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1. Introduction to the New Biogeographic Process

The purpose of the New Biogeographic Process is to use a series of Natura 2000 seminars to help Member States manage Natura 2000 as a coherent ecological network, whilst exchanging experience and best practice, addressing objectives and priorities, and enhancing co-operation and synergies. The process should make a significant contribution to the achievement of Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) for habitats and species of Community interest. The New Biogeographic Process is not another reporting cycle. Reporting under Article 17 already captures progress on the current status of habitats and species, including in the Natura 2000. Instead, the seminars are designed to gather and exchange expert and policy-maker’s knowledge in relation to issues, solutions and actions that can deliver improved conservation status of features in Natura 2000 sites.

The aim is to help Member States meet Target 1 of the EU Biodiversity Strategy 2020.

“To halt the deterioration in the status of all species and habitats covered by EU nature legislation and achieve a significant and measurable improvement in their status so that, by 2020, compared to current assessments:

(i) 100% more habitat assessments and 50% more species assessments under the Habitats Directive show an improved conservation status; and

(ii) 50% more species assessments under the Birds Directive show a secure or improved status.”

The process is a unique opportunity to gather information within and between countries and to allow the establishment of dialogue between individuals and organisations to further improve the coordinated action in management of the Natura 2000 network.

For an Information Note on the Biogeographical process to date please refer to:


2. The Marine Seminar

The kick-off seminar in Saint-Malo is the first biogeographic seminar with an exclusive focus on the management of marine Natura 2000 sites.

The French Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy, the French Agency for Marine Protected Areas and the European Commission (DG Environment) have been responsible for steering the organisation of the seminar. These parties, with the support of the Natura 2000 Marine Experts Group (comprising Member States and NGOs), and with reference to a pre-scoping paper prepared by the European Topic Centre on Biological Diversity - ETC/BD¹, have also been responsible for agreeing the objectives and preparing the seminar programme (Box 1).

Box 1: Marine Seminar Objectives, Themes and Working Groups (WG)

Objectives

1. Identify the issues/pressures affecting conservation management of marine Natura 2000
2. Identify management requirements, measures and potential solutions (proposed or implemented) for marine Natura 2000
3. Identify opportunities for co-operation and collaboration to support management of marine Natura 2000 sites

Themes

1. Conservation objectives; definition, assessment and use for adaptive management
   - WG A National approaches to setting conservation objectives
   - WG B Conservation objectives for habitats
   - WG C Conservation objectives for highly mobile species

2. Reconciling Natura 2000 objectives and marine activities/conservation management planning
   - WG D Fisheries – identifying threats and pressures
   - WG E Fisheries – introducing measures
   - WG F Other marine sectors

3. Regional integration of Natura 2000 issues
   - WG G Cross-border collaboration
   - WG H Regional networks
   - WG I EU Financing

The programme is organised around three themes with plenary sessions, presentations of case studies, working groups and a “knowledge market”. Each of these is an opportunity for participants to present their experiences of implementing Natura 2000 in the marine environment and to hear about how such work is being undertaken in other parts of the European Union.

This document provides background information to support the discussions at the seminar with:

- a summary of the current status of marine Natura 2000 based on the ETC/BD pre-scoping
- an introduction to the seminar themes with some of the common challenges described, and examples of related questions which could be discussed during the working group sessions.

The following information is based on the ETC/BD pre-scoping report prepared for the October 2014 Natura 2000 Marine Expert Group\(^1\). The report was mainly based on the Article 17 (of the Habitats Directive) data from the 2007-2012 reporting period, thus covering EU27 species listed in the Annex II, IV and V and habitat types of Annex I of the Habitats Directive (http://bd.eionet.europa.eu/activities/Reporting/Article_17/). The pre-scoping report also identified the main pressures to marine species and habitats as reported by Member States under Article 17 of the Habitats Directive. Bird species were not covered in the ETC/BD analysis.

The marine domain still suffers from lack of knowledge and lack of harmonisation among Member States’ reporting. Therefore, although providing a broad picture across the five EU marine regions considered under the Habitats Directive, the following analysis should be viewed with caution when looking at more detailed results.

3.1 Summary information - marine Natura 2000 sites and features

The European Union has five main marine regions (Figure 1), each with its own characteristics. The Natura 2000 Barometer provides figures for the number and area covered by Natura 2000 sites (SPAs+ SCIs\(^2\)) obtained by GIS analysis, using the electronic spatial boundaries provided by Member States for each of their sites (see Table 1).\(^3\)

Figure 1: The Natura 2000 network across the five marine regions of the European Union as considered for Nature Directives implementation (Map 2.1 from pre-scoping document).

---

\(^2\) Special Protection Areas and Sites of Community Importance

\(^3\) This information is regularly updated in Natura 2000 Newsletter: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/info/pubs/natura2000nl_en.htm
Table 1: Natura 2000 sites per marine region (area and number) based on Article 17 data for the 2007-2012 reporting period (Table 2.1 from pre-scoping document).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marine region</th>
<th>Area of Natura 2000 sites per region (km²)</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine Atlantic (MATL)</td>
<td>165155.57</td>
<td>2453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Baltic (MBAL)</td>
<td>45888.67</td>
<td>1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Black Sea (MBLS)</td>
<td>2877.49</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Macaronesian (MMAC)</td>
<td>2364.25</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Mediterranean (MMED)</td>
<td>34993.56</td>
<td>2734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Natura 2000 database, end 2013

* The figure and table above include Hatton Bank in N. Atlantic, which is a pSCI beyond the EEZ

Figure 2: Reported area covered by each habitat (km²) in each marine biogeographical region based on Article 17 data for the 2007-2012 reporting period (Fig.2.2 from pre-scoping document)

1110 Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time
1120 *Posidonia* beds
1130 Estuaries
1140 Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide
1160 Large shallow inlets and bays
1170 Reefs
1180 Submarine structures made by leaking gases
1650 Boreal Baltic narrow inlets
8330 Submerged or partially submerged sea caves
The conservation status of the nine Annex I habitats that are considered to be marine for Article 17 reporting purposes and of 40 Annex II/IV species across the five marine regions were summarized in the pre-scoping report (Figures 3 and 4).

**Figure 3: Conservation status of habitat types in each marine region (number of assessments in brackets) based on Article 17 reporting data for the 2007-2012 reporting period** (Fig 3.1 from pre-scoping document).
Conservation status is assessed as being either ‘favourable’ (FV), ‘unfavourable-inadequate’ (U1) ‘unfavourable-bad’ (U2), or Unknown (XX).

**Figure 4: Conservation status of species in each marine region (number of assessments in brackets) based on Article 17 reporting data for the 2007-2012 reporting period.** (Fig 3.2 from pre-scoping document)
Conservation status is assessed as being either ‘favourable’ (FV), ‘unfavourable-inadequate’ (U1) ‘unfavourable-bad’ (U2), or Unknown (XX).

Given the need to focus on a limited number of issues in the seminar, the potential priority for discussions of habitat types and species was assessed and ranked by considering both ‘urgency/priority’ (unfavourable conservation status and declining trends) and the joint interest of all Member States involved in the seminar (those habitat types and species which occur in most of
the countries in the region)⁴. Using this methodology, the top four habitats were sandbanks (1110), reefs (1170) estuaries (1130) and large shallow inlets and bays (1160). It is not a surprise that habitats with higher rank are those present and therefore of common concern across all EU marine regions. The lower assessment of the one marine priority habitat – ‘Posidonia beds’ can be largely attributed to the fact that it only occurs in one of the EU marine regions.

