements and guidelines been applied?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If No, please provide some further information:

16. modernize the HELCOM MPAs database as agreed in the HELCOM 2013 Copenhagen Ministerial Declaration, taking into account and harmonizing with other similar databases;

Has the database been modernized?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

17. continuously report the most recent numerical and descriptive data on HELCOM MPAs to HELCOMs data systems (HELCOM MPA database, GIS based map and data service);

Has the most recent numerical and descriptive data on HELCOM MPA been reported to the secretariat and the HELCOM MPA Database?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

18. regularly assess the status and development of HELCOMs MPAs according to the time tables set by HELCOM and to ensure that the assessments are applicable for corresponding EU and global reporting;

Has the status and development of HELCOM MPAs been assessed regularly?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_