

Danish Society for Marine Biology

DANISH MINISTRY
OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Environmental
Protection Agency

Forest and Nature Agency



Nordic Council of Ministers

The European Marine Strategy – Nordic & Baltic Perspectives

Organisers observations from the workshop 3-4 November in Copenhagen 2005

The European Marine Strategy

– Nordic & Baltic Perspectives

From the workshop 3-4 November in Copenhagen Denmark 2005

LIST OF PRESENTATIONS and WORKSHOP PROGRAMME:

3. November 2005:

16.00 - 16.15: Opening of the workshop

Kurt Jensen, Chair for The Danish Society for Marine Biology.

16.15 – 18.00: Setting the scene.

1) What are the European Marine Strategy (EMS) and the Maritime Policy and the Implications for the future management of the Seas?

Francois Wakenhut, EU Commission, DG-Environment.

2) Can the EMS solve the problem? What are the future challenges for Science and Management for the EMS?

John Gray, Professor University of Oslo, Norway.

3) New challenges for ICES and for marine managers.

David Griffith, General Secretary, International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.

4. November 2005:

09.00 - 10.15: Theme "THE NATIONAL LEVEL"

Chaired by Hans Lassen, International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.

4) Iceland's policy and North Atlantic Cooperation.

Magnus Johanneson, Permanent Secretary, Ministry for the Environment. Iceland.

5) Swedish Strategy for the Marine Environment.

Sif Johansson, Ph.D., Swedish Environmental Protection Agency.

6) Marine environment, Economic Incentives and Sustainable Development.

*Niels Vestergaard, Professor, Department of Environmental & Business Economics.
The University of Southern Denmark.*

10.30 – 11.45: Theme "THE REGIONAL LEVEL"

Chaired by Knut F. Kroepelien, Ministry of The Environment, Norway.

7) Putting science into management of a marine region that stretches from the Baltic to the Arctic Seas.

Katherine Richardson, Professor, University of Aarhus, Denmark.

8) Large Marine Ecosystems of Europe and the Ecosystem Approach to their management

Hein Rune Skjoldal, Director of Research Department, Institute of Marine Research, Norway.

9) European Marine Strategy from a regional point of view

Alan Simcock, Executive Secretary, OSPAR commission.

12.45 – 14.00: Theme "THE LOCAL LEVEL"

Chaired by Tonny Niilonen, Danish Environmental Protection Agency

10) Can the EMS and the national strategies really make a difference in the region?

Peter Blanner, Marine & Fisheries Officer, World Wildlife Foundation, Denmark.

11) Trends in eutrophication patterns in relation to EMS, examples from Finnish coastal waters.

Cecilia Lundberg, Ph. D., Åbo Academy, Finland.

14.15 – 15.05: Theme "MONITORING"

Chaired by Valerie Forbes, Roskilde University, Denmark.

12) New Monitoring and need for future marine management in the Regional Marine Strategy to come.

Bo Riemann, Director of Research Department, National Environment Research Institute, Denmark.

13) Monitoring, modelling and assessment *sensu* the European Marine Strategy.

Jesper Andersen, Chief Environmental Consultant, DHI Water & Environment, Denmark.

14) Linking fisheries management and ecosystem conservation in context of the EMS.

Ole Vestergaard, Scientific Project Manager, Danish Institute for Fisheries Research.

15.05 – 15.45: Discussion, conclusions & next steps.

Chaired by Hein Rune Skjoldal, Institute of Marine Research, Norway.

16.00: Closing of the Workshop.

The European Marine Strategy

– Nordic & Baltic Perspectives

From the workshop 3-4 November in Copenhagen Denmark 2005

ORGANISERS' OBSERVATIONS

The workshop presented speakers from the EU Commission, ICES, OSPAR, national administrations, universities, research institutions, and private consultants and attracted about 100 participants.

An introductory presentation dealing with the background and the proposal for a Framework Directive for the Implementation of the European Marine Strategy (EMS) was followed by three sessions dealing with national, regional and local level respectively. The final session was devoted to future monitoring.

Welcome to the EMS

The EMS proposal was generally appreciated. It was acknowledged that the EMS could constitute a useful framework with wide implications for future work on the protection and conservation of the marine environment in Europe and for a strengthened regional co-operation in Europe using existing institutional arrangements. The strategy should also be used to strengthen co-operation on marine research and monitoring and to push for the implementation of an ecosystem approach.

