

Mats Ivarsson
Phone: +46 10 698 62 61
mats.ivarsson@havochvatten.se

REPORT
5/12/2012 Dnr 2091-11

Philip Stamp
Philip.stamp@defra.gsi.gov.uk

PARTICIPANTS: (see Annex 1)

Time: 25th – 26th of October 2012

Place: The Scottish Government
Victoria Quay, Leith
Edinburgh
Scotland
United Kingdom

Marine Strategy Framework Directive: Common Implementation Strategy

Working Group on Economic and Social Assessment

Summary on decisions made

- **MS are invited to submit comments on the draft work programme by Friday 9 November. It is particularly important to have nominations to lead or support the various work streams. The draft would be forwarded to MSCG in the meantime. NL has offered to contribute to the work stream on cost-effectiveness and cost benefit analyses.**
- **WG ESA members are invited to volunteer to join the steering for the joint GES/ESA workshop by 9 November. SE/UK will submit the group's views on objectives to the EC and MSCG. NL has offered to give a presentation on the co-operation between ESA and GES in their work on marine litter. NL also offered to send in some material (a draft cost-benefit analysis) on this issue to be included in the discussion paper for this meeting.**
- **A volunteer (or volunteers) is needed to take work forward on a review of experience in developing the initial assessments. Please contact Mats Ivarsson if you are interested. The aim should be to have the results ready for consideration at the next meeting of WG ESA. NL has offered to take the lead for this.**
- **The results from the UK presentation on experiences from reporting of the MSFD should be sent to the EC to be discussed on the upcoming MSCG meeting on the 13/14 November.**
- **SE will coordinate requests for projects to feed into the EC.**
- **Next meeting to be held back to back with the targets workshop.**

Day 1, Thursday 25th of October, 14:00 – 18:00

Agenda Item 1 – Welcome, Introduction and adoption of agenda

After a brief presentation of the agenda, a table round presentation of the participants was done and the agenda was adopted.

Agenda Item 2 - Commission update - [Joachim D'Eugenio]

Joachim D'Eugenio reported on the state of play in Member State reporting. Article 12 of the MSFD required the EC to make an assessment of Member State reports; this work would be done by the second half of 2013. The focus would be on coherence and whether there had been sufficient progress to enable the Directive's 2020 objective to be met. There would also be some more in-depth analysis done outside of the requirements of Article 12, which would feed into the working groups and Regional Seas Conventions (RSCs).

Marine Directors had discussed and agreed the Common Implementation Strategy work programme for 2012-14. They agreed to establish a Project Coordination Group to improve the coordination of MSFD-related projects and strengthen the role of RSCs. Funding would be available through the environmental pillar of a financial programme supporting the Integrated Maritime Policy. Three framework projects would cover

- coordination between RSCs on the ecosystem approach
- methodological standards for GES
- emerging pressures, human activities and measures

The Project Coordination Group would discuss what activities are undertaken within each of these framework projects. Additional funding had been made available by the European Parliament for research on marine litter and monitoring.

The CIRCA system (where meeting and other documents are archived and accessed) had recently migrated and would now be publicly open. Member States needed to be aware of this and ensure that they respected data protection requirements. It was possible, if necessary, to create a restricted (password protected) section.

Looking forward, Marine Directors would be meeting at the end of November and would discuss progress on reporting. A conference on marine litter was foreseen for 10-11 April and an EU marine conference for end 2013/early 2014.

Joachim informed the group that the main EC lead for the group would be Cyril Michel.

WG-GES: the work has focused on a coherent approach on the determination of GES and setting of targets, the RSCs have been involved primarily in biodiversity, eutrophication and contaminants and disturbances (marine litter and noise). The future work will be in the form of workshops on specific topics rather than new permanent working groups (see the CIS for the MSFD event calendar for 2012). In

2013, Germany has offered to organize a workshop on marine litter and the technical subgroup for underwater noise has offered to organize a workshop on underwater noise, no date has been set for this.

WG-DIKE: Up until the summer 2012, the WG has been focusing on the reporting sheets for article 8-10. After this, the new focus will be towards other aspects of reporting, particularly the implementation of article 19.3 regarding access of the reported data. The group will also start the work with reporting sheets for the programme of measures.