A similar approach for potentially prioritising species for discussion at the seminar ranked the top four as Harbour porpoise, short-beaked common dolphin, bottlenose dolphin and loggerhead sea turtle. The Harbour porpoise ranks first partly because it is present in all five marine regions so the number of Member States which have a responsibility for its conservation is high. The conservation status of this species has been assessed as favourable in the Atlantic marine region mainly because it is favourable in three countries (DK, IE, UK) which host 75% of the Atlantic population. But in all other marine regions the conservation status is assessed as unfavourable (even bad in the Baltic and the Black sea regions)⁵.

3.2 Pressures on marine species and habitats

As part of their reporting under Article 17 Member States are asked to provide information on important threats and pressures using an agreed hierarchical list which can be found on the Article 17 Reference Portal⁶. Pressures are activities which are currently having an impact on the habitat and potential pressures are activities expected to have an impact in the near future. The percentage of habitat and species reports in all marine regions where pressures are reported as ‘high impact’ are shown in Figures 5 and 6. This list of pressures has a very terrestrial focus and therefore, although relevant as an overview, the more detailed descriptions of pressures on particular habitats and species in Article 17 reports should also be consulted.

Figure 5 Frequency (%) of pressures with ‘high impact’ reported for habitats based on Article 17 reporting data for the 2007-2012 reporting period. (Fig.6.1 from pre-scoping document)

---

⁴ see Aronsson et al (2014) for methodology
⁵ Fact sheets are being prepared by ETC/BD for each of these habitats/ species and will be available soon
4. Theme 1: Setting Conservation Objectives

Member States are at different stages in the defining, assessment, and use of conservation objectives for their marine Natura 2000 sites. The aim of THEME 1 is to support the drawing up of conservation objectives where this has still to be done, and to making existing conservation objectives more operational.

SESSION OBJECTIVES:
To exchange experience, identify good practice and get a better understanding of;

- How to set SMART conservation objectives (specific, measurable, realistic, consistent and comprehensive)
- How to define long-term objectives and achieve these through “adaptive management”
- How to apply conservation objectives to sites where features are in different condition (e.g. degraded or pristine)
- Applying conservation objectives to take account of the variation in habitats across a biogeographical area
- Monitoring/measuring progress in achieving the conservation objectives and how to use them for adaptive management
- Setting and assessing conservation objectives for highly mobile species
4.1 Defining conservation objectives
How to set SMART conservation objectives (specific, measurable, realistic, consistent and comprehensive)

Guidance to assist Member States in setting conservation objectives for Natura 2000 sites is provided in a Commission Note published in 2012. In its most general sense, a conservation objective is the specification of the overall target for the species and/or habitat types for which a site is designated in order for it to contribute to maintaining or reaching favourable conservation status (FCS) of this species/habitat.

It is important to distinguish between conservation objectives of individual sites and the overall objective of achieving FCS. Site level conservation objectives are a set of specified objectives to be met in a site in order to make sure that the site contributes in the best possible way to achieving FCS at the appropriate level (national or the regional level, taking into account the natural range of the respective species or habitat types).

The conservation objectives at the site level must have full regard to:

- the ecological requirements of the species and habitat types listed in the Natura 2000 Standard Data Form (i.e. present on the site, except for those whose presence is non-significant according to the SDF)
- the local, regional, national conservation status of the habitats and species
- the overall coherence of the Natura 2000 network
- higher level conservation objectives at national/biogeographical level and the contribution of the site to them

A clear definition on conservation objectives with measurable indicators and an appropriate monitoring programme are major elements for the successful management of a Natura 2000 site.

The following standards for conservation objectives may be relevant:

- be specific - relate to a particular interest feature (species or habitat type) and define the condition(s) required to satisfy the conservation objective;
- be measurable and reportable - enabling monitoring to be undertaken to determine whether the conservation objectives are being met and for the purposes of Article 17 of the Habitats Directive;
- be realistic - given a reasonable time-frame and application of resources;
- be consistent in approach - the structure of conservation objectives should, as far as is possible, be the same across all (national Natura 2000) marine sites, and at sites supporting the same interest feature, use similar attributes and targets to describe favourable condition; and
- be comprehensive - the attributes and targets should cover the properties of the interest feature necessary to describe its condition as either favourable or unfavourable.

The level of detail given in conservation objectives for certain species or habitats may be constrained by current limitations of scientific knowledge. In such circumstances the overall objective on favourable conservation status, as defined in Article 1 of the Directive, can be applied in combination with...
with site specific knowledge on the actual occurrence, distribution etc. of the actual species or habitat.

Some of the main challenges in setting conservation objectives for marine Natura 2000 sites are:

- having sufficient knowledge of the feature (habitat/species) both within and outside Natura 2000 sites.
- needing to set conservation objectives for broad geophysical structures (e.g. bays and inlets) as well as biological communities (*Posidonia oceanica* meadows)
- determining the current status (favourable or unfavourable) of a habitat/species (especially if there are limited long-term data) and therefore whether the objective should aim for maintenance or restoration.
- considerations of the scale on which to consider biogeography to ensure a consistent approach across the territories of different Member States.
- the need for conservation measures which are not site-specific as well as site-specific measures and scope for setting conservation objectives for interconnected marine sites.
- making conservation objectives a clear and informative expression of the purpose of the site.
- in the absence of landowners, the role of stakeholders in setting objectives (regulators, managers, users etc.).

**Applying conservation objectives to individual sites (degraded, pristine etc.)**

Member States have carried out a substantial amount of work on defining conservation objectives for marine features. This includes agreeing high level objectives for a large number of marine Natura 2000 sites and detailed objectives with associated indicators for some sites. Objectives have also been set where features are considered to have a “favourable conservation status”, as well as those which are degraded and in need of restoration.

Some of the main challenges in applying conservation objectives for marine Natura 2000 sites are:

- the required level of detail to be meaningful and measurable.
- the potentially long time scales over which application may be required before effects are apparent.
- the need to consider policies, targets and timetables for actions to surrounding waters, outside the marine Natura 2000 site.

**Monitoring and measuring progress in achieving the conservation objectives**

Member States are required to monitor the conservation status of habitats and species and report the results (on a 6 yearly basis) to the Commission (Articles 11 and 17).

Some of the main challenges in monitoring and measuring progress are:

- deciding on clear, unambiguous standards that can be monitored economically and reliably and which will identify whether any changes to management are required.
- determining what changes would constitute ‘deterioration’ or ‘significant disturbance’
- distinguishing changes in status from those which are part of natural variability
4.2 Conservation objectives for highly mobile species.

Annex II of the Habitats Directive, as well as Article 4.2 and Annex IV of the Birds Directive, include highly mobile marine species – in particular fish, seabirds, cetaceans, seals and turtles. Natura 2000 sites need to be designated to contribute to the FCS of these species.

