**Technical and administrative**

**support for the joint implementation**

**of the MSFD in Bulgaria and**

**Romania - Phase 3**

**Draft Final Report**

Specific contract No 11.0661/2016/SFRA/729388/ENV C.2

**Final Report**

June 2014

Word_ATKINS_MASTER_CMYK_HORIZ_rel3





|  |
| --- |
| The main authors of this report are Eduard Interwies, Stefan Görlitz, Thomas Dworak. This report is provided under the Framework Contract ENV/D.2/FRA/2012/0017  **Milieu Ltd**. (Belgium), Milieu Ltd. (Belgium), Chaussée de Charleroi 112, B-1060, Brussels.  Tel: 32 2 506 1000; Fax 32 2 514 3603; e-mail: [claire.dupont@milieu.be](mailto:claire.dupont@milieu.be) and [sarine.barsoumian@milieu.be](mailto:sarine.barsoumian@milieu.be); web address: www.milieu.be  **Fresh Thoughts Consulting** Auhofstrasse 4/7, 1130 Vienna (Austria)  Mobile: 0043 (0)676 9715509; email: [thomas.dworak@fresh-thoughts.eu](mailto:thomas.dworak@fresh-thoughts.eu); web address: www.fresh-thoughts.eu |

Contents

[1 Introduction 4](#_Toc475012126)

[2 Challenges for achieving the objectives of the project 5](#_Toc475012127)

[3 Final results of the project 7](#_Toc475012128)

[3.1 Task 1 - Consolidating the information basis 7](#_Toc475012129)

[3.2 Task 1.1 Development of the "Roof Report on Common Indicators" 7](#_Toc475012130)

[3.2.1 Step 1: Agreement on the structure of the Roof Report - report and key achievements 7](#_Toc475012131)

[3.2.2 Step 2 (Comparative Analysis) - report and key achievements 8](#_Toc475012132)

[3.2.3 Step 3 (In-depth analysis) - report and key achievements 8](#_Toc475012133)

[3.2.4 Step 4 (Review and Update) - report and key achievements 8](#_Toc475012134)

[3.2.5 Step 5 (Writing the Roof Report) - report and key achievements 9](#_Toc475012135)

[3.2.6 Coordination with EEA, OSPAR, HELCOM, BSC and WG DIKE 10](#_Toc475012136)

[3.3 Task 1.2 - Maintaining the information exchange platform 11](#_Toc475012137)

[3.4 Task 2 - Capacity-Building Events 11](#_Toc475012138)

[4 Recommendations and potential next steps 12](#_Toc475012139)

[5 Management 13](#_Toc475012140)

[5.1 Status of task execution 13](#_Toc475012141)

[5.2 Meetings held and reports submitted 14](#_Toc475012142)

[5.3 Difficulties and problems faced 14](#_Toc475012143)

[5.4 Adjustment or corrective measures taken 15](#_Toc475012144)

[6 Annex 1: Final Roof Report on Common Indicators 16](#_Toc475012145)

[7 Annex 2: Indicator factsheets 17](#_Toc475012146)

[8 Annex 3: Internal Summary Report II (Task 1.1, Step 3) 18](#_Toc475012147)

**Abbreviations**

Black Sea SAP Black Sea Strategic Action PlanBG Bulgaria

BSC Black sea Commission

CoD Costs of Degradation

CBE Capacity Building Event

ESA Economic and Social AnalysisGES Good Environmental Status

HELCOM Convention Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area

IA Initial Assessment

M Project Month

MSCG Marine Strategy Coordination Group

MSFD Marine Strategy Framework Directive 2008/56/EO

Marine Litter RAP Marine Litter Regional Action Plan

RO Romania

OSPAR Convention Convention for the protection of the marine environment of the north-east Atlantic

# Introduction

This is the draft Final Report of the project "Technical and administrative support for the joint implementation of the MSFD in Bulgaria and Romania - Phase 3" (Specific contract No 11.0661/2016/SFRA/729388/ENV C.2)

The draft Final Report provides DG Environment with information on the work performed in the context of this project, providing details of the work carried out under Task 1.1 (the development of the Roof Report on Common Indicators), Task 1.2 (information exchange platform) and Task 2 (the CBEs) and also includes recommendations for further work in Romania and Bulgaria for implementing the MSFD, in particular related to the Roof Report addressing Art. 8, 9 and 10.