WG-ESA and the work plan for 2012-2014

Among other tasks in the WG-ESA mandate is the role of a forum for addressing other social and economic matters covered by the directive (Annex IV, Art. 13.3 and Art. 14.4): social and economic impacts of targets and measures, cost-effectiveness, cost-benefit analyses, disproportionate costs. It can be concluded that this activity will increase in importance in the years to come.

Agenda Item 3 – WG ESA Work Programme - [Philip Stamp, Joachim D'Eugenio]

Philip Stamp presented a new draft work programme for WG ESA, building on the objectives agreed by Marine Directors. The main development was a new work stream to consider approaches to the development of measures.

Discussion:

Joachim commented that economic questions were becoming increasingly important in environmental policy-making, especially in the current climate. WG ESA needed to keep its expertise alive but on a technical level, where economics helps to achieve the environmental goals.

Whilst several people welcomed it, no comments of detail were made on the content of the proposed work programme.

Action: Philip invited comments to be submitted by Friday 9 November. It was particularly important to have nominations to lead or support the various work streams, otherwise it would not be possible to make much progress. The draft would be forwarded to MSCG in the meantime.

Agenda Item 4 – MSFD and cost effectiveness: options for the WG-ESA work programme – [Eduard Interwies, InterSus – Sustainability Services]

Eduard Interwies (Intersus) drew on experience from the Water Framework Directive in presenting ideas to WG ESA on the work it might do on measures. These could range from quite modest actions to more ambitious forms of guidance, ie:

- A. "pure" exchange of experience on what the MS are doing regarding CE of measures
- B. build the link between WG-ESA and WG-GES regarding the assessment of measures

- C. Review potential common measures (at the EU-level) and give indications on their cost-effectiveness
- D. Produce an "information sheet" similar to the ones done for the WFD-economics
- E. Produce guidance on how to apply CE analysis in the MSFD-context

Based on the experience of WFD, the last of these options was probably not useful.

Discussion;

Joachim commented that, depending on the outcomes of the meeting, there would be some support available to help the group.

Points made in discussion were that

- options A – D all looked useful and were not mutually exclusive;
- there was a need to understand what the initial assessments were saying about pressures, problem areas and hence priorities where measures might be needed;
- account needed to be taken of existing policies and measures; MSFD needed to focus on where there were policy gaps, taking account of the policy baseline/business as usual scenario (we noted that there were various different usages and interpretations of these terms);
- how would coordination between WG ESA and the RSCs work in assessing measures?
- the EC stressed the importance of strengthening the role of the SRCs. It was noted that they play an important role in the CIS by participating in different working groups not always in WG ESA. They should be invited through MSCG, a question will be directed on how they want to participate.
- proposals for measures would come from several different actors; governments, member states, or regional seas conventions. It would not be realistic or appropriate for WG ESA to take a lead responsibility on this.
- in analyzing the need for additional measures to meet MSFD objectives, we need to assume that other policies in the pipeline are fully effective and that analysis of pressures and impacts are key challenges in joining up the economic and ecological side. Assuming 100% achievement, or less than 100%, will give different results, thus the outcome is all about assumptions.
- the EC could do a piece of work on assessing implications from new pressures such as aquaculture, marine minerals, offshore energy and tourism;
- MSFD was about achieving GES at the scale of marine regions but this was often not at the same scale as many measures;

- Some people found that WFD information sheets were not very useful (at least for those Member States that worked on them); others had found them to be very useful.

Agenda Item 5 – Preparation for WG ESA/GES workshop on targets and measures - [Joachim D'Eugenio]

Joachim said that Marine Directors had decided not to set up new working groups but wished to strengthen existing groups and use a workshop format to address specific questions. The GES 2012 meeting had discussed possible sub-topics for a targets to measures workshop to be held jointly with WG ESA. It was envisaged that each working group might meet back to back with the workshop. The EC's latest thoughts were that cost-effectiveness could be a subject but there was a need to have some kind of structured information to feed into the workshop. The discussion in WG ESA would need to be fed back to WG GES and the MSCG meeting on 13-14 November.

Members of WG ESA were invited to volunteer to join a steering group to help prepare the workshop. One of the EC's technical support contracts could take care of the preparation of a suitable discussion document for the workshop. Outputs from the workshop could be translated into a possible "information sheet".