“For animal species ranging over wide areas these sites shall correspond to the places within the natural range of such species which present the physical or biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. For aquatic species which range over wide areas, such sites will be proposed only where there is a clearly identifiable area representing the physical and biological factors essential to their life and reproduction.” (Habitats Directive, Article 4.1).

Some examples of conservation objectives which have been defined for highly mobile marine species are shown in Table 2. They illustrate the difficulties of moving from repeating the requirements of the Directives to setting SMART objectives as described above.

Table 2: Examples of conservation objectives for highly mobile species.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Natura 2000 Site</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Example of conservation objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Sylt Outer Reef</td>
<td>Harbour porpoise, common seal, grey seal</td>
<td>Maintenance and restoration at favourable conservation status of the following Habitats Directive species and their natural habitats: Harbour porpoise, common seal, grey seal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Lower River Shannon</td>
<td>Bottlenose dolphin</td>
<td>To maintain the favourable conservation condition of bottlenose dolphin in Lower River Shannon, which is defined by the following list of attributes and targets: Target 1. Species range within the site should not be restricted by artificial barriers to site use. Target 2. Critical areas, representing habitat used preferentially by bottlenose dolphin should be conserved in a natural condition. Target 3. Human activities should occur at levels that do not adversely affect the bottlenose dolphin population at the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Cardigan Bay</td>
<td>Bottlenose dolphin, grey seal</td>
<td>The presence, abundance, condition and diversity of habitats and species required to support this species is such that the distribution, abundance and populations dynamics of the species within the site and population beyond the site is stable or increasing. Important considerations include; distribution, extent, structure, function and quality of habitat, prey availability and quality. As part of this objective it should be noted that: • The abundance of prey species subject to existing commercial fisheries needs to be equal to or greater than that required to achieve maximum sustainable yield and secure in the long term. • The management and control of activities or operations likely to adversely affect the species feature is appropriate for maintaining it in favourable condition and is secure in the long term. • Contamination of potential prey species should be below concentrations potentially harmful to their physiological health. • Disturbance by human activity is below levels that suppress reproductive success, physiological health or long-term behaviour. Restoration and recovery. As part of this objective it should be noted that for the bottlenose dolphin populations should be increasing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional challenges in setting and applying conservation objectives for marine Natura 2000 sites for highly mobile species include:

- determining how Natura 2000 sites are used and why they are important to such species
- linking actions across the range of such species (national, regional, international)
- having sufficient data, at adequate confidence levels to identify trends and status
- considering the role of the network as well as of individual Natura 2000 sites.
- considering natural fluctuations in species distribution

4.3 Potential issues for discussion under Theme 1

**WORKING GROUP A: National approaches to setting conservation objectives**

**SOME ISSUES TO STIMULATE DISCUSSION:**
- Appropriate balance between broad and specific conservation objectives?
- Appropriate time and spatial scales for objectives?
- Setting objectives for “pressures” or “states” (as part of the DPSIR framework)?
- Linking conservation objectives and conservation status?
- What is the scope/desirability of taking a consistent approach to conservation objectives across biogeographical regions/Member States/national level?
- How to draft objectives that can be measured and monitored both practically & cost effectively?
- Need for a consistent approach to describing objectives for different habitats/species?
- Setting objectives for interconnected / transboundary sites?
- What is the role and stage in the process of “stakeholders” in the objective setting (or do they only contribute to the “measures” debate)?
- What is the supporting science behind setting objectives?
- What type of legal basis is used to support implementation?

**WORKING GROUP B: Conservation objectives for habitats**

**SOME ISSUES TO STIMULATE DISCUSSION:**
- What is the scope/desirability of taking a consistent approach to describing objectives for different habitats?
- How to incorporate “typical species” considerations into conservation objectives for different marine habitats?
- How to take into account Favourable Reference Values in setting conservation objectives?
- Setting objectives and determining the conservation status of poorly studied habitats/species and with data of variable quality and reliability.
- Inclusion of habitat sub-types in conservation objectives (desirability, knowledge base, common understanding/definition
- Distinguishing changes in status from changes which reflect natural variability in setting COs?
- Determining what changes would constitute deterioration or significant disturbance
- How long is long-term? How realistic in a changed environment (climate, invasive species)? Are conservation objectives determined with a monitoring programme in mind? If so, what is the typical scope of a monitoring programme and how does it support adaptive management?
WORKING GROUP C: Conservation objectives for highly mobile species

SOME ISSUES TO STIMULATE DISCUSSION:
- Setting objectives when there are gaps in the scientific knowledge of the ecological requirements of species and working with data of variable quality and reliability
- How to deal with species, which benefit from a modified environment, or have interactions which are harmful to other listed species? (e.g. scavengers)
- Setting measurable and reportable objectives for highly mobile species
- Scope for a common strategy across Member states for highly mobile species (e.g. common conservation objectives, common monitoring standards and joint monitoring programmes)
- Deciding on a balance between broad/generic conservation objectives and more specific objectives
- How to take into account Favourable Reference Values in setting conservation objectives
- How to incorporate habitat considerations or the concept of key areas into conservation objectives for highly mobile species (e.g. feeding, breeding, migration bottlenecks)
- Taking account of natural variability when setting COs for highly mobile species
- Taking account of potential effects of climate change when setting conservation objectives for highly mobile species
- Setting recovery targets in a changed environment (eutrophication, climate)?

5. Theme 2: Reconciling Natura 2000 objectives and marine activities- Conservation Management and Planning

Working groups D and E will look at the identification of pressures and the preparation of measures with respect to the fishery sector. Working group F looks at the identification and preparation of measures with respect to the non-fishery activities. All should consider how the impact from commercial fisheries is addressed proportionally both within the sector and with other sectors.

SESSION OBJECTIVES:
• Identifying pressures and impacts at individual site level (risk assessment);
• Identifying (practical) conservation measures to tackle pressures and resulting in cumulative impacts;
• The planning of measures to progress towards reaching conservation objectives and the importance of adaptive management; strategies for planning
• Marine spatial planning and spatially defined activities and measures
• Stakeholder dialogue and engagement in conservation management planning
• Management measures in the context of Article 6 e.g. taking of measures, avoidance of deterioration and the appropriate assessment with respect to plans and projects
• Socio-economic analysis considering both costs and benefits of implementing management measures

Identifying threats and pressures at individual sites level

The threats and pressures on Natura 2000 features can be described in general terms but also need to be specified for individual sites.
Key general principles include;
• identifying operations for each feature, since features (and sub features) have different sensitivity to effects of different operations;
• assessing the sensitivity of features;
• establishing (and recording) the nature of the link between each operation and each feature (i.e. the mechanism by which it has an impact);
• assessing the vulnerability of each feature to the effects of each operation.

Relevant general information on threats and pressures is available from a variety of sources. For example, the marine Natura 2000 guidelines provide an overview of threats and pressures, the Marine Life Information Network (MarLIN) includes sensitivity assessments for various marine habitats and species to a list of marine activities, and the Commission has published a relevant document.