The work done is described for each task in a general way to avoid too much unnecessary text, as most tasks have already been described in previous reports. However, tables and lists of "key achievements" demonstrate clearly that the individual tasks were all carried out satisfactorily.

The objectives of this project were to provide technical and administrative support for:

1. Ensuring a comprehensive and clear delivery by Bulgaria and Romania of all elements required by the MSFD reporting in 2018 either at regional (Part A "Roof Report") or national level (Part В reporting) and coherence between European, regional and national assessments; and
2. Six Capacity Building Events (CBE) in the Black Sea marine region with the view to strengthening the administrative and technical capabilities in Bulgaria and Romania for joint MSFD implementation.

Within each of these objectives, the identification of financing needs (to underpin the implementation of Article 22 MSFD) as well as of future implementation support needs (for example to guide future research and other support projects) for a successful MSFD implementation shall be considered, as and when appropriate.

This 3rd phase of the Commission’s support to Bulgaria and Romania took into account the results of the previous phases: Phase I, which focused on monitoring programmes (finalised in January 2015) and Phase II, which aimed to develop coordinated or joint Programmes of Measures (finalised February 2016).

Specifically, this meant that the comparative analysis in Step 1 of Task 1.1 included overview tables of the revised GES and target definitions for the MSFD descriptors in RO and BG, developed on the basis of these two initial phases. Also, the results of the monitoring could be used partly in the identification and development of common indicators and thresholds.

However, due to the updated/new GES decision, a complete revision of GES and targets is currently taking place in both countries, making some of the Phase I and II results obsolete.

# Challenges for achieving the objectives of the project

The main challenges over the course of the project were the uncertainties surrounding the revision of the GES Decision 477/2010 and the lack of availability of comprehensive status and monitoring information from both BG and RO. Several monitoring results for both Member States (MS) will only be available in February 2017 after finalisation of the ongoing project. Also, as both countries are just finalizing their PoMs, the view is more focussed on the first implementation cycle rather than on the second.

Nevertheless, the exchange of knowledge and experience during the CBEs has been judged by both MS as extremely valuable because there is currently no other practical forum to exchange on the national approaches and experiences to build a basis for a common approach to implementt the MSFD and to create a Roof Report. For example, under the current project (Phase III) Bulgaria shared with Romania the results oftheir national project “Investigations on the State of the Marine Environment and Improving Monitoring Programs developed under MSFD” (ISMEIMP). It is important to continue such exchange in the future to further develop the Roof Report and to coordinate the further development and implementation of joint and / or common GES definitions, environmental targets, indicators and threshold values not only at bilateral level but at regional level. Such coordination is also essential for producing common Art. 8.1c assessments.

A further challenge was the fact that there is insufficient budget in both countries to carry out the relevant data gathering exercises and assessments to improve the knowledge base needed to establish the scientific evidence for defining or updating GES, environmental targets and assessing status. However, the CBEs provided a valuable forum to discuss the methodological challenges related to developing the evidence base. Technical expertise, quality checks (e.g. approach in line with updated GES Decision) and thepresentation of approaches taken by other Regional Sea Conventions (RSCs), provided by the consortium is considered as an important factor in steering the overall process of updating results of Art. 8, 9 and 10.

Finally, there are some legal barriers (e.g. different definition of coastal assessment areas, set thresholds in legislation) that do not yet allow a common approach to some aspects of MSFD implementation and which cannot be resolved in the context of project.

