



Document title	“Actions still needed” considered for inclusion in the joint documentation on regional coordination of PoMs based on input from State and Conservation
Code	3J-5-Rev.1
Category	CMNT
Agenda Item	3J – Follow-up of HELCOM agreements and activities
Submission date	10.11.2015
Submitted by	Secretariat

Background

This revision document contains the correct topics suggested by State and Conservation (not including the topic ‘physical loss and damage to the sea floor’).

The State and Conservation Working Group considered the request from the Gear Group to provide technical input on potential joint actions and regional measures indicated on the list of “Specific topics in need of further regional coordination” provided by GEAR 10-2015.

The request was addressed at State and Conservation 2-2015, further elaborated during an intersessional online meeting on 1 September 2015, and finalized through written procedure. Four topics were addressed by the Group:

- Spatial protection measures
- Conservation, restoration and reintroduction of species
- Selective extraction and by-catch of species
- Input of contaminants; related to assessment of hazardous substances

Poland contributed as Lead Country to the topic related to by-catch.

A GEAR IG PoM workshop was held on 28 October 2015 with the aim of finalizing the proposal on topics for further regional coordination (“Actions still needed”) with the view of including them in the [Joint documentation on regional coordination of programmes of measures](#) (the Joint documentation) being developed under the GEAR Group. The workshop was attended by Chairmen of HELCOM PRESSURE and HELCOM RESPONSE (skype participation), Co-Chair of HELCOM State and Conservation (Nature Conservation) and Vice-co-Chairman of HELCOM/VASAB MSP WG, together with representatives from Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Lithuania, Poland and Sweden, as well as CCB and Oceana as HELCOM Observers.

A few actions were not recommended by the workshop for inclusion in the Joint documentation as either they are already ongoing or require additional consideration ([Memo GEAR IG PoM Workshop 1-2015](#)). The workshop fine-tuned the remaining actions, in a common refined template. The Workshop proposed that the updated proposals for actions still needed originating from the State and Conservation working group, as contained in this document, should be considered by State and Conservation 3-2015. The Joint documentation will be submitted on 18 November for consideration at HOD 49-2015.

Action required

The Meeting is invited to:

- take note of the fine-tuned actions as contained in this document,
- provide comments by 17 November to the Secretariat (marta.ruiz@helcom.fi).

“Actions still needed” considered for inclusion in the Joint documentation on regional coordination of PoMs based on input from State & Conservation

Section 4.2 – Inputs of synthetic and non-synthetic contaminants and systematic and/or intentional releases of substances (Poland)

a) Micropollutants in effluents from wastewater treatment plants

Row no.	Actions still needed to reach the target(s)	
1	Name of action / measure:	Micropollutants in effluents from wastewater treatment plants
3	HELCOM type of action	d. i; Data c. ii. Assessment e.
4	Type of coordination (as defined in the Joint Document): (1) regional coordination of national measure, (2) regional measure, (3) sub-regional measure, (4) joint regional action in relation to third parties	2
5	Short description of the action / measure including its purpose and a description of the mechanism of how the action / measure improves the state of the environment	Micropollutants despite low (ng/L to µg/L) concentrations in environmental samples, due to their environmentally hazardous properties including for example high persistence, high toxicity to aquatic organisms, or endocrine disrupting properties, may pose risk to the environment. WWTPs’ effluents are a significant pathway of micropollutants to the environment, in particular for those that originate from household products and -articles, or personal use. As the real environmental situation with regard to those pollutants remains unknown, survey based on existing national data, screening studies and monitoring programs should be considered as a first step. The other activity should concentrate on evaluation of novel WWT techniques by compiling existing information on e.g. feasibility, costs, and good practice.
6	Spatial coverage (e.g. European, whole Baltic Sea, sub-basin(s))	The Baltic sea (and possible coordination with OSPAR)
7	Recommended start and duration, if appropriate, of action / measure (temporal coverage)	During 2016
8	Contribution of the action / measure to achieve the target (possibly including reference to available studies on effectiveness)	The activities are aimed on identification of micropollutants problem scale facilitating the analysis of the need for future measures in the BSR countries as well as indicate possible and feasible measures.