Identifying practical conservation measures to tackle threats and progress towards reaching conservation objectives

Guidance to assist Member States in establishing conservation measures for Natura 2000 sites is provided in a Commission Note published in 2013. This includes guidance on the requirements of the Habitats Directive, what is meant by conservation measures, when the necessary conservation measures are to be established, ways to implement Article 6.1, key elements to consider in establishing the necessary conservation measures, and the monitoring, evaluation and review of conservation measures. The guidance emphasises the requirement for measures to correspond to the ecological requirements of the Annex 1 habitat types and Annex II species present on the site. The types of measures that may be applied are indicated (e.g. statutory, contractual) together with key elements to consider in establishing the measures (e.g. participation, resources), as well as the purposes of monitoring and requirements for review and evaluation.

The marine Natura 2000 guidelines identify the current status of Natura 2000 features, target status and time scale to reach, as the driving elements for the definition of conservation measures in the marine Natura 2000 sites.

There has been considerable discussion about how fisheries management measures might be applied in Natura 2000 sites given that there can be national, European and international implications. The Commission paper on fisheries measures for marine Natura 2000 sites provides guidance on the scientific and technical information to underpin formal requests to DG MARE for fisheries management measures under the CFP.

Some of the issues to be tackled when identifying conservation measures for marine Natura 2000 sites are:

- the type, scale and level of detail to which data on natural features and socio-economic activity can be mapped in the marine environment

---

• an understanding of the ecological requirements of the feature
• the scope for both proactive and reactive measures
• the international dimension of planning and preparing conservation management for marine sites e.g. types of measures which may be appropriate within and beyond territorial waters.
• the potential role of a “lead authority” alongside the idea of a “site champion” given the different administrative and ownership patterns of marine sites compared to terrestrial.
• the importance of integrated monitoring programmes and particularly the benefits of exploring links with the monitoring requirements of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and the Water Framework Directive.
• The significance of management plans and marine spatial planning in providing a framework for delivering conservation measures in marine Natura 2000 sites.

5.1 Natura 2000 and the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP)
Commercial fishing activities are acknowledged to be a group of activities that have the potential to affect the conservation status of habitats and species which are protected in Natura 2000 sites12. In order to maintain or restore the conservation status of relevant habitats or species, Member States may therefore require the introduction of fisheries management measures.

The 2013 EU Regulation of the CFP13 empowers Member States to adopt conservation measures for fishing vessels under their sovereignty or jurisdiction that are necessary for complying with Article 6 of the Habitats Directive and Article 4 of the Birds Directive (Article 11). In cases where other Member States have a direct management interest in the fishery to be affect by such measures, the Commission is empowered to adopt such measures, upon request, by means of delegated acts. Relevant information, including the rationale, scientific evidence in support and details on their practical implementation and enforcement will need to be provided to the Commission and the relevant Member States. Joint recommendations may also be submitted by Member States with a direct management interest. In urgent cases, where no recommendation has been made, the Commission can adopt measures, but limited to those in the absence of which the establishment of the conservation measures is in jeopardy. Outside the territorial waters of Member States (12nm), the Commission has exclusive competence for fisheries management measures, hence regulation through the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) (EU 1380/2013) will be required. A formal request for adoption of such measures must be made to DG MARE of the Commission by individual Member States or in joint proposals. The Commission has outlined the relevant procedures in a background document including an eleven point list of the scientific and technical information to be provided to support such requests (Box 2)14. Whilst not a definitive list, nor a requirement, the Commission considers that information drawn from the 2008 document represents a useful basis on which to determine what information and data might accompany a request for fisheries management measures for Natura 2000.

12 Guidelines for the establishment of the Natura 2000 network in the marine environment (2007)
BOX 2. Guidance on scientific and technical information to be provided with a formal request to DG MARE for fisheries management measures for Natura 2000 sites located outside their territorial waters.

1) Comprehensive description of the natural features including distribution within the site.
2) Scientific rationale for the site's selection in accordance with the information provided in the Natura 2000 data form. Intrinsic value of its features. Specific conservation objectives.
3) Basis for the spatial extent of the site boundary clearly justified in terms of conservation objectives.
4) Threats to habitats and species from different types of fishing gear. List of other human activities in the area that could damage the habitats.
5) Fleet activity in the area and in the region, distribution of fleets (by nation, gear and species), and information on target and by-catch species, all over the last 3 years.
6) Seasonal trends in fisheries over the last 3 years.
7) Proposed fisheries management measures to maintain the habitats features in favourable condition. Are they proportionate and enforceable? Other conservation measures that apply to the area.
8) Control measures envisaged by the Member State, possible ecological and control buffer zones to ensure site protection and/or effective control and monitoring measures.
9) Measures to monitor and assess the maintenance and/or recovery of the features within the site.
10) Coordination with neighbouring Member States as appropriate.
11) Evaluation of possible displacement of fishing effort and impact on new areas.

Whenever a Member State requests regulatory fisheries management measures in order to fulfil conservation objectives, the Commission will evaluate the request and as appropriate take the necessary measures under the Common Fisheries Policy, based on scientific advice and after broad consultation with stakeholders, especially through the Regional Advisory Councils (RACs). Part III of the revised CFP, on measures for the conservation and sustainable exploitation of marine biological resources, is pertinent to the implementation of the Habitats Directive in the marine environment. If there is evidence of a serious threat to marine biological resources or to marine ecosystems relating to fishing activities, for example in a Natura 2000 site, in the waters of a Member State, the Commission, at the request of a Member State or on its own initiative, may in exceptional circumstances, decide on emergency measures. Commission emergency measures can only last for 6 months and can only be renewed once for an additional 6 months. Member State emergency measures can apply for a maximum of 3 months\textsuperscript{15}.

Article 17 of the CFP is especially pertinent to complying with proactive measures required under Article 6(2) of the Habitats Directive. This states that the criteria to be used by Member States when allocating fishing opportunities available to them shall include environmental criteria as well as those of a social and economic nature. The criteria may also include the impact of fishing on the environment, and Member States should endeavour to provide incentives to fishing vessels deploying selective fishing gear or using fishing techniques with reduced environmental impact.

\textsuperscript{15} EU 1380/2013, Articles 12 & 13.
The Commission has provided some guidance to improve the understanding of interpretation of the Habitats Directive in relation to fisheries, a common methodology for assessing the impact of fisheries on Natura 2000 sites and clarification of the process by which the management of fishing activities in Natura 2000 sites links to the CFP, and an overview of the potential interactions and impacts of commercial fishing methods on marine habitats and species protected under the EU Habitats Directive\(^{16}\).

Table 3: Examples of fisheries management measures under the CFP which have supported the management of Natura 2000 sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012/638/EU</td>
<td>2012/638/EU: Commission Implementing Decision of 24 September 2012 confirming measures proposed by the Netherlands for the protection of marine areas of conservation in the North Sea Coastal Zone, the Vlakte van de Raan and the Voordelta (notified under document C(2012) 6510)</td>
<td>Trawling restrictions in specified areas, within management zones of three Natura 2000 sites in Netherlands waters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Potential issues for discussion under Theme 2

**WORKING GROUP D: Fisheries – identifying threats and pressures**

**SOME ISSUES TO STIMULATE DISCUSSION:**
- Methods for identifying commercial fishery metiers which may affect Natura 2000 habitats and species;
- What is a useful balance between identifying generic pressures/impacts and the added value of identifying threats and pressures from commercial fishery metiers on a site-by-site basis?
- Overcoming the difficulties of using data from the fishery sector (VMS data) and the use of scientific monitoring data;
- Improving the coherence and quality of appropriate assessments
- The uncertainty with respect to proposed measures resulting from decades of ‘intensive fishing’ activity and the problem of the “shifting baseline”;
- Approaches to the use of expertise from the fishery sector and the use of knowledge from scientific monitoring which are mutually beneficial
- Approaches to identifying cumulative impacts of threats and pressures from fishing activities
- How to address the impact of recreational fisheries on Natura 2000 habitats and species?

