**Draft Minutes 19-20.02.2014** CBE February Bulgaria (Varna)

Completion of monitoring fact sheets (MFS) for D5 and D10 (bilateral event)

The meeting started with the welcome by the representative of BSBD, Mrs. Stela Barova.

See attendance list for participants at the meeting.

Draft agenda was presented and commented. Monitoring fact sheets (MFS) were in the focus and more specifically MFS at program and subprogram level.

Mr. Raben informed the participants about the need for finalization of programme level MFS by 15th May 2014 in time for the public consultation and sub-programme level MFS at 15th September in time for final reporting. He furthermore informed about the possibility to use this exercise to coordinate monitoring between Bulgaria and Romania.

The meeting was informed that EU COM together with the MS have put forward 10 questions from the WG DIKE process regarding information about the monitoring programmes. These questions should be answered when reporting to the Commission on the monitoring programmes (art 11). The newest developments on these questions and on the reporting process will be presented at 9th WG DIKE meeting in Brussels on 26th February 2014. (DIKE\_9-2014-03\_Art11ReportingPackage.doc)

<https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/a/eecfb159-91f7-4c29-8aef-5a6b3a665025/DIKE_9-2014-03_Art11ReportingPackage.doc>

Mr. Parlichev and Mr. Vasiliu presented the MFS for Descriptor 5 – eutrophication for Bulgaria and Romania respectively.

Points from the BG presentation to be further discussed or handled in the MFS process:

* How should the MFS handle existing monitoring and intended (future) monitoring?
* Plans for filling monitoring gaps.
* Mrs. Shtereva said that regarding point 1.4 (Monitoring institutions, BG) not only point sources are objects of monitoring but diffuse sources. What is the responsibility of the National Meteorological institute? Do we have any information from them about N?
* Regarding 2.1 (Relevant monitoring requirements from other directives etc). This section should only state where programme relevant monitoring is carried out and for what purpose
* NiD is relevant. Find out if relevant monitoring is carried out and reported.
* Regarding point 2.4 (GES).The definition of GES as reported for article 9 should be considered here. The question is how the monitoring programs show us how close we are (the distance) to GES?
* The current BG definition of GES (Art.9) is expected to be updated at the end of the year.
* Regarding point 2.5 (Targets). Section should address targets reported under article 10.
* The purpose of the monitoring programme is to show where we are in relation to GES and where should be. The same for the targets.
* About 3.6 (Data Management). QQ/QA should be moved in subprogram level MFS.
* About 4.1 (aggregation of data). This aggregation of data should be in subprogram level MFS.

Additional points from the RO presentation to be further discussed or handled in the MFS process:

* Focus on double monitoring by different monitoring institutions in RO. Optimization possibilities.
* Focus on monitoring efforts for different directives resulting in double monitoring. Optimization possibilities.
* BG and RO to coordinate GES definitions.
* Data availability and access: It was mentioned that the data from BSC is available only by password (Advisory groups members only). Data available from EU only includes data collected for public money.

The draft MFS template was reviewed at the meeting:

General comments:

* Remember to have focus on the number of assessment units defined in the 2012 reporting. If there are separate targets for the various assessment units the monitoring may need to reflect this. If there is a revision of assessment units this needs to be reported to the Commission again in order to take effect.
* Discussion on reason for using the MFS and not the WG DIKE reporting sheets directly. Purpose of MFS is that they facilitate communication and planning and still allow the reporting to be carried out. Communication for public consultation and with other stakeholders (eg industry); between BG and RO for coordination; with the BSC and third countries in the Black Sea; between monitoring institutions and authorities within each country for administration and planning purposes. The reporting sheets are focused on the reporting obligations and are less well suited for communication purposes. The MFS include many (most) of the questions from the reporting sheets.
* Regarding plans and gaps: Think carefully about what is necessary and what is feasible from a resource point of view and when and how monitoring is planned. It is necessary to fulfill the MSFD requirements and at the same time be realistic with regards to capacity and timing.
* Suggested to coordinate description of gaps and plans between BG and RO.

Specific comments

1.1 Subject area: Program name and ID (BLKXX-D5)

1.2 Definition/Description: The important question is what is monitored and why we monitoring these specific items? Distinguish between what is monitored (current programme) and what the gaps are (describe in section 6)

2.1 Necessity: Be precise. Only required monitoring should be stated.

2.2 GES Criteria: Only relevant GES criteria should be mentioned – all criteria which are relevant for the programme.

2.4 and 2.5 GES and Targets: State relevant GEs definitions and targets. How exactly do the monitoring programs address GES and targets. Important is to know the status and distance to GES (similarly with targets). Include relevant targets from other directives (Eg. WFD). Use relevant targets from BSSAP. Do not monitor twice (2.5).

2.6. Spatial allocation – Programme level!

3.1 General description of subprogrammes: Use the excel sheet agreed at the CBE in January 2014 in Constanta. Only a general description of relevant subprogrammes.