9	Proposed activities for implementation (very briefly) e.g. technical requirements, milestones including reference to ongoing activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Step 1: Compilation and assessment of available information and data of micropollutants of concern for Contracting Parties in the Baltic Sea – during 2016 (PRESSURE) • Step 2: Compile information from CPs of treatment techniques and experiences– during 2016/7 • Step 3: Summary report on advanced treatment techniques, including consideration of feasibility, costs, good practice and management options – during 2017
10	Obstacles to implementation (at regional and CP level)	Lack/incompleteness of national data on micropollutants

Section 4.4 – Spatial protection measures (Finland)

- a) Coordination of management measures of pressures and impacts on MPAs, in particular for adjacent transnational MPAs

Row no.	Actions still needed to reach the target(s)	
1	Name of action / measure	Coordination of management measures of pressures and impacts on MPAs, in particular for adjacent transnational MPAs
3	HELCOM type of action	b. Management coordination ii. Plans, guidelines and manuals
4	Type of coordination (as defined in the Joint Document): (1) regional coordination of national measure, (2) regional measure, (3) sub-regional measure, (4) joint regional action in relation to third parties	Not applicable. (Regional coordination of management of MPAs)
5	Short description of the action / measure including its purpose and a description of the mechanism of how the action / measure improves the state of the environment	<p>HELCOM Recommendation 35/1 (para m) recommends that HELCOM MPA related guidelines and guiding documents should be updated as necessary in order to keep them in line with new knowledge and compatible with other international criteria</p> <p>Coordinated management guidelines for the same pressures in the same area gives adjacent transnational MPAs better and more comprehensive protection of species the marine nature values in these areas.</p>
7	Recommended start and duration, if appropriate, of action / measure (temporal coverage)	<p>Provide a first insight to coordination of management of measures in adjacent transnational MPAs by 2016.</p> <p>If the action is expanded to include a review and revision of HELCOM guidelines for management plans in general (point 9, step 3), the action is estimated to take several years and will need implementation through a project.</p>

8	Contribution of the action / measure to achieve the target (possibly including reference to available studies on effectiveness)	When management plans in adjacent transnational MPAs are well coordinated the pressures can be dealt in a cost-effective way in the whole area. The action will contribute to achievement of HELCOM Recommendation 35-1,
9	Proposed activities for implementation (very briefly) e.g. technical requirements, milestones including reference to ongoing activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) identify adjacent transnational MPAs using HELCOM MPA database and invite Contracting Parties to inform on any contacts between MPA managers. 2) make an inventory of the steps and management measures that Contracting Parties have already taken in MPAs, e.g. concerning fisheries and shipping. 3) investigate if existing management guidelines relevant for the Baltic Sea provide sufficient guidance to address pressure and impacts, including HELCOM guidelines and those related to the Habitats and Birds Directive, and as need may arise identify where HELCOM can provide complementary guidance, in particular for management of transnational MPAs. <p>The activity should be carried out linked to the development of conservation plans for e.g. HELCOM Red listed species, also considering the adequate protection of species in adjacent MPAs.</p> <p>The information in the HELCOM MPA database should be up to date regarding the MPA management plans, including for transnationally located MPAs. Network for managers responsible for these MPAs should be established.</p>
10	Obstacles to implementation (at regional and CP level)	There may be no management plans for these areas and not enough resources to do the work
6	Spatial coverage (e.g. European, whole Baltic Sea, sub-basin(s))	Baltic Sea

b) How to consider MPAs in Maritime Spatial Planning and vice versa

Row no.	Actions still needed to reach the target(s)	
1	Name of action / measure	How to consider MPAs in Maritime Spatial Planning and vice versa
3	HELCOM type of action	b. Management coordination ii. Plans, guidelines and manuals
4	Type of coordination (as defined in the Joint Document): (1) regional coordination of national measure, (2) regional measure, (3) sub-regional measure, (4) joint regional action in relation to third parties	Not applicable. (Regional coordination of MPA/MSP processes).