WORKING GROUP **E**: Fisheries – introducing measures

**SOME ISSUES TO STIMULATE DISCUSSION:**
- Methods for (a) identifying, (b) spatially/temporarily planning and (c) prioritising the appropriate measures;
- How to deal with new/modified fishery techniques (electro-pulse, sum wing, etc.) and issues related to the transition to “sustainable fishing techniques”?
- Types of measures linked to different objectives e.g. prevent habitat degradation, species bycatch, loss of food availability;
- Improving the involvement of fisheries sector and the fishery authorities in the process and how (fishermen are mostly at sea!);
- What has been the experience so far with the new CFP Regulation with respect to fishery measures to support marine Natura 2000?
- What have been the experiences with enforcement and monitoring the effect of fishery measures on marine Natura 2000 habitats and species?
- Developing joint fisheries management measures e.g. inshore/offshore, between different countries;
- Scope for measures which are beneficial for Natura 2000 and fisheries? Balance between incentives and statutory measures;
- Enhancing research, education and information about proposed measures across sectors
- Considering costs and benefits of taking appropriate measures

WORKING GROUP **F**: Other marine sectors

**SOME ISSUES TO STIMULATE DISCUSSION:**
- How to identify and to scale spatial and temporal impact of non-fisheries sectors on Natura 2000 habitats and species?
- Do we know the respective stakeholders in these different sectors and are those typically involved representative? How to improve the involvement of stakeholders in the process?
- How to collaborate across border and across the entire Natura 2000 network?
- Ensuring pressures and impacts are addressed proportionally? Currently most attention goes to fishery, but other are less approached and several may have a significant effect;
- Types of measures linked to different objectives e.g. prevent habitat degradation, direct impact on species or indirect through the loss of food availability
- Methods for enforcing management measures and monitoring of their impact on Natura 2000 habitats and species.
- Developing joint measures e.g. inshore/offshore, or land-based or between different countries and scope for setting mutual goals for Natura 2000 and sectoral interests
- Highlighting examples of compensatory measures and of management of widespread activities (boating, leisure sports).
- Balance between incentives and statutory measures;
- Identifying cumulative pressures and impacts
6 Theme 3: Regional integration of Natura 2000 issues

SESSION OBJECTIVES:
Presentation of case studies and discussion of issues and potential solutions around 3 aspects of cooperation and the use of regional networks to support marine Natura 2000:

- Cross border collaboration in delivering the Natura 2000 network
- Synergies between regional networks and scope for cooperation
- Accessing financing mechanisms (EMFF, LIFE, INTERREG, etc.) and collaborating on financing programmes to support marine Natura 2000

6.3 Natura 2000 and Regional Conventions/international obligations

The Natura 2000 network contributes to and is supported by a variety of international obligations on biodiversity conservation. These not only relate to MPAs, but also to actions on habitats and species for which Natura 2000 sites need to be designated.

The 6th Environmental Action Programme of the European Community identifies ‘nature and biodiversity’ as one of the priority themes for action. Objectives and priority areas for action on nature and biodiversity laid down by the European Parliament and the Council in the 6th Community Action Programme include:

- Establishing the Natura network and implementing the necessary technical and financial instruments and measures required for its full implementation and for the protection, outside the Natura 2000 areas, of species protected under the Habitats and Birds Directives (Art 6.2.a. 7th indent)
- Further promote the protection of marine areas, in particular with the Natura 2000 network as well as by other feasible Community means (Art. 6.2.g. 4th indent)

As a contracting party to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the European Community has prepared an EU Biodiversity Strategy and Biodiversity Action Plans which aim, inter alia, to integrate biodiversity considerations into other Community policies. Marine biodiversity issues are addressed by both the Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) for Natural Resources, and the BAP-Fisheries. Marine issues have also been raised in relation to the impact of European fishing fleets in international waters.

The Natura 2000 network supports and benefits from regional MPA initiatives.

In the Baltic, under the auspices of the Helsinki Commission (HELCOM) the first Coastal and marine Baltic Sea protected areas (HELCOM MPAs) were established in 1994, following the adoption of the 1992 Helsinki Convention. Article 15 of the Helsinki Convention requires the Contracting Parties to take all appropriate measures to conserve natural habitats and biological diversity in the Baltic Sea (HELCOM 1992). To further implement Article 15, HELCOM Recommendation 15/5 "System of coastal and marine Baltic Sea protected areas (BSPAs)" was issued in 1994. In Recommendation 15/5 HELCOM agreed on guidelines and criteria for HELCOM MPAs. HELCOM Recommendation 15/5 was renewed in 2014 and is now superseded by the HELCOM Recommendation 35/1 “System of coastal and marine Baltic Sea protected areas (HELCOM MPAs)".
In the Mediterranean, through the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean (SPA/BD Protocol), the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention established the List of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance (SPAMI’s List) in order to promote cooperation in the management and conservation of natural areas, as well as in the protection of threatened species and their habitats. The conservation of the natural heritage is then the basic aim that must characterize the SPAMIs.

In the North East Atlantic, the Oslo/Paris Commission (OSPAR) Recommendation 2003/3 on a Network of Marine Protected Areas set out the goal for OSPAR Contracting Parties to continue the establishment of the OSPAR Network of Marine Protected Areas in the North-East Atlantic and to ensure that:

a. by 2012 it is ecologically coherent, includes sites representative of all biogeographic regions in the OSPAR maritime area, and is consistent with the CBD target for effectively conserved marine and coastal ecological regions;

b. by 2016 it is well managed (i.e. coherent management measures have been set up and are being implemented for such MPAs that have been designated up to 2010).

In all three examples given above there is some overlap in the MPAs which are part of the Natura 2000 network, and those which contribute to the MPA networks under these regional sea agreements (Figure 7). There is also some overlap in the threatened and declining species and habitats identified by these regional sea conventions whose protection may benefit from MPAs, and marine species and habitats for which Natura 2000 sites have been designated.

Figure 7. Overlap of marine Natura 2000 sites and Baltic Sea Protected areas (HELCOM MPAs).

6.4 Financing mechanisms to support implementation of Natura 2000

Effective management and restoration of sites in the Natura 2000 network requires significant investments. While the main responsibility for financing Natura 2000 lies with the Member States, Article 8 of the Habitats Directive legally links delivery of necessary conservation measures to the provision of the EU co-financing. At a national level, the Prioritised Action Frameworks (PAFs) under Article 8 of the Habitats Directive can be developed to facilitate a more systematic use of different EU funds for Natura 2000 and provide an opportunity to address the financing needs in a more structured way.

The Commission prepared a new "Financing Natura 2000 Guidance Handbook" for the period 2014-2020\(^\text{17}\). The document is designed to help EU Member States strengthen the uptake of EU funds for the management and conservation of their Natura 2000 sites in the new multiannual financial framework.