5. Quality assurance: Delete section “Subprogram questions”

6. Litterature: Parts of the extensive reference list from RO D5 MFS could be relevant for BG.

7.1 and 7.2 (Activities required to implement the concept: The section need to be expanded to reflect the specific questions in the WG DIKE reporting sheets.

Sub-programmes

The draft MFS- subprogram template was reviewed and partly revised at the meeting:

General comments:

* Suggested to make the MFS (sub-programme a close copy of the reporting sheet and put the same question as in reporting sheet. The advantage of this is that is easy to communicate as stated earlier.
* The sub-programmes will not be published for public consultation. It was pointed out that the closer the design of the MFS the easier it will be to transfer data from the sheet to the electronic reporting system.
* BG: coordination with IO-BAS was difficult (they are not involved in planning process). IO-BAS is not required to do this work and the BSBD (Mr. Parlichev) will have to do the entire reporting. Mr. Parlichev suggests using the EU reporting sheet template for the sub-programmes to reduce the work load.
* For every sub-programme there are a number of sub-programme criteria for which one or mere parameters will be measured. These sub-programme criteria need to be described for each of the questions in the MFS (and reporting sheet). See draft template (due 05.03.2014) for guidance to each question.
* A separate fact sheet should be made for Activities as monitoring of these is different to monitoring of parameters.
* It was suggested to make the sub-programme MFS in excel. One Excel file for each programme and one sheet for each sub-programme.

Specific comments on the elements of current subprogram sheets:

The subprogrammes and subprogramme criteria and parameters are shown in the excel sheet developed at the CBE in January in Constanta: BS-CBE Jan\_MFS Pgm Subpgm\_list\_rev.xlsx

3.3. Access to data:

Military data (not available)

Data already reported trough national environmental agencies should be available

Data collected for commercial purpose may have to be paid for, other data should be freely available.

Discussion on compliance monitoring and operational monitoring and other types of monitoring: Mr Raben suggested to use the definitions in the WG GES Common Understanding paper for definitions of different types of monitoring. (Search for latest version on Internet: "Common Understanding of (Initial) Assessment, Determination of Good Environmental Status (GES) & Establishment of Environmental Targets

(Articles 8, 9 & 10 MSFD)")

Regarding shared monitoring: Focus on possibilities for split of work between Bulgaria and Romania. For this possibility to mature there GES and targets should be aligned as far as possible. It was suggested to look at the reported GES and targets and consider revision and coordination.

To do - D5:

1. We use MFS for program level that has been agreed on by CBE participants
2. Revised factsheet will be sent to the meeting participants on Wednesday 26th February
3. BG and RO to seek accept at relevant level of the revised MFS as these MFS will be used for public consultation.
4. D5 program MFS - all the revisions have to be done and sheets to be exchanged between BG and RO for coordination purposes by 10th March (deadline).
5. The finalization of agreed factsheet will be on 14th March (deadline)

**20.02.2014 Draft Minutes**

CBE MFS D10 and planning of further work.

Presentation by BG and discussion: BG MFS D10

1.5. Additional information BSC, UNEP, Regional seas program of UN. Technical recommendation should not be included here but moved to section 6 Literature.

2.1 Necessity: Very long and thorough list – keep list elsewhere (not in MFS) for reference. Only include directives and other obligations etc that require monitoring of marine litter. Much (most) of the listed text refers to marine litter but has no monitoring requirement. Some of the mentioned directives etc may generate ML data that could be relevant for the ML monitoring programme and could be mentioned. Go through text and reconsider. Some text could be relevant for other MFS (D8).

2.3 Features, pressures and impacts: All pressures and activities which affects the marine environment are mentioned – which are (will be) addressed by the programme;

2.4 GES: Should refer to the definition of GES as reported for article 9. GES definition is not made yet and should be carried out in the future!

2.5 Environmental targets: Overall targets – for beaches, water column and for seabed habitats. Targets need to be developed. Refer to section 7 on gaps and plans. Discussion of possible targets: Stomach content of ML in birds is considered by the authorities but possible targets have not been defined. Relevant protocol is required and should be coordinated with RO. Targets on sources of solid waste. Other targets suggested and need to be developed.

Presentation by RO and discussion: RO MFS D10

1.1 Subject area: BLKRO-D10; LITTER

1.2 Definition/description: Define what the programme is doing – what is addressed?

2.1 Necessity: Check to see if there are any obligations to monitor ML.

Relevant to mention other plans – CoastWatch EU program NGO – is followed and generates monitoring data

2.4 GES: GES is not defined.

3.2 Description of monitoring network: Describe area monitored by trawls (Sulina-Vama-Veche). Include beaches covered. Include one-time monitoring:

ML ingested by fishes (qualitative assessment)-project based; Mare Nostrum

Area monitored: on coast, Cape Midia-Vama-Veche

Parameters monitored amount and character of marine litter; Frequency;

3.5 Threats, activities and measures: List what is covered by the programme. refer to section 7 on gaps and plans for future programme.