5	Short description of the action / measure including its purpose and a description of the mechanism of how the action / measure improves the state of the environment	The Ecosystem approach provides guiding principles for Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP). MSP is to consider any restrictions and regulations to MPAs provided through MPA management plans. Some activities are however allowed within MPAs, while conservation objectives may be affected by activities causing pressure outside the MPAs. Thus, MPA/MSP interaction is not delimited by the MPA borders and there is a need to consider activities both inside and outside MPAs in the MSP context and vice versa.
7	Recommended start and duration, if appropriate, of action / measure (temporal coverage)	The action could start in 2016. Tentatively development of regional guidelines (see point 9) could take up to 3 years.
8	Contribution of the action / measure to achieve the target (possibly including reference to available studies on effectiveness)	MPAs will be properly taken into account in MSPs and vice versa contributing to the application of HELCOM-VASAB Regional broad scale regional MSP principles.
9	Proposed activities for implementation (<u>very</u> briefly) e.g. technical requirements, milestones including reference to ongoing activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Contracting Parties in HELCOM VASAB MSP WG could be invited to inform on how MPAs have been considered so far in national MSP plans as well as any background information already compiled by the group with a view to sharing information with State and Conservation. 2) set up a workshop or back-to-back meeting with State and Conservation and HELCOM-VASAB MSP Working Group to discuss how the action can be jointly taken forward. <p>The workshop could explore options for how to acknowledge MPAs in MSP and vice versa (possible options are protocol/guidance, amended workplans, ad hoc meetings etc. In the longer-term some form of joint regional guidelines could tentatively be developed.</p>
10	Obstacles to implementation (at regional and CP level)	There is little experience in establishing national MSP
6	Spatial coverage (e.g. European, whole Baltic Sea, sub-basin(s))	Baltic wide mainly

- c) Develop joint tools/approach for assessing effectiveness of spatial protection measures for individual sites as well as network level

Row no.	Actions still needed to reach the target(s)	
1	Name of action / measure	Develop joint tools/approach for assessing effectiveness of spatial protection measures for individual sites as well as network level
3	HELCOM type of action	3. b. Management coordination iii. Assessment tool

4	Type of coordination (as defined in the Joint Document): (1) regional coordination of national measure, (2) regional measure, (3) sub-regional measure, (4) joint regional action in relation to third parties	Not applicable. (Regionally coordinated approach to assess effectiveness of measures).
5	Short description of the action / measure including its purpose and a description of the mechanism of how the action / measure improves the state of the environment	HELCOM Recommendation 35/1 calls for assessing “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 “ (para k).
7	Recommended start and duration, if appropriate, of action / measure (temporal coverage)	The action could start in 2016 but the start will depend on resources. It can be noted that HELCOM is partner to a 2015 Life+ application where development of an approach to assess management effectiveness of MPAs is included.
8	Contribution of the action / measure to achieve the target (possibly including reference to available studies on effectiveness)	The action will contribute with information on the effectiveness of MPAs and MPA networks for future decision making. The action will contribute to the fulfillment of HELCOM Recommendation 35-1.
9	Proposed activities for implementation (very briefly) e.g. technical requirements, milestones including reference to ongoing activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Meeting to transfer lessons learnt from OSPAR process. 2) Develop criteria on how to assess effectiveness of management for single MPAs and for the network as a whole, making use of work carried out in OSPAR and elsewhere.
10	Obstacles to implementation (at regional and CP level)	To develop an approach to assess effectiveness is considered to require project support.
6	Spatial coverage (e.g. European, whole Baltic Sea, sub-basin(s))	Whole Baltic Sea, and possibly for use in other marine regions as well.

Section 4.5 – Conservation, restoration and reintroduction of species (Secretariat assisted by Germany)¹

- a) Activities to support implementation of draft HELCOM Recommendation [X/X] on Conservation of Baltic Sea species categorized as threatened according to the HELCOM Red List

Row no.	Actions still needed to reach the target(s)
1	Name of action / measure Activities to support implementation of draft HELCOM Recommendation [X/X] on Conservation of Baltic Sea species categorized as threatened according to the HELCOM Red List ²

¹ Filled in by Secretariat based in input from State and Conservation WG.

² Note that there is a study reservation on the current draft Recommendation. The Recommendation will be addressed again at HOD 49-2015. The analyses are only relevant to initiate after the adoption of the Recommendation.