The handbook analyses and describes opportunities for financing investments in Natura 2000 from different funds and instruments. It provides guidance on complementarities between different funds and policies which can be of benefit to the network. There are also practical tips on better integration of Natura 2000 in the operational programmes and some guidance on possible use of innovative financing instruments. The most specific to Natura 2000 is the European financial instrument for the environment (LIFE). Other potential sources of funds are primarily targeted to deliver general EU goals but can support Natura 2000 if compliant with the overall objectives. They are the European Maritime Fisheries Fund (EMFF), the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD), the European Regional Development Fund (ERFD), the European Social Fund (ESF), Cohesion Fund (CF), and the Framework Programme for research and innovation (Horizon 2020).

**LIFE/LIFE+** is the only funding instrument which provides dedicated support to biodiversity and Natura 2000. It has supported environmental and nature conservation projects throughout the EU, as well as in some candidate, acceding and neighboring countries. Financing via action grants is available for various projects including: pilot projects, demonstration projects, best practice projects, technical assistance projects, capacity building projects, awareness and dissemination projects\(^\text{18}\).

For the 2014-2020 period, the LIFE Programme is divided into two sub-programmes: one for Environment and the other for Climate Action. The environment strand covers three priority areas: Environment and Resource Efficiency, Nature and Biodiversity and Environmental Governance and Information. The priority areas for the Climate Action strand are: climate change mitigation, climate change adaptation and climate governance and information. The scope for Integrated Projects (IPs) has also been introduced. IPs for the sub-programme for Environment will primarily focus on the implementation of plans and programmes related to nature (including Natura 2000 management), water, waste and air quality and Climate Governance and Information. In 2014, the LIFE Monitoring


Team published a thematic report on marine-related LIFE projects which analyses the LIFE programme contribution to protecting and improving the marine environment.\(^{19}\)

The EMFF is implemented by Member States through national operational programmes. There are several opportunities to fund Natura 2000 in the framework of sustainable fishing activities. For example, the EMFF Regulation stipulates that, where appropriate, the specific needs of Natura 2000 areas and the contribution of the programme to the establishment of a coherent network of fish stock recovery areas should be integrated into national operational programmes. The fund can support the preparation, monitoring and updating of protection and management plans for fishery-related activities relating to Natura 2000 sites and for their management, restoration and monitoring to support implementation of the MSFD. More indirectly the Fund can assist with the establishment of cooperation between fishermen and scientists and the diversification of livelihoods in rural communities.

In addition, the EMFF supports the development and implementation of the Union’s Integrated Maritime Policy through, *inter alia*, promoting the protection of the marine biodiversity and marine protected areas such as Natura 2000 sites, the sustainable use of marine and coastal resources and cross border cooperation. The fund provides financial support for studies, projects, public information and sharing best practices, awareness-raising campaigns, coordination activities, including information-sharing networks, development of sea–basin strategies, cross–sectoral data exchange systems, training projects for the development of knowledge, etc.

### Table 4: Examples of how investing in management of Natura 2000 can support thematic objectives of the 2014-2020 Multiannual financial framework (From Table 3.1 Guidance Handbook, Kettunen et al., 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU thematic objective</th>
<th>Synergies between investment in Natura 2000 and thematic objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Objective 2:</strong> Enhancing access to, and use and quality of, information and communication technologies (ICT)</td>
<td>Establishing cooperation between ICT and Natura 2000 sites to develop solutions that can support, test and/or pilot innovative e-solutions (e.g. environmental monitoring such as citizen monitoring, environmental governance, public access to information etc.). When developed and tested, such solutions can help to improve the management of Natura 2000 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic objective 8:</strong> Promoting sustainable and quality employment and supporting labour mobility</td>
<td>Implementing Natura 2000 management goals while creating direct and indirect employment opportunities: opportunities related to managing activities on the sites (e.g. seasonal employment related to ongoing management), opportunities related to tourism, opportunities related to production of Natura 2000 –branded produce etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic objective 11:</strong> Enhancing institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders and efficient public administration</td>
<td>Improving the capacity of authorities responsible for nature protection: resources for additional staff, physical assets (equipment, software), expertise (training) and technical assistance (e.g. twinning projects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6.2 Potential issues for discussion under Theme 3

**WORKING GROUP G: Cross-border collaboration**

Collaborative working between individual Member States and within Member States, for example across administrative boundaries.

**SOME ISSUES TO STIMULATE DISCUSSION:**

- Are there particular species and habitats whose protection/restoration will benefit from cross-border collaboration?
- What has been the added value of cross-border collaboration? Are the species and habitats better managed / protected or has most of the effort been on cross-border negotiations with little effect on the status of Natura 2000 species and habitats?
- Is there a return on investment for the involved authorities / stakeholders? (e.g. new insights, concrete measures)
- What have been the major hurdles to overcome?
- What management models have been used to deliver cross-border collaboration;
- What has been the use of other than LIFE-Nature EU-financial instruments for cross-border collaboration (see also working group I)

**WORKING GROUP H: Regional networks**

**SOME ISSUES TO STIMULATE DISCUSSION:**

- What are the different types of regional networks and regional sea conventions, and how might they support marine Natura 2000 implementation?
- Is there need/value in developing a vision for the management of MPAs for regional seas or for parts of their respective areas (North Sea, the Channel, Adriatic Sea, Aegean Sea) to support the implementation of Natura 2000?
- How might regional networks be used to understand/promote/deliver ecological connectivity between Natura 2000 sites?
- What might be the added value of regional seas MPAs to supporting management of marine Natura 2000 given that they focus on more species / habitats than in the Habitats Directive? How might any additional management opportunities be integrated into Natura 2000 sites?
- What are the opportunities for standardising data collection and monitoring methods across Natura 2000 using regional networks
WORKING GROUP I: EU Financing

SOME ISSUES TO STIMULATE DISCUSSION:

- What types of EU financing mechanism can be used to support marine Natura 2000: how well are they known and can they been better communicated at national level?
- What has been the experience so far with INTERREG? EMFF? LIFE? Etc. in supporting implementation of marine Natura 2000.
- How important has been the EU-financing relative to national resources to implement management in marine Natura 2000 sites?
- What might be the opportunities for complimentary, co-ordination mechanisms in funding programmes?
- How has EU-financing contributed so far to the protection of Natura 2000 habitats and species? If not or insufficiently, can we indicate precisely why and where the EU-funding should be modified so that these are more geared to support marine initiatives for Natura 2000?

7 The wider context

Natura 2000 focuses on endangered species and habitats, however the management of marine Natura 2000 should be complementary with the aims of having a high-quality marine environment in which human activities are managed in a sustainable way. Two particularly relevant cross-cutting EU initiatives are the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and Marine Spatial Planning.

7.1 Natura 2000 and Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) programme of measures

The Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) requires Member States to develop marine strategies for each marine region or sub-region. The approach required is to undertake an assessment of the current environmental status of the waters concerned, and of the environmental impact of human activities thereon, to determine the desired state of the marine environment. These are then used to establish a series of environmental targets and associated indicators, and to develop a programme of measures in order to achieve or maintain Good Environmental Status (GES).