The basis for common targets and status assessments are common indicators. So far, the following common indicators and thresholds between Bulgaria and Romania have been identified.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Addressed in its entirety in the Roof Report | | | Addressed partially in Roof Report (i.e. a common indicator is included, but it does not address all aspects of the criterion) | | | | Addressed at national level | | |
| Pressure Descriptors | | | | | | | | | | |
| D2C1 | ✓ | | |  | | | |  | | |
| D2C2 |  | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| D2C3 |  | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| D3C1 | ✓ | | |  | | | |  | | |
| D3C2 |  | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| D3C3 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D5C1 |  | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| D5C2 |  | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| D5C3 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D5C4 |  | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| D5C5 | Not yet clarified whether D5C8 will be used instead of D5C5 in Bulgaria and Romania | | | |  | | | ✓ | | |
| D5C6 |  | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| D5C7 |  | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| D5C8 | Not yet clarified whether D5C8 will be used instead of D5C5 in Bulgaria and Romania | | | | | | | | | |
| D6C1 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D6C2 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D6C3 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D7C1 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D7C2 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D8C1 | ✓ | | |  | | | |  | | |
| D8C2 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D8C3 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D8C4 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D9C1 | ✓ | | |  | | | |  | | |
| D10C1 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D10C2 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D10C3 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D10C4 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D11C1 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D11C2 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| Environmental Status Descriptors | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | M | B | F | M | | B | F | M | B | F |
| D1C1 | ✓ |  |  |  | |  |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| D1C2 | ✓ |  |  |  | |  |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| D1C3 | ✓ |  |  |  | |  |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| D1C4 | ✓ |  |  |  | |  |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| D1C5 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D1C6 |  | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| D6C4 |  | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| D6C5 |  | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| D4C1 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D4C2 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D4C3 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |
| D4C4 |  | | |  | | | | ✓ | | |

Note: M = mammals; B = birds; F = fish.

In the Roof Report, indicator factsheets are included for common indicators agreed between Bulgaria and Romania. Depending on the availability of information from monitoring programmes, the indicator factsheets have been completed to different stages. For some, the assessments will need to be completed by Bulgaria and Romania after the end of this support contract.

# Final results of the project

## Task 1 - Consolidating the information basis

The main objective of Task 1 was to support Bulgaria and Romania in building the information basis for a more coherent and comparable joint implementation of the MSFD. In addition, the aim was to support the comprehensive delivery of all elements required for the MSFD reporting in 2018 as well as for successfully conducting the public consultation (Article 19 MSFD).

This objective has been achieved through two main activities:

1. The preparation of a joint "Roof Report on Common Indicators" and “Indicator Factsheets”, which describe the common elements and approaches between Romania and Bulgaria; and
2. The maintenance of the EEA’s information exchange platform, which was set up in Phase I of the support project.

## Task 1.1 Development of the "Roof Report on Common Indicators"

In both Bulgaria and Romania, there is currently no specific plan regarding the 2018 update of the reports under Art. 8, 9 and 10 MSFD. The implementation of monitoring programms in 2017 has been planned, including data collection for human activites, pressures and impacts for updating of GES assessment, as well as planinng of national budget for actualization of the reports in 2018.

Hence, the work under Task 1.1 was an important supporting activity, but not an end product as such. It was a preparatory type of activity, discussing possible elements of the Art. 8, 9 and 10 reports to be updated in a coordinated way and showing possible ways forward until the final deadline for reporting in 2018.

Additionally, the work of Task 1.1 was strongly interlinked with EU-level developments, as the Roof Report aims to reflect both the revised COM Decision on GES (2010/477/EU), the updated Annex III and the Art. 8 Guidance (which will be based on the revised COM Decision), as well as any formal requirements and data formats regarding the 2018 update. However, the revision of the COM Decision is still subject to the European Parliament’s opinion, and a more detailed proposal for the reporting will be developed by the EEA for discussion on 1-2 March at the 14th meeting of WG DIKE. The proposal for the reporting will be revised and finalised during the joint meeting of WG DIKE/GES/POMESA on 27th April, with the aim of finalising, if possible, the reporting sheets and guidance that will be sent to the MSCG for endorsement at their April 2017 meeting. So, by the end of the project no final documents on reporting were available for use in Task 1.1.

### Step 1: Agreement on the structure of the Roof Report - report and key achievements

In Step 1, a preliminary structure of the Roof Report was developed and agreed with Romania and Bulgaria based on the preliminary outline proposed in the consortium´s project proposal. The draft structure was further discussed and developed at the CBEs until CBE4, as developments both on the European as well as national level made several changes necessary (e.g. the adaptation of how to structure the common indicators to the various versions of the revised COM Decision).