The outcome from this meeting will be the first step in preparing an agenda and discussion papers for the joint workshop (GES/ESA),

The EC suggested the following sequence of events:

- EC drafts an agenda which is circulated among ESA and GES for comments.
- Identification of volunteers to participate in the work is done within WG ESA.
- Discussion documents are exchanged during January – February.
- Finalizing of agenda and discussion papers in March.
- The workshop (GES/ESA) is held in April
- Results from the workshop are sent to the MSCG and directors in June with proposal for further work items under existing work programme.

Discussion:

Points made in discussion were that

- the EC wanted a more detailed definition of the workshop with suggestions on topics to take home to GES and simply ask them if they can sign under that.
- NL wants to focus the discussion on environmental problems and offered to give a presentation on the co-operation between ESA and GES in their work on marine litter. NL also offered to send in some material (a draft cost-benefit analysis) on this issue to be included in the discussion paper for this meeting.
- there is a need for looking into potential new pressures, feeding in to the general understanding of pressures, and whether we have policy gaps. This would contribute to finding out how far are we able to characterize the need for more action.

- a question could be circulated among the MS to investigate the interest for discussing specific regional issues, typically involving 2-3 member states.
- the EC presented a challenge; every presentation must be done jointly with GES/ESA persons.
- a presentation from the WG ESA meeting should be done at the MSCG (13-14 November) in addition to a 1 page progress report.

Day 2, Thursday 14th of October, 08:30 – 16:00

Agenda Item 6 – Presentations on initial assessments

Kristine Pakalniete - on the ESA in the Latvian Initial Assessment

Time schedule of the work

The main part of the work was done in the period January-December 2011. After the public consultation improvements were made in June-July followed by official approval and reporting to EC in October 15, 2012.

The objectives of the work for the IA was to start building information and knowledge base in a systematic way by mobilizing available knowledge and information and preparing the required assessments.

The coordination of the work on regional sea level has been done within the project GES-REG (INTERREG IV A, 2011-2013), including Estonia, Lithuania, Sweden and Finland.

The Latvian analysis of the ESA of use of the sea in the initial assessment applies a combined approach based on the ecosystem services approach and the Marine water accounts approach. Eco system services have been linked to specific users and beneficiaries and the socioeconomic benefits/values of the use have been described in the TEV framework.

In addition; the socio economic significance of the use of the sea has been assessed by a range number of indicators (economic, social, cultural values).

Characterization of the pressures has been done based on the uses and their impact on the EGS (Ecosystem Goods and Services). Seven pressures, including nutrient enrichment and risk of oil spills, were analyzed to identify relevant ones for the business as usual scenario and for the assessment of cost of degradation.

The analysis of the cost of degradation is based on the ecosystem services approach but is complemented with some assessments based on the thematic approach.

General information gaps that have been identified regarding the ESA concerns, for instance limited environmental information in terms of links between state and impact from pressures, and lack of economic valuation studies on the benefits of improving the state of the EGSs.

For the coming work, the main efforts will be put into the development of BAU-scenarios, CEA of additional measures and for assessing the benefits from improving the environmental state.

Discussion:

Points made in the discussion were that;

- the BAU-scenario in the MSFD had been significantly developed since the time of the WFD programme of measures. This is due to the differing time-horizons (2015 vs. 2020) and to the fact that there has been a lot of development in policies which are not reflected in the WFD BAU for nutrient enrichments.

Torben Wallach - on the Danish Initial Assessment

Some of the problems that were experienced concerned the division of statistics between Baltic sea and the North Sea and how/if to assess secondary employment in “upstream” sectors related to maritime sectors and activities.

Another problem was how to assess the economic activity in shipping, only 20% of the Danish merchant fleet is found in Danish waters. Eventually this was done by use of the amount of tax paid by the sector. Also the tourism and recreation sector was assessed by means of harsh assumptions.

Cost of degradation was only assessed in qualitative terms.

The use of TEV was questioned in the light of the results from the analysis where the economic significance of for example fishing was underestimated compared to its share of total turnover in the Danish economy.

Discussion:

Points made in the discussion were that;

- the use of TEV can be questioned if the light of the strange results that are achieved sometimes. Should we instead be more conservative and only focus on turnover for example?
- there is a need to be clear about the purpose of the analysis, is it just reporting, or do we use it for measures and so on, how much effort do we put into this?
- the information is crucial in the discussions with stakeholders to underpin the arguments for measures.
- it could also be the other way around, the economic analyses have in some cases been questioned from the other side meaning that assumptions made result in a diminished description of sectors. This on the other hand is evidence for ability to pay for measures.