Governance

Many mechanisms for dealing with the marine environmental problems have been developed at international and EU level, mainly in a sector-wise way. There is therefore, a need for an integrated approach in order to solve the problems in a sustainable way. The proposed EMS directive provides such an approach, and since it is a legally binding instrument, the EU Commission will be able to enforce implementation.

The EMS will help to put focus on fisheries as components of the marine ecosystem, but it was noted that the regulation of EU fisheries must be conducted under the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP). Hence, there is a need for better integration of fisheries and environmental objectives towards long-term sustainable use of resources. During the discussion it was questioned whether the Regional Advisory Committees (RACs) could also deal with environmental and nature conservation issues. This would be time consuming and would possibly cause problems at national level.

The link between the EMS Directive and the Water Framework Directive (WFD) is not clear. It can be foreseen that several measures will be needed to improve the status of marine areas in relation to land-based activities (such as oxygen depletion) and these should be provided under the WFD.

Main problems

The main threats to the marine environment were identified as caused by fisheries (habitat destruction, impacts on species, reduction of stocks), agriculture (nutrients) and industry

(hazardous substances). Many regulating measures have been launched but implementation and enforcement are often weak. The EMS aims to put focus on the main issues and to force Member States (MS) to identify and implement measures.

Good Environmental Status (GES)

The proposal establishes a framework for the development of marine strategies to achieve "good environmental status" (GES). GES is not defined in the text but generic descriptors will be developed by a Committee procedure. Definitions of GES are supposed to emerge at regional level and must be approved by the Commission. An intercalibration phase (like that under the WFD) is not included in the proposal, but would have been useful to ensure a common understanding of GES and the elaboration of common goals.

Ensuring consistency

Several of the activities and concepts under the EMS proposal are already in place and should be used. Characterisation, assessment and analysis of pressures and impacts (§7) are done under the Regional Marine Conventions OSPAR and HELCOM and establishment of environmental targets should correspond with or supplement the targets being established under the WFD and the Habitats Directive.

Generally, different wording for similar issues are used under the EMS, the WFD and the Habitats Directive. Characterisation and assessment of GES (Annex II) should correspond to the WFD and be based on typology and should use the Ecological Quality Objectives (EcoQOs) being developed by the regional conventions.

When approving the Marine Strategies the Commission should ensure consistency between the objectives established by the EMS Directive, the WFD and the Habitats Directive for bordering or overlapping areas.

Science and research

The demand for good science is great and knowledge must be improved. Fisheries science is well developed and the advice given to politicians is scientifically sound. Fisheries management has, however, failed because the political decisions do not follow the scientific advice, mainly for socio-economic reasons. It seems that the Fisheries Commissions are old fashioned and operate in a sector-wise way. Fisheries management problems should be solved by taking environmental issues into account and possibly by improved communication between scientists, managers and fishermen who in principle should have common interests and goals.

Marine research is dispersed and more international co-ordination is needed. Research should be multi-disciplinary and science, monitoring and policy/decision making should be

The European Marine Strategy

– Nordic & Baltic Perspectives

From the workshop 3-4 November in Copenhagen Denmark 2005

linked. Fisheries and environmental research should be linked. More research is needed on impacts of fisheries and fishing gear on biodiversity and habitats, habitat loss and environment - fish stock productivity interactions (contaminants and climate change). There is also a knowledge gap on benthic habitats and resilience effects.

The overall question is: Do we have the knowledge to develop measures with reference to targets? Scientific work supporting the EMS should be included in the EU 7th Framework Programme.

Monitoring

The monitoring programmes are not scientifically up-to-date and must be improved. A variety of programmes exist all over Europe and the diversity is large. Programmes overlap and duplicating and the sampling frequencies are not optimal. Some programmes are not able to identify trends within 10 - 25 years.

Monitoring programmes should be hierarchical and include modelling. The challenge is to develop operational indicators and to integrate information from monitoring and results from modelling. Marine management needs operational models and data.

The new generation of marine monitoring strategies will be closely linked to the EU directives and it is important to integrate the monitoring programmes under the EMS and the WFD.