3	HELCOM type of action	b Management coordination ii. Plans, guidelines and manual, v Follow-up assessment of agreed actions and plans
4	Type of coordination (as defined in the Joint Document): (1) regional coordination of national measure, (2) regional measure, (3) sub-regional measure, (4) joint regional action in relation to third parties	Not applicable. (Regional coordination of analyses and development of guidelines to support the implementation of HELCOM Recommendation).
5	Short description of the action / measure including its purpose and a description of the mechanism of how the action / measure improves the state of the environment	<p>The [draft] HELCOM Recommendation on Conservation of Baltic Sea species categorized as threatened according to the HELCOM 2013 Red List contains a set of actions aimed at improving the state of Red listed species in the Baltic Sea. For effective implementation of the Recommendation several supporting analyses are planned to be undertaken with the view of coordinating measures as relevant (State and Conservation 1-2014) (see point 9).</p> <p>-</p> <p>In addition, the State and Conservation Working Group should develop “by 2017 guiding documents on conservation, recovery or action plans and/or related management measures for HELCOM threatened species or species groups and their habitats”. These guidelines will directly support the implementation of the Recommendation and the improvement of HELCOM Red listed species.</p>
6	Spatial coverage (e.g. European, whole Baltic Sea, sub-basin(s))	Analyses and guidelines will be developed with a Baltic Sea perspective, however to consider a wider geographic perspective as needed for migratory species. Coordinated measures could furthermore be relevant on a sub-basin scale.
7	Recommended start and duration, if appropriate, of action / measure (temporal coverage)	At adoption of the Recommendation (tentatively in December 2015). Estimated 2 years implementation time of actions.
8	Contribution of the action / measure to achieve the target (possibly including reference to available studies on effectiveness)	The action will contribute to the BSAP goal to reach “A favorable conservation status of Baltic Sea biodiversity” and more specifically to the implementation of HELCOM Recommendation [X/X] aiming at the protection and conservation measures for HELCOM threatened species.

9	Proposed activities for implementation (<u>very</u> briefly) e.g. technical requirements, milestones including reference to ongoing activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) to make an inventory of existing measures that will contribute to the improved status of threatened species and biotopes/habitats and analyze if they are sufficient to improve the state of those species 2) based on this gap analysis; identify the need for new measures and for which new measures it could be suitable to consider joint measures (regional plans) or coordinated measures (coordination of national measures) 3) Development of by 2017 guiding documents on conservation, recovery or action plans and/or related management measures for HELCOM threatened species or species groups and their habitats
10	Obstacles to implementation (at regional and CP level)	<p>State and Conservation Working Group to lead the activities. Agreed analyses on existing measures to be carried out by Contracting Parties. A Lead Country approach to be considered for development of the guidelines. It should also be considered to set up an intersessional HELCOM group to address conservation of species and habitats.</p> <p>Adoption of the Recommendation</p>

Section 4.7 – Selective extraction and incidental by-catch of species (Poland)

- a) Adjustment or utilization of EU data collection framework to retrieve data for assessments and the development of management measures related to by-catch of species

Row no.	Actions still needed to reach the target(s)	
1	Name of action / measure	Adjustment or utilization of EU data collection framework to retrieve data for assessments and the development of management measures related to by-catch of species
3	HELCOM type of action	<p>a. Measures v. Joint actions with the aim of influencing international regulations</p> <p>b. d. Data and information i. Data</p>
4	Type of coordination (as defined in the Joint Document): (1) regional coordination of national measure, (2) regional measure, (3) sub-regional measure, (4) joint regional action in relation to third parties	<p>a v.=4. Joint regional action in relation to third parties</p> <p>For d_i: Not applicable. (Regional coordination of data retrieval).</p>
5	Short description of the action / measure including its purpose and a description of the mechanism of how the action / measure improves the state of the environment ³	<p>HELCOM Input to: the new EC proposal for Data Collection Framework, new multiannual programs for data collection and regional DCF groups.</p> <p>New DCF Regulation has been proposed in July 2015, in order to make DCF compliant with the reformed Common Fisheries Policy. It is proposed that the new DCF Regulation will define the frameworks for EU multiannual programme for data collection, which will be prepared after adoption of a Regulation. Multiannual programme for data collection will define only stable and basic variables, but other parameters will be more flexible and can be changed with time. The role of regional DCF groups in deciding in detail how the data should be collected is strengthened. This approach is in line with regionalisation under the reformed Common Fisheries Policy. Such an EU approach may provide room for more active role for regional stakeholders such as HELCOM, in deciding on data collection in each marine region.</p> <p>This action should contribute to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HELCOM contribution to DCF processes; • Gaining needed data on by-catch for such actions as: management of endangered species, gathering information on threats, carrying out assessments of by-catch. Data could comprise fish species present on coastal waters, particularly those not covered by EU legislation, as well as information on marine mammals and bird by-catch.