Various requirements under the Habitats and Birds Directives can contribute to this task. Some or all of the habitats and species protected under these Directives could be considered as potential indicators of GES, especially with regard to Descriptor 1 which is concerned with biodiversity. While this primarily relates to Natura 2000 designation and management, other provisions such as the requirement to take requisite measures to preserve, maintain or re-establish a sufficient diversity and area of habitats for all species of wild birds (Art. 3 BD) and the requirement to protect species outside protected areas (Art. 5 BD & Art.12 HD), avoiding deterioration of habitats quality outside protected areas Art. 4(4) BD, regulations for introduction of species (Art. 22 HD) and managing landscape features (Art.10) can also be useful. Cross-reference or incorporation of the measures
introduced through management plans for Natura 2000 sites could also help the measures introduced under the different Directives to be mutually supportive. The wider measures to achieve FCS will contribute to achieving GES and could be written into the MSFD marine strategies.

Regarding the specific case of Natura 2000 sites, rather than creating a new legal provisions or requirements for designating MPAs, the Directive supports the full implementation of the Natura 2000 network in the marine environment as an important contribution to achieving GES of marine waters. Member States are required to identify measures that need to be implemented in order to achieving GES, taking into consideration the measures relevant for MPAs in general. Measures aimed at achieving the conservation objectives set for Natura 2000 sites in a marine region should then be inserted in the plan of measures for the region as a whole\(^{20}\).

In cases where there are management plans for Natura 2000 sites, they can be integrated into other development plans, for example when preparing the programme of measures under the MSFD. There are benefits to both initiatives. Management actions for species and habitats under the Habitats and Birds Directives will help achieve GES. At the same time, marine areas that will achieve GES will contribute to achieving Favourable Conservation Status of the species and habitats under the Habitats Directive.

### 7.2 Natura 2000 and Marine Spatial Planning

Within the EU, the MSFD requires Member States to develop marine strategies for their own waters, and coordinated strategies with other Member States for the Baltic Sea, North-East Atlantic Ocean, Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea. This is the environmental pillar of the EU Integrated Maritime Policy, promoting an ecosystem approach to management and the integration of environmental concerns into different policies. Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP), has been identified as a cross-sectoral tool supporting the EU Integrated Maritime Policy and is promoted through EU Directive (2014/89/EU)\(^{21}\) which establishes a framework for marine spatial planning and integrated coastal management aiming at promoting the sustainable growth of maritime and coastal economies and the sustainable use of marine and coastal resources (Article 1). The framework provides for the establishment and implementation by Member States of maritime spatial plans and of integrated coastal management strategies.

In both cases the environmental benefits of these types of strategic planning for marine areas are recognised. They include:

- Development of sustainable maritime activities and the protection of the marine environment based on a common framework and similar legislative implications.
- reducing the risk of spatial conflicts between expanding maritime uses, including the protection of the marine environment, in such a way that the social and economic demands on marine areas are compatible with safeguarding the marine environment and its ecological functions.
- supporting the implementation of existing EU legislation.
- a common approach providing Member States who apply MSP with an opportunity to share their expertise with others.

---
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ANNEX 1: CASE STUDIES SUBMITTED PRIOR TO SEMINAR
Case studies submitted under Theme 1: Setting Conservation Objectives

Mapping of the seabed in SCI Ropotamo (Black Sea, Bulgaria) towards assessment of the conservation status and management of sandbanks and reefs.

CONTRIBUTORS
Valentina Todorova, Lyubomir Dimitrov, Dimitar Berov, Ventzislav Karamfilov, Stefania Klayn

MAIN CONTACT
Name: Valentina Todorova
E-mail: vtodorova@io-bas.bg

SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY
Habitat mapping of the seabed is critical for generating and improving our knowledge about the habitat extent, area and distributional pattern of sandbanks and reefs. Knowing what is where is of primary importance for the assessment, conservation and proper management of the habitats. Within the framework of the 7 FP EC Project CoCoNet, field surveys were carried out in 2013-2014 in SCI Ropotamo (Black Sea, Bulgaria) for mapping of the seabed habitats. Multi-beam echo-sounder system was used as a main tool to create sonar mosaic of the seafloor. Areas with different backscatter characteristics were validated with groundtruth data: sediment samples for grain size and benthic infauna characterization and underwater photographic samples for phytobenthos and epibenthos characterization. A map of the seabed substrates using Folk 16 classification was produced. Digital elevation model and bathymetric chart were also produced. The substrate and bathymetric maps were interpreted as the habitat types 1110 and 1170. The biological communities were characterized with regards to their distribution, species composition, abundance and diversity. The results of the survey provide the knowledge base for the conservation status assessment of the sandbanks and reefs in SCI Ropotamo and provide a baseline for future impact assessment of human activities and threats in a well-defined spatial management context.

SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION
The study was carried out within the 7 FP EC Project CoCoNet: “Towards Coast to Coast Network of Marine Protected Areas Coupled with Sea-based Wind Energy Potential”.

KEY LESSONS LEARNT
Habitat mapping is required for developing the knowledge of the spatial distribution, extent and area of the sandbanks and reefs. Knowing what is where is a baseline for proper management of the human activities that may represent threat to the habitats of conservation importance.

USEFUL WEBLINKS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
Management of two marine Natura 2000 sites in the coastal waters of Cyprus (Eastern Mediterranean Sea)

CONTRIBUTORS
Marina Argyrou & Melina Marcou

MAIN CONTACT
Name: Marina Argyrou; E-mail: margyrou@dfmr.moa.gov.cy

SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY
Two marine Natura 2000 sites, Cavo Greco and Lara-Toxeftra (Akamas) located on the Eastern and Western part of Cyprus respectively; accommodate priority species and habitats, such as marine turtles, monk seal, Posidonia meadows, reefs, etc.

Lara – Toxeftra area is the main nesting habitat for Green and Caretta turtles. A monitoring program is being implemented since 1978, while management measures are being enforced since 1989. Long data results show an increasing trend for the nesting of *Caretta caretta* and a constant fluctuation for the *Chelonia mydas*. In 2013 Lara-Toxeftra was included in the list of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance (SPAMI’s List).

The Department of Fisheries and Marine Research (DFMR) elaborated a management plan for Cavo Greco identifying the important species and habitats of the area. It is noted that mapping of Posidonia meadows and reefs has been conducted for all the Natura 2000 areas, including Cavo Greco area. Management measures have been proposed.

The main threats for both areas is the tourist development, the increasing boat traffic, public visitation, umbrellas and sunbathing and driving on beaches, especially in Lara-Toxeftra area.

Well managed MPAs can play an important role in biodiversity conservation and in fish stocks recovery. It is obvious that the development and regular updating of an effective management plan, based on scientific information, is a prerequisite for the MPAs success. Therefore the main issue to be addressed is that MPAs should be followed by the development and establishment of an effective and efficient management plan, which will be relied on adequate human and financial resources. A substantial supplementary issue that needs to be considered for MPAs effectiveness is the surveillance and law enforcement.

SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION
Management of Natura 2000 sites including efficient law enforcement. Funds should be allocated for this purpose through various programs.