Philip Stamp - Update from OSPAR project on regional economic and social analysis

This is an Eftec-led project for OSPAR to produce a social and economic analysis by looking across the initial assessments in the OSPAR region. The project is looking in to the requirements of regional co-operation; that is cooperation to ensure that measures are coherent and coordinated by using existing regional institutional cooperation structures. The aim of the project is to provide an overview of typologies of marine sectors, uses and definitions in national datasets, and to carry out a detailed analysis of one sector to learn lessons for the future. The project will also produce an overview of national information on use of marine

waters and cost of degradation together with an assessment of availability and comparability of national data with recommendations for improvement.

The project started in August 2011 and a progress report was presented to the EIHA in April 2012 (EIHA – Environmental Impact from Human Activities, a working group under Oskar). A draft interim report was presented in October 2012 and the final report is due in May 2013.

A number of barriers to collating regional overview are identified in the interim report. These are primarily variations in methods and approaches, the use of different data types and reference years, differing sectoral coverage and problems with less well defined sectors like tourism and leisure. The report also presents a number of options for improvements on consistency and comparability; for example using common terminology for similar activities and sharing information on benefits of different methods.

Discussion:

Points made in the discussion were that;

- Eurostat are doing some work on characterization and classification, these things have partly been solved, for example the definition on sectors.
- the Oskar-project is not about coordinating measures or to work on the development of the programme of measures (PoMs) at this stage, only about exchange of information about GES, PoMs etc.
- on the regional seas level it is difficult to have measures if they are not coordinated to a certain extent with the target of other MS, for example regarding marine litter.
- development of PoMs are national processes and coordination doesn't necessarily mean that the same measures should be applied in all countries. But regarding some environmental problems, for example noise, for all MS to do research themselves would be a waste of money. It is also a matter
- other examples of coordination needs is the view on how the division of coastal and inland economy should be done, as well as the definition of many of the descriptors
- coordination between member states is also about creating a leveled playfield for stakeholders, not necessarily implying common measures.

Agenda Item 7 – -Approach to reviewing findings and lessons learned from IAS – [Kevin Brady]

The initial assessment shall be updated every 6th year according to article 17.2(a). This is why it is important to consolidate the knowledge and experiences from the initial assessments while it is fresh.

The analysis could focus on process issues like:

- typologies of sectors and definitions
- the division in coastal and inland areas
- approaches and techniques
- the guidance doc, was it used?
- can MS analyses be integrated at regional seas level?

It may also cover analytical output like;

- value of marine waters across EU seas? There are many different approaches and estimates
- regional dimension of degradation
- regional differences in costs (where are the largest costs?)

There are different options for doing this; either by drawing upon, not duplicating, other work, for example the OSPAR report. The work could be done by an ad hoc group from WG-ESA, a lead agency or MS or by a consultant with WG ESA as steering group.

The next steps will be to agree on scope of the review and on the delivery route. The questions that need answers are; what do we want to find out, what should it focus on and who should undertake the review?

Discussions

Points made in the discussion were that;

- EU is now engaged in compliance check and in-depth assessment of the things delivered up till now. This is however beyond our timescale.
- the language is a problem in the Baltic Sea area.
- It is important to think about what particular information this group would find useful when we sit down to do this the next time. What are the key points, the lessons from the process, change of guidance? This is not necessarily a massive piece of work but might be reference to already done studies, like Ospar.
- It is important to draw on and not duplicate already done studies, maybe a questionnaire with well thought through questions would be a good way of doing this.
- It would be useful to talk to the people that have worked with our material that is not presented in the ESA group.
- a report was done in France on differences in approaches etc., this report will be provided and can be circulated.

- a less time consuming route would be to ask members to write a page about what was good, not so good and what was problematic. This could be an annex to the existing guidance and it could be very helpful.
- apart from a summary it would also be good to give a wider picture. The ESA is part of the IA-culture in different MS. In terms of legislation IA has been very superficial and mainly focused on budget. This doesn't fit in to many MS processes.
- domestic process for legislation is influencing the work to a large degree, for example how IA should be done. The questionnaire should also include what other processes that influence the work, 5 – 6 questions.
- to the EC we could say that we would like to get a handful of a few open broad questions across, covering scope and content of assessment. This should also be directed to those not attending this group, which could also be a learning process for the EU
- there are also a lot of resources out there in terms of running projects, in the Mediterranean among other places.
- the Swedish and French work can be the basis for the new questionnaire.
- are there any volunteers for organizing this? We have an option from the EC, but we can also do it ourselves.