3.6 Data management – should be moved to relevant sub-programme sheet. Data/information on beach litter are reported to CoastWatch Europe program (only on request);

4.2 Assessment of GES: Partial data and information

7.1 Changes to the current monitoring program:

To adapt CoastWatch EU program (beach litter) to MSFD requirements.

To include ML program into Integrated National MP. Spatial extent need to be defined.

7.2: Working steps required: Different nets to be used to collect data; improve methodology; equipment needed or better use of existing equipment; regular participation in intercalibration exercises; training courses; workshops;

Anton Krastev made a presentation of the dynamics of ML based on the MISIS project cruise that was carried out at BG, RO and TU coast and used in ML initial assessment. This monitoring was therefore project based.

He explained what ML consist of and how it behaves: Very light ML at the surface and in the water column, we have heavy things on the bottom and micro-particles and litter accumulated on the beach. ML affects birds, humans, mammals.

Sources and accumulation specific for the region. Main BS current goes in southern direction. The main road of ships goes along the coast. The litter comes from rivers, coast and from ships. Currents and waves accumulate ML on the cliffs and in bays on the coast.

Monitoring possibilities: The large objects (barrels) could be detected by sonar. Accumulation on the coast - containers, could be observed by divers. The floating objects observed easy. The largest part of the litter is micro-particles. Very hard to estimate them. We can combine some investigations –algae and micro-particles. Divers during the regular monitoring for microphytes.

Beaches are monitored by some NGOs. This could be incorporated in the monitoring programme.

Further developments of a ML monitoring programme.

Based on the presented MFS there is now an outline of MP of ML for BG and RO. Two monitoring activities are more advanced – beach or coast litter monitoring and seafloor monitoring from trawl surveys. These two activities could be the first part of a ML monitoring programme.

Existing monitoring ML monitoring methods

(ref: Guidance on Monitoring of Marine Litter in European Seas (MSFD Technical Subgroup on Marine Litter, 2013). This document includes an overview of the maturity of each method and the estimated costs.

* List of protocols – Beach litter;
* Floating Visual;
* Floating-manta trawl
* Sea floor IBITS
* Sea floor Video deep-sea floor
* Sea floor divers
* Sea floor- video shallow water
* Micro-particles
* Biota –Birds-ingestion
* Biota plastic litter in nests and entanglement
* Biota-entanglement

Monitoring programme – subprogramme level

There is currently no established monitoring programme in BG or RO. It was decided to focus on the programme level MFS at this CBE.

Revision of MFS D10:

1.5 Additional information: Links to Technical support and coordination projects such as MISIS project and this project are relevant here. Technical support and guidance literature should be put in the literature section (6).

2.1 Necessity: Only include information on directives etc that require or carry out monitoring of marine litter. Regarding BS commitments: BSC –no formal requirements; Decision 2008/949/EC – on demersal trawl is relevant; MARPOL – environmental protection agency monitored, so we take it into account as a potential sources for information; Port Reception Facilities Directive – relevant;

2.2 GES criteria: Only include GES criteria that are addressed by the monitoring programme. Micro particles should be removed as monitoring is too immature at present.

2.3 Features pressures and impacts: Only list elements from Annex III that are addressed by the programme.

Marine litter

**Features:** Habitat types:

-beach/coast

-Seabed

**Pressures**

To be revised by both BG and RO.

It was discussed if both countries should make the same reporting. It was concluded that the skeleton should be the same but that specific features may be different and therefore monitoring may be different.

2.4 GES: The future program will be designed in order to take on board new development of methods, technical procedures and development on regional level (BSC) and EU level.

2.5 Targets: Conclusion on how to present targets:

Overall target – beaches

Overall target – water column

Overall target – seabed

Targets should be state, pressure and/or operational targets (ref: Common understanding document)

2.6 Spatial allocation: Remove references to commitments that do not require monitoring of ML

3.1 Sub-programmes:

Level of pressure source – Criterion litter input from land sources (riverine,etc)

Level of pressures in the marine environment – Criterion Litter characteristics and abundance and microparticle abundance.

3.2 Monitoring network. Include relevant beaches and trawl survey plans.

3.3 Threats: Include relevant human activities

6. Literature: Include relevant guidance documents and task group reports etc.

7. Plans and gaps: Be realistic. What are the gaps, plans and timing? What is required? What is possible now, what has to take place later and what kind of resources will be required to have an adequate monitoring programme?

To do - D5:

1. We use MFS for program level that has been agreed on by CBE participants.
2. Revised factsheet will be sent to the meeting participants on Wednesday 26th February
3. D10 program MFS - all the revisions have to be done and sheets to be exchanged between BG and RO for coordination purposes by 18th March (deadline).
4. The finalization of agreed factsheet will be on 24th March (deadline)

Further planning and upcoming CBEs

Further planning of CBEs and action points were discussed and agreed upon and can be seen in Excel documents: BS\_CBE Jan\_Feb\_Action points 20022014.xlsx and BS-CBE Jan\_Planning CBE\_v7\_20022014.xlsx.

CBE 14 to be confirmed by Velikova 3rd October (Istanbul tentative).

Closure of meeting at 16.50