³ Cooperation with Russia on the issue of by-catches is needed.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaining needed data on by-catch from chosen fishing fleet segments, recreational fishing; • Indicator development (by-catch indicator- lacking of data, to establish thresholds or environmental limits for by-catch.
6	Spatial coverage (e.g. European, whole Baltic Sea, sub-basin(s))	The Baltic Sea,
7	Recommended start and duration, if appropriate, of action / measure (temporal coverage)	2016 depending on a EU progress on this issue.
8	Contribution of the action / measure to achieve the target (possibly including reference to available studies on effectiveness)	Obtaining data on by-catch of threatened and endangered marine species from DCF will be cost efficient, as these data can be collected together with “traditional” fishing data. Data from by-catch can be used for analysis of pressures assessments of marine environment, and for development of indicators. Consultation with BALTFISH, and cooperation with ICES and ASCOBANS, BSAC needed.
9	Proposed activities for implementation (very briefly) e.g. technical requirements, milestones including reference to ongoing activities	<p>1) Make an inventory of what kind of data from DCF will be useful for Baltic Sea region, and what kind of data will be needed for HELCOM Baltic Sea indicators and environment assessments. Any successful implementation of measures prerequisites an effective monitoring. DCF could be a part of this implementation process.</p> <p>2) Determine how the access to the data coming from data collection could be organised for HELCOM in order to ensure highest standards of primary data protection. New data from recreational fisheries is specifically relevant.</p>
10	Obstacles to implementation (at regional and CP level)	<p>Currently DCF is designed for collecting fisheries data and does not take into account environmental elements. The relevant focus on environmental aspects of new DCF should be ensured.</p> <p>Problems with obtaining by-catch data from commercial and recreational fisheries could appear.</p>

b) Testing alternative fishing gears/fishing techniques to minimize by-catch through joint project/projects

1	Name of action / measure	Testing alternative fishing gears/fishing techniques to minimize by-catch through joint project/projects
3	HELCOM type of action	a Measures. iv HELCOM Recommendations that require implementation through measures and b. Management coordination ii Plans, guidelines and manuals

4	Type of coordination (as defined in the Joint Document): (1) regional coordination of national measure, (2) regional measure, (3) sub-regional measure, (4) joint regional action in relation to third parties	a_iv:= 2 Regional measure For b_ii: Not applicable (Regional coordination of national technical developments to reduce by-catch)
5	Short description of the action / measure including its purpose and a description of the mechanism of how the action / measure improves the state of the environment	The project HELCOM BALTFIMPA aimed at development of a selective and more environmental friendly fishing gears comparing to currently used, has not been continued after failing to obtain LIFE + financing. At the same time, measures in order to minimize negative impact of fisheries on protected species are urgently needed. Therefore, this is a proposal for continuation of activities proposed under HELCOM BALTFIMPA project with special emphasis on minimization of by-catch problem. Several of the topic are already agreed as a work plan of the HELCOM FISH group. MAMBO ⁴ project proposal should be taken into account. Outcome from the project could be provided to BALTFISH.
6	Spatial coverage (e.g. European, whole Baltic Sea, sub-basin(s))	Baltic Sea
7	Recommended start and duration, if appropriate, of action / measure (temporal coverage)	2016-2017
8	Contribution of the action / measure to achieve the target (possibly including reference to available studies on effectiveness)	Information provided by the project should be useful for decision makers to implement measures to reduce by-catch of threatened and endangered species, especially in MPAs.
9	Proposed activities for implementation (very briefly) e.g. technical requirements, milestones including reference to ongoing activities	<p>HELCOM to serve as a coordination body, in cooperation with other relevant bodies, for mainly nationally funded activities regarding alternative gear development and testing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyse traditional fishing gears • Define potential by-catch “hot spots” • Analyse and test usefulness of available alternative fishing gears, • Analyse and test new fishing gears/fishing techniques; • Prepare a HELCOM Recommendation concerning utilisation of alternative fishing gears/fishing techniques for by-catch “hot spots” in the Baltic Sea; • Prepare guidelines for fishing in MPAs, including also by-catch “Hot spots”, as well as education for fishermen.
10	Obstacles to implementation (at regional and CP level)	Relevant financial support for the project coordination should be ensured

⁴ MAMBO project – Management Actions and Conservation Measures for the Baltic Sea Odontocete.