The group concluded that the main value of a review of experience would be in relation to the process (rather than content of IAs). Information could be collected through a short set of open questions.

Action: A volunteer (or volunteers) is needed to take this work forward. Please contact Mats Ivarsson if you are interested. The aim should be to have the results ready for consideration at the next meeting of WG ESA. NL has offered to take the lead for this, other volunteers are welcome.

Agenda Item 8 – Discussion on options for the work programme of the WG ESA/GES workshop

The group discussed possible objectives, topics and outputs for the workshop.

The group agreed that there could be two main objectives:

(1) Understanding the extent of the problem

- To understand the nature and extent of pressures from human activities and their implications for the achievement of Good Environmental Status in 2020. NL has offered to give a presentation on the co-operation between ESA and GES in their work on marine litter.

- Taking account of policies which are already in the pipeline, to identify where the principal implementation gaps lie, compared with targets for the achievement of GES
- To characterize those gaps in terms of their spatial extent (EU/regional seas/national waters)

(2) *Understanding the link between GES-ESA (inter linkages for both content and timetable)*

- Breakout session discussing case studies (with scene setting)
- Explore certain key questions (TBC) for e.g.
 - “Gap analysis” of the existing (and forthcoming) policies
 - The BAU scenario for building the program of measures
 - What additional evidence/data are required from each the (GES and ESA) in order to identify gaps or carry out CEA/CBA?
 - spatial discussions

Topics covered could include:

- Overview of marine uses and pressures (current state or projection of future state)
- Overview of GES determinations and targets
- Identification of key problem areas
- Overview of cost of degradation
- Evaluation of implementation gaps and environmental priorities EU/region/country
- Assessment of potential new pressures and implications for MSFD
- Information gaps
- Requirement for new measures

Outputs from the workshop could take the form of a summary report on high level findings, information paper(s) and tasks remitted to either of the working groups. Participation should include representatives of the RSCs.

The group agreed to forward these ideas to the EC, MSCG and WG GES.

Action: WG ESA members to volunteer to join the steering group by 9 November. SE/UK will submit the group's views on objectives to the EC and MSCG.

Agenda Item 9 – Experience from reporting under article 8 – [Mansi Konar]

General comments:

The positive experience of the reporting was that the economists were involved at an early stage in the process of developing reporting sheets. This allowed for a flexibility in the reporting that reflected the different approaches on ESA among MS.

On the negative side; there were frequent changes made on the reporting sheets which were also finalized very late during the process. There was also a great deal of work with the technical aspects of reporting, especially with regards to the database. The reporting itself was a very time consuming process in ensuring consistency with other sheets (i.e. reporting on pressures under Article 8b) and the summarizing of information from written reports. Member States with borders covering more than one regional sea/sub-area boundary faced particular difficulties when using existing national evidence bases to meet reporting requirements.

Experience from Ecosystem services approach (UK):

- There were some problems related to interpreting the information required
- Cost of degradation was relatively simpler to complete while ecosystem services sheet was the trickiest.
- Confidence levels for assessment: mostly low or unknown
- Information we had available had to sometimes be re-interpreted to fit into the requirements of the reporting sheets
- Separate cells for limitations of data made it easier to point out assumptions used for analysis and caveats.

Experience from Cost based approach (NL):

- Assessment as per geographical unit were tricky (e.g. vessels moving across different parts of the sea)
- Less clarity on how certain cells of the sheet to be filled (e.g. employment trends)
- Information on confidence in data redundant for national indicators
- Better experience compared to reporting for WFD

Experience from Thematic approach (DE):

- Very Labour intensive process
- Continuous revision of sheets during the work process caused problems
- There was lack of clarity on how to fill the sheets
- Problems to fill in data which were only available on national scale
- Human activities sheet was easier to complete than cost of degradation sheets,
- Unclear how the commission will use information that is not homogeneous information

Recommendations to the EC

- Produce a lessons learnt document and provide clarity on how the data will be used. There is also a need for the EC to discuss how, and if the reported data can be used for European-wide comparisons given the different methods used. A point of departure could be to look at lessons learnt from OSPAR study
- Next round of reporting needs to focus on key data needs in order to mitigate risks of member states providing a lot of information that is not required. The

EC should also assess gaps in data and be 'proportionate' whether member states should collect the data for further rounds of reporting.