Worry was expressed as regards (lack of) funding of the development and implementation of future monitoring programmes.

Cooperation

According to the EMS proposal, the EU Member States must develop and implement Marine Strategies, but the collective responsibility for the Marine Regions is not acknowledged. It is important to avoid re-doing work that has already been done and in that respect ensure sufficient cooperation between different regional organisations, in particular regarding transboundary pollution. A special issue is cooperation with third countries where enforcement could be a problem.

Management of marine resources

Resources are not utilised in an optimal way. Countries where marine resources contribute substantially to the national economy cannot afford to fail in marine management. The resources of the sea are overexploited and must be managed in a sustainable way based on the ecosystem approach and the precautionary principle.

Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)

MPAs are considered as a useful tool in both fisheries management and ecosystem conservation. MPAs may help to alleviate marine environmental problems such as habitat loss,

biodiversity reduction and removal of large individuals in fish stocks. Mapping of sensitive, vulnerable and important areas and development of a strategy for their protection is needed. More research is needed regarding optimal design, location, timing, size and number of MPAs for the conservation or protection of habitats. There is also a need to develop better tools for monitoring and evaluation of MPAs.

Economy and Cost-benefit considerations

The value of ecosystems is often first realised when they cease to function. The marine ecosystem is a capital good and provides valuable goods and services. Human impacts affect functions of and interactions in ecosystems and threaten the production of services. As for fisheries, the rate of economic return from investment in the fish stocks should be made higher in order to make incentives for the fishermen to protect and conserve the marine resources.

A decision support system (NEST) being developed under the MARE project combines cost calculations with nutrient and fish models and can be used for scenario evaluation.

Cost-benefit calculations in relation to nutrient reductions in the Baltic Sea showed benefit differences between Baltic countries; Poland, for example, would have a negative balance. This will certainly affect political decision-making.

Timetable

The proposed timetable is long and does not correspond with those of the Habitats Directive and the WFD. It is important to ensure that existing initiatives and implementations are not undermined or delayed due to the EMS.

Information

Condensed information needs to be provided to the public. Making the public participate and understand that unsustainable use of resources is not acceptable will support the political will to make the right decisions. Understanding is the key to good management and the EMS will support development towards better-informed policy-making.

Recommendations

The process of developing the EMS strategy and proposal has taken several years. It is now important to ensure that it is included in the agenda of the Council with a view to adopting it.

Because the proposal as it stands does not define GES, it is impossible to estimate the cost. It is felt that this will hamper national political support for the proposal. Hope was expressed that more specific sets of characteristics and criteria from previous drafts would be reinstated during the Council negotiations.

It is important that the wording for similar issues under the EMS, the WFD and the Habitat Directive is harmonised. Characterisation and assessment of GES must correspond to the use of "typology" and "good ecological status" *sensu* the

The European Marine Strategy – Nordic & Baltic Perspectives

From the workshop 3-4 November in Copenhagen Denmark 2005

WFD and mapping and classification of “marine landscapes” and “nature types” in order to assess favourable conservation status *sensu* the Habitats Directive.

The development of new and improved monitoring methods is needed and more efforts should be put into research on the mutual impacts of fisheries and environmental conditions.

Emphasis and support should be given to international co-ordination and cooperation on research and monitoring programmes.

There is a need for increasing public awareness and understanding of the marine environment and the intentions of the proposal.

Claus Hagebro
Rapporteur

The European Marine Strategy

– Nordic & Baltic Perspectives

From the workshop 3-4 November in Copenhagen Denmark 2005

General overview of the proposed EMS Directive:

- § 1: **Subject-matter**
Establishment of framework for the development of Marine Strategies designed to achieve Good Environmental Status (GES)
- § 2: **Definition of scope**
- § 3: **Marine regions/Sub-regions**
- § 4: **Plan of action for establishing Marine Strategies** *(incl. timetable)*
- § 5: **Coordination and cooperation**
- § 6: **Competent Authorities** – Annex I
- § 7: **Initial assessment** – Annex II
(Characteristics, pressures and impacts, socio-economic analysis)
- § 8: **Determination of Good Environmental Status (GES)** – Annex II
(determine sets of characteristics for GES)
- § 9: **Establishment of environmental targets** – Annex III
(Establish a comprehensive set of environmental targets and associated indicators)
- § 10: **Establishment of monitoring programmes** – Annex II + IV
(Establish and implement coordinated monitoring programmes for ongoing assessment of GES)
- § 11: **Approval of framework elements**
- § 12: **Programmes of measures** – Annex V
(Identify cost-effective and technical feasible measures to be taken to achieve GES)
- § 13: **Special areas** (derogations)
- § 14: **Information**
- § 15: **Approval of programmes of measures**
- § 16: **Updating**
- § 17: **Interim reports**
- § 18: **Public consultation and information**
- § 19: **Commission reports**
- § 20: **Review of the directive**
- § 21: **Technical adaptations**
- § 22: **Committee**
(help the Commission to:
 - *lay down generic qualitative descriptors, detailed criteria and standards for the recognition of GES*
 - *adopt specifications and standardized methods for monitoring and assessment)*
- § 23: **Transposition**
- § 24: **Entry into force**

The European Marine Strategy

– Nordic & Baltic Perspectives

From the workshop 3-4 November in Copenhagen Denmark 2005

List of Participants – 3rd November 2005

Name	Prenome	Affiliation	e-mail
Ammendrup	Jon	Nordic Council of Ministeres	jam@dfu.min.dk
Andersen	Jesper	DHI, DK	
Andersen	Michael	Danmarks Fiskeriforening, DK	ma@dkfisk.dk
Andersen	Ole Norden	Luscus, DK	luscus@mail.dk
Andersen	Thomas Torp	University of Aarhus, DK	thomas.t.andersen@biologi.au.dk
Berggreen	Ulrik, Chr.	Forest and Nature Agency, DK	ucb@sns.dk
Bertelsen	Mette	ICES	mette@ices.dk
Birkeland	Mads Joakim	Dansk Biologisk Laboratorium, DK	birkeland@hotmail.com
Bjerre	Finn	Miljøkontollen, DK	fibjer@mff.kk.dk
Bjørnstad	Linda K.	Fisker og Kystdepartementet, NO	linda.bjornstad@kfd.dep.no
Blanner	Peter	WWF, DK	p.blanner@wwf.dk
Brozek	Morten	Storstrom County, DK	tmmbr@stam.dk
Bruntse	Grethe	Sønderjylland County, DK	gbr@sja.dk
Bundgaard Madsen	Harley	Fyn County, DK	
Börjesson	Lena	Miljökontoret i Helsingborg, SE	
Carew	Andrea	The Fisheries Secretariat, SE	andrea.carew@fishsec.org
Daell	Lisbet	Vejle County, DK	ldk@vejleamt.dk
Dahl	Steen Ø.	Hedeselskabet, DK	sda@hedeselskabet.dk
Edelvang	Karen	DHI, DK	kae@dhi.dk
Filskov	Jonathan	Dansk Biologisk Laboratorium, DK	jonathanfilskov@gmail.com
Flensborg	Anette	Danish Dir. Fish, DK	afd@fd.dk
Forbes	Valerie	Roskilde University, DK	vforbes@ruc.dk
Glob	Elsebeth	Fyn County, DK	
Gray	John	University of Oslo, NO	j.s.gray@bio.uio.no
Griffith	David	ICES	david@ices.dk
Gudjonsson	Asmundur	Nordic Council of Ministeres	ag@norden.org
Göransson	Peter	Miljökontoret i Helsingborg, SE	peter.goransson@helsingborg.se
Hagebro	Claus	Rapporteur, DK	head@weconsult.dk
Hansen	Flemming	DHI, DK	
Hansen	Lisbet Poll	DONG, DK	lph@dong.dk
Haugaard	Jette	Forest and Nature Agency, DK	jhg@sns.dk
Hugason	Kristinn	Fiskeriministeriet, IS	kristinn.hugason@sjr.stje.is
Iversen	Per Erik	Norwegian Pollution Control, NO	per-erik.iversen@sft.no
Jensen	Kurt	DONG, DK	kuje@dong.dk
Jensen	Poul N.	Århus County, DK	pnj@ag.aaa.dk
Jensen	J. Nørrevang	ICES	jorgen@ices.dk
Johannesen	Odma	Min. Food, Agric. & Fisheries, DK	ojo@fvm.dk
Johanneson	Magnus	Ministry of Environment, IS	
Johansen	Steen	Dansk Biologisk Laboratorium, DK	sback@worldonline.dk
Johansson	Sif	Swedish EPA, SE	sif.johansson@naturvårdsverket.dk
Jürgensen	Carsen	COWI, DK	
Jørgensen	Henrik	Sønderjylland County, DK	hgj@sja.dk
Karlsson	Magnus	Miljökontoret i Helsingborg, SE	
Karm	Maria	Danish Soc. For Mar. Biol., DK	
Kindt-Larsen	Lotte	University of Copenhagen, DK	lol@dfu.min.dk
Knudsen	Helle H.	NIRAS, DK	hkh@niras.dk
Kroepelien	Kurt	Ministry of Environment, NO	kkkr@md.dep.no
Larsen	Lena	ICES	lena@ices.dk
Lassen	Hans	ICES	hans@ices.dk
Laursen	Jens	Sønderjylland County, DK	jsl@sja.dk
Laursen	Martha	Ringkjøbing County, DK	vammb@ringamt.dk