The final structure of the Roof Report was agreed between CBE4 and CBE5.

Key achievements of Task 1.1, Step 1:

* Agreement on a final structure of the Roof Report.

### Step 2 (Comparative Analysis) - report and key achievements

Through the "comparative analysis", the information base for the further work was established by assessing and analyzing all available EU and national reports on MSFD implementation in Bulgaria and Romania, in particular the:

* the COM’s Article 12 national and regional technical assessment reports, including the assessment of monitoring programmes in the version available in May 2016;
* the specific recommendations for Bulgaria and Romania included in the Commission Staff Working Document on the first phase of implementation of the MSFD;
* the JRC’s “In-Depth Assessment of the EU Member States’ Submissions for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive under Articles 8, 9 and 10”;
* the agreed Action Plan (for BG) to fill the gaps noted in the Article 12 assessment;
* the Phases I and II final reports/results; and
* the national Article 8, 9, 10 and 11 reports/information, and the draft PoMs.

Missing information on national developments were collected via an "Assessment Sheet". The results were summarized in a coordinated "Internal Summary Report I" and updated overview tables on GES, targets and indicators for both countries.

Key achievements of Task 1.1, Step 2:

* Finalizing the comparative analysis and summarizing the results in the Internal Summary Report.
* Updating the overview tables on GES, targets and indicators to the current status.

### Step 3 (In-depth analysis) - report and key achievements

Based on the information base established in Step 2, the in-depth analysis assessed documents regarding "common indicators" and related topics (i.e. the most recent developments in Bulgaria and Romania, mostly in terms of on-going and planned research and monitoring projects; the most recent EU developments on the revision of the GES Decision and Annex III; the Article 8 Guidance; work of the BSC and other RSCs on common indicators).

Also, the analysis of the reporting requirements and the recording of any changes to GES and the "distance to target" due to the implementation of the PoMs of both countries was carried out in this Step.

Key achievements of Task 1.1, Step 3:

* Assessing the draft version of the Art. 8 reporting guidance and discussing it at CBE1.
* Closely following the developments of the revision process of COM Decision 477/2010 and MSFD Annex III and continually adapting the Roof Report and structure to it.
* Assessing OSPAR and HELCOM documents and plans for Roof Reports and common indicators.
* Assessing on-going research projects (to be found in Annex III as part of the attached Internal Summary Report II).

### Step 4 (Review and Update) - report and key achievements

Based on the information and data gathered in Steps 2 and 3, Step 4 tackled the actual update of Art. 8, 9 and 10 elements, as well as the coordination and designation of common indicators between Bulgaria and Romania.

As far as possible, the updated process followed the five steps as indicated in the Terms of Reference (see table below).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Step 4 | Progress made during this project |
| Review and Update of GES and Articles 8, 9 and 10 | Completed as far as possible as shown in the the Roof Report |
| Develop set of assessment areas | Common understanding of the assessment areas for WFD coastal waters and open waters |
| Mapping of the relevant human activities | Mapping of pressures and activities has taken place as far as data has been made available. Some issues are still outstanding as indicated in the draft Roof Report |
| Mapping of the pressures in the marine environment, assessment of their impacts (Art. 8.1b) in relation to the different ecosystem elements to be assessed under Art. 8.1a. |
| Assessment of the current environmental status of the ecosystem elements | Status assessment has been discussed for the Descriptors. Clear picture on what will be covered in part A and B of the Roof Report. Status assessment provided for indicators under D1-Mammals, D3, D8, D9. D5 is under preparation and will be completed by the end of the project.  Note: Indicator factsheet for D1 – Marine mammals was preprared describing available information on EU project carried out in 2014, but this is a very preliminary status assessment with low confidence. |
| Assessment of the uses of the marine waters, and of the costs of degradation | Topic was addressed and discussed at CBE 6, list of marine uses /human activities has been compiled and included in the Roof Report. Recommendations for further work are provided |