- To look for ESA and regional consensus to look at constructive ways to help ensure comparability.

Discussion

Points made in the discussion were that;

- some MS agreed that the reporting was very time consuming with problems related to summarizing and rearranging data and in some cases also reinterpreting data.
- some MS that this was more or less a cut and paste exercise of condensed data.
- UK did not pay much attention to priorities in the reporting sheets but filled in pretty much all the information available.
- the WFD-process is being done at the same time and that some experiences could be collected from that work.
- the thoughts in this presentation will be sent to the EC to be dealt with on the MSCG, comments are welcome within two weeks.
- someone from WG ESA should go to the next DIKE meeting, both UK and NL informed that they would brief their delegates to take this issue with them to the meeting.

Action: The results from the UK presentation on experiences from reporting of the MSFD should be sent to the EC to be discussed on the upcoming MSCG meeting on the 13/14 November.

Agenda Item 10 - Presentation on marine litter – [Rob van der Veeren]

The Dutch assume that most of the objectives of the MSFD will be achieved by other directives and agreements, e.g. IMO, WFD, UWWTD etc. The only exceptions are marine litter and noise. Since, for noise it is not clear whether there is a problem, research is needed to determine whether or not there is a problem. For litter, the Dutch have performed studies with respect to costs and effects of measures, cost-effectiveness and cost benefit analyses. In this presentation, Rob shared this information and presented some lessons learned (the reports are available in English on the internet http://www.noordzeeloket.nl/krm/stand_van_zaken/nationaal_traject/Economische_analyses_2011/).

One of the lessons from the CEA was that due to lack of knowledge on impacts of measures, a proper quantification of impacts is impossible, but using guesstimates, a ranking on cost effectiveness of measures can be established. More or less the same applies to the CBA, where it was found that the beneficiaries depend on the type of marine litter: large pieces are unattractive for recreating people, small pieces are more important for the ecosystem.

In order to illustrate ecosystem impacts, the Netherlands have developed a system called Eco points which are calculated by multiplication of the impacts of a measure on environmental quality, area and a weighting factor linked to rarity. When applying this method to marine litter, they found out that measures against marine litter didn't result in significant impacts on ecosystem functioning and therefore did not result in an improvement in terms of eco-points. Therefore, the Dutch are now looking for other ways to present the story of ecological impacts of litter in the marine environment using pictures.

A lot of work is put in to describing the types of costs and effects related to marine litter, for example:

- Recreational benefits of reduction of litter in marine environment (international literature review),
- Costs of beach cleaning along the Dutch coast
- Costs incurred by fisheries and shipping due to marine debris in propellers and nets.
- Inventory of strategies related to port reception facilities. There are huge differences between harbors in various countries. Harmonization may make it easier for ships to dispose waste on land instead of at sea. This harmonization is seen as a cost-effective measure

Next year, focus will also be turned to soil integrity and substrate, underwater noise, potential measures on top of CFP and additional protected marine areas. For those areas more qualitative analyses are expected, since hardly any quantitative data is available.

By the end of 2013 information on costs and benefits for all types of measures should be available, and a final report on the CBA for measures in the MSFD will be written in early 2014.

Discussion

Points made in the discussion

- How will the narrow focus of the Dutch approach be explained to the EC? If the other directives are implemented successfully and deliver what they are supposed to, there will be no need for additional measures, otherwise additional measures will be analyzed and applied.
- Will the eco-point system be developed in terms of level of detail and sensitivity? Some development has been done regarding hard substrates and fish. Measures aimed at an increase of hard substrate did show an increase in nature points (and even more importantly for fisheries policies; but the latter was not presented in the report). Although not the primary focus of the nature point study, hard substrate may be something the Dutch might want to look into more in detail next year. As stated before, the ecological impacts of marine litter were not significant enough to result in an increase in eco points, therefore, the story of ecological consequences of the reduction of marine litter is now told in pictures instead.

Agenda Item 11 – Evidence plans

There was an open discussion on evidence plans - whether countries have developed such plans and initial thoughts on priorities?