The European Marine Strategy

– Nordic & Baltic Perspectives

From the workshop 3-4 November in Copenhagen Denmark 2005

List of Participants – 3rd November 2005

Name	Prenome	Affiliation	e-mail
Leonhard	Simon B.	Bio/consult as, DK	sbl@bioconsult.dk
Lisbjerg	Dennis	BIOS, DK	dl@biospublishing.com
Lundberg	Cecilia	Åbo Akademi, FI	cecilia.lundberg@abo.fi
Mjølnærød	Ingrid Bysveen	Norw. Dir. For Nature Mangmt, NO	ingrid-bysveen.mjolnerod@dimat.no
Möllmann	Christian	Danish Inst. F. Fish. Res., DK	cmo@difres.dk
Nicolaisen	Jan	Hedeselskabet, DK	jnc@hedeselskabet.dk
Nielsen	Martin Reinfeldt	Greenpeace, DK	
Nielsen	Poul Erik	Forest and Nature Agency, DK	pen@sns.dk
Niilonen	Tonny	Danish EPA, DK	
Nordemann	Poul	Aarhus County, DK	
Olausson	Jessica Hjerpe	Natl Board of Fisher., SE	jessica.hjerpe@fiskeriverket.se
Olesen	Michael	Marine Biological Laboratory, DK	molesen@bi.ku.dk
Olsen	Jóhanna	Miljø, Levnedsmiddel og Veter, FO	johanna@hfs.fo
Paulsen	Helge	DIFRES/NCM	hep@dfu.min.dk
Pécseli	Maria	Forum Skagerrak II, DK	amt.mape@nja.dk
Pedersen	Cathrine Bøgh	Fyn County, DK	cbp@fyns-amt.dk
Petersen	Anders Højgård	Private, DK	andershp@webspeed.dk
Petersen	Verner Hastrup	Storstrom County, DK	vhp@vm.stam.dk
Petterson	Karin	Adm. Board Västra Göta, SE	karin.petterson@o.lst.se
Ranner	Herwig	IMI Bruxelles, BE	herwig@imieu.org
Rasmussen	Thomas	Sønderjyllands County, DK	thr@sja.dk
Richardson	Katherine	University of Aarhus, DK	richardson@biology.au.dk
Riemann	Bo	National Env. Res. Inst., DK	bri@dmu.dk
Robson	Mike	DONG, DK	mro@dong.dk
Schwærter	Steen	Vejle County, DK	ssc@vejleamt.dk
Selck	Henriette	Roskilde University, DK	selck@ruc.dk
Simcock	Alan	OSPAR	Alan@ospar.org
Skjoldal	Hein Rune	Institute of Marine Research, NO	hein.rune@imr.no
Skyt	Pernille Holm	Energi E2, DK	pnh@e2.dk
Smith	Annie	Birdlife International, UK	annie.smith@rspb.org.uk
Smith	Susan	Natl Board of Fisher., SE	susan.smith@fiskeriverket.se
Strömngren	Sten	Danish Dir. Fish, DK	str@fd.dk
Svensson	Narné	Swedish Maritime Adm., SE	narine.svensson@sjofartsverket.se
Søndergård	Jan	Greenpeace, DK	jan.soendergaard@nordic.greenpeace.org
Sørensen	Thomas Kirk	Danish Inst. F. Fish. Res., DK	tkh@dfu.min.dk
Trolle	Camilla	Danish EPA, DK	cht@mst.dk
Tuovinen	Eero	Prime Minister's Office, FI	eero.tuovinen@vnk.fi
Van Deurs	Mikael	Danish Inst. F. Fish. Res., DK	m.g.v.d@mail.tele.dk
Vestentoft	Jeppe	Danish Maritime Authority, DK	jtv@dma.dk
Vestergaard	Niels	University of Southern DK, DK	nv@sam.sdu.dk
Vestergaard	Ole	Danish Inst. F. Fish. Res., DK	osv@dfu.min.dk
Wakenhut	Francois	DG-Environment, EU	Francois.WAKENHUT@cec.eu.int
Warberg	Rikke	Vejle County, DK	rwa@vejleamt.dk
Weile	Klaus	Dansk Biologisk Laboratorium, DK	dbl@danskbiolab.dk
Wennersten	Ronald	Royal Institute of Technology, SE	rw@ket.kth.se
Wennström	Mikael	Länstyelsen Åland, FI	mikael.wennstrom@la.aland.fi
Wichmann	Henrik	Forest and Nature Agency, DK	hew@sns.dk
Wilken-Jensen	Helle	University of Copenhagen, DK	hnnwj@mail.dk
Wiene	Iben	University of Copenhagen, DK	iben.wiene@mail.dk
Wiese	Metta	Private, DK	m_gekko@yahoo.com
Aarefjord	Hilde	Norwegian Poll. C.A., NO	hia@sft.no