While initially planned to start late in the project´s timeline, several aspects of the work done under Steps 2 and 3 initiated the planned work for this step earlier than planned. For example, during the review of the definitions of GES, targets and indicators (Step 2), a first convergence analysis was performed at CBE1 with the aim of identifying the Art. 8, 9 and 10 elements that are already harmonized and those that could potentially be defined in a harmonized way (in BG and RO). Also, in the course of the planning of the CBEs, the descriptors with the highest potential for harmonized definitions of GES and criteria, targets and indicators were identified. Also, at CBE1 the approach regarding assessment areas used by HELCOM was presented, and a general comparison of existing assessment areas in Bulgaria and Romania was made. The discussion was continued at the CBE2 on the general level and on the descriptor level. Future work in BG and RO will aim to harmonise the assessment areas under the MSFD with the coastal water bodies under WFD in both countries.

The work of updating Art. 8, 9 and 10 and identifying and designating common indicators was then mainly done with the assistance of respective national scientific experts at the CBEs 2 to 6 (see Task 2 below for details).

Key achievements of Task 1.1, Step 4:

* Identification of descriptors to focus on in each CBE and planning of CBEs accordingly. All descriptors were addressed in the CBEs, but the sequence was determined by the availability of results of the on-going projects.
* Initial work and exchange of information regarding the “nested assessment areas” approach.
* Identification and designation of common indicators for several Descriptors.
* Specification and detailing the chosen common indicators with thresholds (where possible) via the newly developed indicator factsheets.

### Step 5 (Writing the Roof Report) - report and key achievements

This step encompasses all work related to the actual writing of the Roof Report. The mature version of the Roof Report as set out in the Annex contains:

* Information on the aspects included in the Roof Report and aspects that will be addressed on the national level.
* State-of-play of common GES definitions.
* State-of-play of common targets.
* Information/Maps of human activities as far as they are available[[1]](#footnote-2).
* Indicator factsheets for common indicators, completed as far as possible. and

Common assessments for Descriptors 3, 5, 8, 9 and D1-Mammals.

Key achievements of Task 1.1, Step 5:

* Preparation of the final draft of the Roof Report.
* Development of indicator factsheet structure.
* Assessments of some common of the indicators, the results of which was fed into the relevant indicator factsheets.
* Incorporate Bulgarian, Romanian and COM comments and production of the final version.

### Coordination with EEA, OSPAR, HELCOM, BSC and WG DIKE

The work under this task has also been coordinated with other relevant organisations as describedbelow:

* The EEA wascontacted several times to align with the 2018 reporting requirements related to WISE-Marine. As mentioned before, no final documents on reporting could be used in Task 1.1 as the EEA and WG DIKE are still working on this file.
* HELCOM and OSPAR were contacted to ensure coherence in approaches in developing the Roof Report In addition, the aim was to learn from the approaches taken in these sea basins. As shown in the Internal Summary Report II (see Annex), these two RSCs have progressed much further than others and provided an important input to the work in Phase III. Also, a representative from HELCOM participated at CBE1 via video conferencing to describe HELCOM´s approach with regard to assessment areas and the Baltic Roof Report.
* The Black Sea Commission (BSC) wasinvited to the kick-off meeting and the first two CBEs, but the invitations were rejected. Romania presented the project during the Pollution and Monitoring Assessment Advisory Group (PMA AG) on 8-9 September 2016 and members were asked to join the meetings. The reaction was positive but members of PMA AG never attended a meeting.
* The approaches towards the development of common indicators under HELCOM, OSPAR, UNEP/MAP and the BSC were additionally assessed using documents and sending specific requests to the RSCs.
* A briefing note was prepared and presented to WG DIKE at their meeting on 7.12.2016. The note can be found at <https://circabc.europa.eu/d/a/workspace/SpacesStore/64061dc2-282c-42a6-9305-4d643fbefb86/DIKE_13-2016-04_BG-RO_2018roofreport_MilieuBG-RO.doc>
* Draft versions of the reporting guidance documents, in particular regarding Article 8, have been used. This was possible since the consultant in charge of supporting the Commission in drafting these guidance documents is also a part of this project’s consortium.