Discussion

Points made in the discussion were that;

- it was noted that an evidence plan describes what research we need to be done but also what information we need to obtain from other sources. This will feed in to the ESA WP but may also be suggestions for projects put forward to the Project Coordination Group.
- the Project Coordination Group might be able to assist when it comes to contracts on smaller technical assistance.
- one activity could be the development of economic indicators, for example definitions of costs. This might be something for the current WP.
- EEA has been working on socio economic indicators that might be useful in this context. EEA also have a project group for work on environmental accounts focusing on priority needs for evidence plans.
- information about the Project Coordination Group concerning dates for meetings, participants etc. should be produced and circulated in the WG.

Action: SE will coordinate requests for projects to feed into the EC.

Agenda Item 12 – Forward planning and conclusions

- **Review of the work programme in light of the meeting's discussions**
Members are asked to send comments on the WP by the 9th of November to feed in to the MSCG-meeting.
- **Volunteers to lead or contribute to work streams**
 - The success of the WG ESA is dependent on participant involvement. Members of the WG are therefore invited to volunteer to lead or support the different work streams in the work programme. NL has offered to contribute to the work stream on cost-effectiveness and cost benefit analyses.
 - We've got a way forward on the focus for the review on initial assessments, to catch the essence of the experiences. Members of the WG are invited to volunteer to lead or support this work. NL has offered to take the lead for this, other volunteers are welcome.
- **Reporting**
Any further comments on this can be sent by the 9th of November to be amended to what will be sent to the MSCG-meeting.
- **Evidence plans**
Suggestions that can be forwarded to the EC (Project Coordination Group) are welcome.

- **The joint GES/ESA workshop**
WG ESA members are invited to volunteer to join the steering group, as well as for the development of case studies, for the joint GES/ESA workshop by 9 November. NL has offered to give a presentation on the co-operation between ESA and GES in their work on marine litter. NL also offered to send in some material (a draft cost-benefit analysis) on this issue to be included in the discussion paper for this meeting and a (limited) help in writing this discussion document.
- **The next meeting**
A one day meeting, back to back with the workshop in April is envisaged.

Annex 1. Participant list

List of Participants	Marine Strategy Framework Directive: Common Implementation Strategy
Meeting of 25-26 October, Edinburgh	
DENMARK	
Mr Torben Wallach	Danish Nature Agency
ESTONIA	
Ms Tea Nõmmann	SEI Tallinn
Mr Silver Vahtra	Ministry of Environment Estonia
Ms Aljona Karloseva	SEI Tallinn
FRANCE	
Mr Mahe Charles	French marine Protected Areas Agency, Ifremer
Mr Sebastien Flores	Ministry of Environment Directorate for Water and Biodiversity ; Strategic planning and Sea and Coast Integrated Management Unit
ITALY	
Mr Cristian Mastrofrancesco	ISPRA
Ms Taira Di Nora	ISPRA
LATVIA	
Ms Kristine Pakalniete	AKTiiVS Ltd – Economic Research and Consultancy
LITHUANIA	
Ms Daiva Semeniene	Center for Environmental Policy, Lithuania
MALTA	
Stephania Baldacchino	Malta Environment and Planning Authority
THE NETHERLANDS	
Mr Rob van der Veeren	RWS Waterdienst
POLAND	
Andrzej Jagusiewicz	Chief Inspector for Environmental Protection
Agnieszka Zaplatka	Ministry of Transport, Construction and Maritime Economy
PORTUGAL	
Conceição Santos	Directorate General for maritime Policy

ROMANIA Cristian Rusu	National Administration Romanian Waters
SLOVENIA Ms Spela Peterlin	Institute for Water
SPAIN Alejandro Maceira	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment
SWEDEN Mr Mats Ivarsson	Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management
UNITED KINGDOM Mr Philip Stamp	Defra, Marine strategy and evidence
Ms Mansi Konar	Defra, Marine and Fisheries Economics Branch
Mr Dominic Pattinson	Defra
Mr Kevin Brady	Marine Scotland
EUROPEAN COMMISSION	
Mr Joachim D'Eugenio	European Commission – DG Environment Deputy Head of Unit
EEA Mr Manuel Lago	
CONSULTANTS Mr Eduard Interwies	InterSus/EU-Commission
STAKEHOLDER ORGANISATIONS Caroline Price	Marine Strategy Navigation Group (RYA)