The European Marine Strategy

– Nordic & Baltic Perspectives

From the workshop 3-4 November in Copenhagen Denmark 2005

“EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM”

Text-cuts from Commissions Proposal [COM (2005) 505 final]

The process with stakeholders

“In short, what emerges from this process is an unambiguous message that Europe's seas and oceans are at high risk and efforts to protect them need to be urgently set up to safeguard their long term productivity and thus marine-related economic and social activities.”

The Problem

“The principal threats to the marine environment that were identified include effects of climate change; impacts of commercial fishing; oil spills and discharges; introduction of non-native species; eutrophication and the related growth of harmful algal blooms; litter pollution; contamination by dangerous substances and microbiological pollution; radionuclide discharges; and noise pollution.

Climate Change and fisheries were highlighted as two of the most important pressures on the marine environment.”

Summary of the proposed action

“The end objective of the proposed Directive is to achieve good environmental status of the marine environment by 2021. The proposed Directive will only define common objectives and principles at EU level. The proposed Directive will establish European Marine Regions as management units for implementation. For their marine waters within each Region, Member States will be required to develop Marine Strategies on the basis of the completion of a number of steps. In developing Marine Strategies, Member States will be invited to co-operate actively among themselves and also with relevant third countries. Finally, in order to take into account the particular contexts of certain Marine Regions, the Directive foresees special situations and areas where it would be impossible for a Member State to achieve the level of ambition of the environmental targets set in the framework of the Directive.”

The European Marine Strategy

– Nordic & Baltic Perspectives

From the workshop 3-4 November in Copenhagen Denmark 2005

FURTHER INFORMATION:

ABOUT THE WORKSHOP:

Ulrik Chr. Berggreen. E-mail: ucb@sns.dk tel (+45) 3947 2939

Or The Danish Society for Marine Biology (dsfmb) e-mail: Danishsfmb@yahoo.co.uk or send to DSFMB, Christiansdal 52, DK-2610 Rødovre

HOME PAGES:

Workshop: www.dsfmb.dk

EMS: <http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/water/marine> (Strategy) + (Directive) + (Impact Assessment)

THE WORKSHOP WAS ORGANISED BY:

The Danish Society for Marine Biology (dsfmb), The Danish Ministry of the Environment:
Danish Environmental Protection Agency (MST) and Danish Forest and Nature Agency (SNS),
in co-operation with the Nordic Council of Ministers.