***Deliverables***

D1.1: Agreed Structure and Content of the Roof Report (concrete outline, content, related data needs and formats used) (planned for month (M) 2; see Interim Report and the draft final version attached to this final report in Annex I).

D1.2: "Mature" Roof Report forming the regional part of the BG and RO MSFD reporting requirement in 2018 (first draft M9, final draft M10, final M11; see Annex I).

D1.3: Reports of the meetings relevant for Task 1.1 (see http://projects.eionet.europa.eu/black-sea-marine-region-documents/library/phase-iii/task-2).

## Task 1.2 - Maintaining the information exchange platform

ATKINs set up an internal and document area on EIONET. In the internal area, all drafts and internal documents are and will be stored (access is only granted with an EIONET password). In the external area, all finalised deliverables have been stored. Support has been given to the RO/BG focal points to get access to the relevant folders.

Furthermore, the EEA has been contacted to discuss their time plan and work on developing WISE-Marine and implementing the reporting requirements. As mentioned before, the final reporting requirements will only become available in April 2017; therefore, a revision of the Roof Report and the indicator fact sheets might be necessary once the documents become available.

***Deliverable***

D1.4: The deliverable of this task was the continuous maintenance of the platform. Relevant documents of the project can be found on the platform.

## Task 2 - Capacity-Building Events

Six CBEs have been held with the aim to exchange information and build capacities of RO/BG experts to help update the Art. 8, 9 and 10 assessments and to draft a first version of the Roof Report.

The CBEs have had an essential role in the project as they have been the only chance to exchange information and coordinate MSFD implementation between the two countries. Each descriptor was discussed according to the following points:

* Review of GES definitions and discussion of the need for/plans for any update (Art. 9) and specification of coordination possibilities.
* Review of Art. 10 (targets/indicators), discussion and identification of any need/plans for revision/updates and specification of coordination possibilities.
* Gap analysis against latest version of revised Commission Decision on GES (criteria and methodological standards).
* Plan for updating the results of Art. 8 (a or b, as appropriate) in line with GES definition if appropriate; identify and agree on common indicators (and tresholds if possible) for the Roof Report (review existing common indicators, modify if possible, identify additional potential common indicators); spatial scale/assessment areas for analysis; data analysis required to feed into the Roof Report/assessment, responsibilities and timelines.

A lot of conceptual work has been achieved at the CBEs (such as identification and development of common indicators and thresholds and according factsheets, ways of finding common assessment areas, common mapping of certain pressures, common version of the Roof Report, transboundary assessments of the status of D1-Mammals, D3, D5, D8, and D9), even though few data are yet available for carrying out assessments. National public and scientific experts have been present at the CBEs, which is seen as very important by all participants, as both countries used this opportunity to discuss their national approaches and to learn from each other. Both MS stressed several times that these meetings are the only possibility for a deeper exchange between them.

***Deliverable***

D 2.1 to 2.6: The planning document with the agreed agendas for the CBEs, including the meeting notes, the presentations given at the meetings and the lists of participants can be found at <http://projects.eionet.europa.eu/black-sea-marine-region-documents/library/phase-iii/task-2>.

# Recommendations and potential next steps

[needs an update when RO/BG has sent all data discussed]

Below are recommendations on what work is still needed to finalise the Roof Report in 2018:

**General recommendations**

Both countries have started to implement the requirements of the revised GES Decision (i.e. adapting former GES/target/indicator descriptions or devising new ones). This process is currently progressing at different speeds in Romania and Bulgaria;Bulgaria has progressed further with the alignment. Both countries should continue this work and should exchange further, in particular to define common indicators, thresholds (if appropriate), assessment methods, GES and targets.

This requires also improving the marine status assessment and monitoring in both countries, in particular in relation to criteria covered, geographical coverage and number and frequency of sampling. Most important would be to establish continuous (joint or at least coordinated) monitoring programmes for all descriptors, instead of monitoring infrequently and on an *ad hoc* basis, which is currently the case.

As the financial situation in both countries is very limited, both MS together with EC should investigate potential funding options to help finance monitoring and status assessments.

On the descriptor level, the table below shows where the main focus of the work in both countries should be targeted:

[table below will be updated when RO/BG has sent all data and reviewed the draft roof report]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | GES defined according to the new GES Decision | Targets to be defined | Improve monitoring |
| D1-Fish |  |  |  |
| D1-Mammals |  |  |  |
| D1-Birds |  |  |  |
| D1-Seabed Habitats |  |  |  |
| D1-Water Column Habitats |  |  |  |
| D2 |  |  |  |
| D3 |  |  |  |
| D4 |  |  |  |
| D5 |  |  |  |
| D6 |  |  |  |
| D7 |  |  |  |
| D8 |  |  |  |
| D9 |  |  |  |
| D10 |  |  |  |
| D11 |  |  |  |

The MS name in the cell indicates which MSthe recommendation is addressed to.

**Recommendations related to common assessment areas**

During the project, the discussion on common assessment areas for coastal, shelf and open waters has led to a common understanding. For MSFD coastal waters, the definition of assessment areas will require further discussion at the scientific level to better align the different views and designations. In particular, this relates to aligning the WFD coastal water bodies with the MSFD coastal assessment areas. This is being pursued in both countries but there is no final conclusion yet.

**Mapping of human activities and pressures**

[needs an update when RO/BG has sent all data discussed]

**Assessment of the current environmental status of the ecosystem elements**

[needs an update when RO/BG has sent all data discussed]

**Recommendations related to Art. 8.1c:**

As it is currently unclear in both Romania and Bulgaria[[2]](#footnote-3) if and how the Initial Assessment (IA) and the Economic and Social Analysis (ESA), including the Costs of Degradation (CoD) will be updated and/or renewed in 2018, only some general recommendations can be made:

* First, financial support to jointly coordinate the work on updating results of Art. 8.1c documents should be obtained, at least for the initial phase of such an update, to ensure coherence of the approaches.According to both countries, without financing there would certainly be two completely separate reports.
* Second, the countries should be clear about the scope of a possible update of the ESA and the CoD analysis as part of the IA update. There are different options:
* to perform only an update of the data/information provided, which would be the least intensive option;

to "restructure" the sectors/themes and adding (and analyzing) more sectors, which would be a more intensive option; or

* to use completely new approaches, e.g. for the CoD, which would be the most labour-intensive option.

# Management

## Status of task execution

The table below gives an overview on status of each task:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Task 1: Consolidation of the information basis | Progress made | Work planned towards the final report |
| Task 1.1 Development of the roof report |  |  |
| Step 1: Agreement on the structure of the Roof Report | Completed. |  |
| Step 2: Comparative analysis | Completed. |  |
| Step 3: In-depth Assessment of reporting requirements | Completed as far as possible. |  |
| Step 4: Review and Update of GES and Articles 8, 9 and 10 Reports | Completed as far as possible. |  |
| Step 5: Write Roof Report | Draft attached to the report. | Revise and finalise based on Commission, RO and BG comments. |
| Task 1.2 Maintaining information exchange platform | Set up and maintenance of EIONET page. | Maintenance. |
| Tasks 2: Capacity-building activities |  |  |
| Step 1: Agreement on topics of capacity building events | Completed. | - |
| Step 2: Development of detailed content and planning | Completed. | - |
| Step 3: Identification of experts | Relevant experts participated in the 6 CBEs. | - |
| Step 4: Organisation of events | Completed. | - |
| Step 5: Execution of events | 6 events executed. | - |
| Step 6: Collection and analysis of feedback and drafting the final capacity building report | Feedback collected at each of the events and constant exchange on the planning of the CBEs with RO/BG NfPs and the project team. | Finalising the final report for CBE 6. |

## Meetings held and reports submitted

The table below summarises the reports submitted and meetings held in the context of the project:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reports | Date |
| Draft interim report (including summary report task 1.1/Step 2) | 30.6.2016 |
| Final interim report (including summary report task 1.1/Step 2) | 29.7.2016 |
| Progress report | 07.11.2016 |
| Second internal summary report (task 1.1/Step 3) | 29.11.2016 |
| Draft final report | 06.02.2017 |
| Final report | 06.03.2017 |
| Meeting | **Dates** |
| CBE 1/task 1.1 meeting (agreeing on the structure of the roof report) | 31.05.16-1.6.2016 |
| CBE 2/additional task 1.1 meeting (Step 3 questionnaire/information) | 5-6.7. 2016 |
| CBE 3 | 299-30.9.2016 |
| CBE 4/task1.1 meeting (discussion of Step 3) | 2-4.11.2016 |
| CBE 5 /task 1.1 Meeting (roof report drafting meeting and updating Articles 8, 9 and 10) | 16-17.1.2017 |
| CBE 6 | 24-25.1.2017 |
| Progress meeting | 11.11.2016 |
| Final meeting (with Steering Group) (in Brussels) | 21.2.2017 |

## Difficulties and problems faced

The implementation of this project was affected by the following factors:

* The PoM in BG was only finalised on 28.12.2016, and in RO the PoM is still be developed. The work on the PoM was very often the main focus of both countries during the project, which led to technical, financial and human resource capacity constraints that affected to ability to progress on the 2018 updates under Art. 8, 9 and 10 elements to the full extent.
* The lack of finalized PoMs also had a negative impact on the Art. 8, 9, and 10 work, both at the national level as well as for the support project, as it remained unclear what the improvements on the status of the marine environment (due to planned measures) will be. Also, the setting of the environmental targets was also influenced by by the uncertainty in the improvements on status.
* The responsible authorities are significantly understaffed. Three people in BG are responsible for the implementation of both WFD (marine issues) and MSFD; no other institutions were really involved in the MSFD implementation. In RO the MSFD implementation is mainly done by one person, who is supported by the director in the national Ministry.
* Both countries strongly rely on technical support from universities, national research institutions and consultancies for any work involving GES, targets, indicators and monitoring. Almost all technical work related to the implementation of the MSFD at national level is handed over on a project basis to such institutions. While in BG several projects have started and have delivered results, in RO the work started but results can only be expected after the end of the project.
* The long process of revising the COM Decision 2010/477 also made it difficult for RO and BG to develop their work in line with the decision, as there is not yet a finally agreed version available (still subject to Parliament decision). Furthermore, the latest version of the revised COM Decision allows MS to set threshold values after 2018 for certain reasons. RO and BG have decided to make use of this allowance for some indicators/descriptors. This reduced the ability to fully implement the steps set out in the ToR.

## Adjustment or corrective measures taken

In order to find solutions to the above-mentioned issues, a progress meeting was held on 11.11.2016 between the Commission, RO/BG NFPs and the consultants. During the meeting, the situation wasdiscussed and a way forward was agreed. This way forward was submitted in written format to the Commission and also provides the basis for the final report.

As the Roof Report cannot be fully completed during Phase III, the consultants have proposed recommendations on future work need for the finalisation of the Roof Report, including how to cover the aspects of Art 8, 9 and 10 (see section 4).

# Annex 1: Final Roof Report on Common Indicators

The draft final Roof Report can be found at http://projects.eionet.europa.eu/black-sea-marine-region-documents/library/phase-iii/final-report/draft-final-version-06022017/draft-roof-report

# Annex 2: Indicator factsheets

The draft final indicator factsheets can be found at <http://projects.eionet.europa.eu/black-sea-marine-region-documents/library/phase-iii/final-report/draft-final-version-06022017/draft-indicator-factsheets>

# Annex 3: Internal Summary Report II (Task 1.1, Step 3)

The final Internal Summary Report II can be found at <http://projects.eionet.europa.eu/black-sea-marine-region-documents/library/phase-iii/final-report/draft-final-version-06022017/internal-summary-report-ii>

1. The “Cross-Border MARitime Spatial PLANning in the Black Sea Project” will deliver updates to the information provided so far, but due to the delays this information will only become available after the project ends. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. In Bulgaria, it is planned to update the Initial Assessment in 2018, and funding has already been aquired from the national budget (not approved yet). ESA and CoD will be a part of the IA update;). In Romania, there is no planning yet with regard to an update/another Initial Assessment. In 2018 RO will start to assess the environmental status, although it is difficult because the programme of measures is not in force. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)