KEY LESSONS LEARNT (max 150 words)
There is good scientific knowledge and monitoring programs. There is a lack of personnel and funding (financial constrains) for an efficient control enforcement.

USEFUL WEBLINKS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
Addressing marine litter in Europe - Innovative business models and inspiring solution

CONTRIBUTORS
ECNC-European Centre for Nature Conservation

MAIN CONTACT
Name: Veronika Mikos ; E-mail: mikos@ecnc.org

SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY
In this case study we wish to highlight the importance of solutions that are integrated into scalable business models involving cross-sectoral collaboration which help to prevent and minimise marine litter in Europe. The objectives are in line with current trends in international and EU environmental policy, the EU 2020 Biodiversity Strategy targets, the IMP’s Blue Growth initiative, the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) and other related policies.

Environmental, maritime and fisheries policies have in common both the need to conserve natural resources and the fact that they are all crucial vectors of competitiveness. Hence the benefit of combining Europe’s ambitions for achieving “blue growth” in the maritime economy with “green growth” while protecting the environment is that it will boost development in those sectors and foster circular economy that prevents the loss of valuable materials.

Marine litter is a symbol of a resource-inefficient society. Not only is waste that ends up in our oceans not being put to better use, as raw material for new products, it can cause harm to marine life if they ingest it or become entangled in it, and it is difficult and expensive to clean up. There is a growing body of evidence to show that marine litter, in particular derelict fishing gear, poses serious environmental, conservation, animal welfare, human health and economic costs that are of relevance to many stakeholders. It is a global problem that requires urgent action.

One example of a successful initiative is ‘Healthy Seas, a Journey from Waste to Wear’ (www.healthyseas.org), which aims to remove waste, in particular fishing nets, from the seas for the purpose of creating healthier seas and recycling marine litter into textile products. The recovered fishing nets are transformed and regenerated into ECONYL® yarn, a high-quality raw material used to create new products, such as socks, swimwear, underwear and carpets.

SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION
At present, the initiative is operating in the North Sea, Adriatic and Mediterranean Sea, all regions important for biodiversity and coastal and maritime tourism, where waste fishing nets are collected with the involvement of various stakeholders such as divers, salvage companies, fishermen and fish farms.

To foster a shared understanding of both the problem, and effective solutions, the European Commission can play an extremely valuable role in coordinating, or facilitating coordination of, the data sharing and intelligence regarding marine litter to enable the identification of trends, notable problem gear types and geographic hotspots. Moreover, enabling the sharing of best practice solutions would have clear advantages to government and industry stakeholders wishing to make an effective contribution.

Furthermore, we believe that the opportunity exists for the European Union to demonstrate the importance of economic drivers in solving this problem by seeking to introduce regulatory changes which support the expansion of industries deriving economic value from the collection and recycling of fishing gear and other marine litter. One example could be the introduction of a relevant public purchasing policy, requiring a given percentage of recycled composition in plastic goods.

Healthy Seas provides a showcase at European level for circular economy and sustainability while highlighting that “waste is too valuable to be wasted”. It has been featured among others at the Green Week 2014 in
Brussels and at the EU Business and Biodiversity Platform. Commissioner Vella applauds the Healthy Seas initiative and supports its further implementation.

**KEY LESSONS LEARNT**

Most fishing nets are made from nylon, a valuable engineering-grade plastic which can be regenerated and used in textile products. We explain how the regeneration of fishing nets can support business models that offer a self-sustaining and scalable solution to the problem of waste fishing nets across Europe. Sustainability is the focus, from both the environmental and economic point of view. The strength of Healthy Seas lies in its partnership of NGOs and businesses working towards the same aim: a better planet and healthier seas, while learning-by-doing and being open to new partners and creative ideas.

Effectively tackling the problem of derelict fishing gear and, more generally, marine litter will clearly require long-term, co-ordinated action at the local, regional and global level. Healthy Seas is a successful industry-NGO collaboration project which showcases sustainable and self-financing solution which has the potential to be expanded and replicated more widely.

**USEFUL WEBLINKS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**

[http://healthyseas.org/](http://healthyseas.org/)
Improving Posidonia meadows management in Andalucia based on knowledge and participation: the utility of socio-economic studies of habitat environmental services

CONTRIBUTORS
Elena Díaz Almela, Rosa Mendoza y Soledad Vivas

MAIN CONTACT
Name: Rosa Mendoza; E-mail: rosam.mendoza@juntadeandalucia.es

SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY
Posidonia oceanica meadows, the ancient and endemic marine habitat of the Mediterranean, are extremely slow growth and currently diminishing for causes such as water pollution, illegal trawling and dredging, coastal works, urban sprawl, the arrival of invasive alien algae, uncontrolled boat anchoring on meadows, as well as incomplete knowledge of their extent and status. All this harms ecologically and thus economically, the local fishing and tourism industries, as well as coastal stability, but also reduces global climate change mitigation potential. This concern for the disappearance of Posidonia oceanica habitats led the Andalusian Council for Environment to launch the project LIFE + POSIDONIA ANDALUCIA, with a budget of 3,562,125 euros, 69.48% from the EU LIFE + Nature fund, to create a management framework for these marine habitats in the Andalusian Natura 2000 network, to curb their loss.

The case study will describe how the status and trends in quality and extent of the Posidonia meadows was assessed and monitored, including the role of stakeholders in this process. Examples of measures to mitigate the threats through improved surveillance, control of invasive algae spread and installation of ecological moorings and artificial reefs will be described and also how the socio-economic costs of the disappearance of the Andalusian Posidonia meadows was determined. These actions will support a process of adaptive management to achieve the conservation objectives and, through adaptive management, ensure long term protection of the Andalusia seagrass meadows. To this end, spatial protection and conservation objectives of Natura 2000 areas harbouring this priority habitat are analysed and management plans are developed for all of them.

SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION
Life+PosidoniaAndalucia has collaborated with projects Life+Prime, Life+Seamatter and Life+Accolagoons
We are willing to collaborate with projects focusing on:
- Posidonia meadows management and coastal management plans
- Studies of habitat environmental services: socio-economic studies and green infrastructure

KEY LESSONS LEARNT
- Well based information of Posidonia meadows location and state, and socio-economic studies of habitat loss environmental costs, are a powerful element to raise awareness and interest among stakeholders and the general public in the conservation of this relatively cryptic marine habitat
- Some environmental services of Posidonia meadows have potential to raise funds for habitat conservation and restoration, from fisheries and climate change mitigation or adaptation programs.
- Coastal stakeholders are willing to participate in management planning and meadow monitoring but demand solid information and updating, and that their views are taken into account to achieve green growth and/or equilibrium between their coastal economic activities and conservation.
- There is still scope to improve spatial conservation of seagrass meadows, even of Posidonia, in Andalusia
- Management plans approval and improved surveillance are key to enforce seagrass and coastal conservation

USEFUL WEBLINKS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
- [www.posimed.org](http://www.posimed.org)
Inventory and Designation of Marine Natura 2000 Areas in the Spanish Seas, the LIFE+ INDEMARES project

CONTRIBUTORS
Elena Consuegra Alcalde

MAIN CONTACT
Name: Elena Consuegra Alcalde; E-mail: consuegra.elena@magrama.es

SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY
The LIFE+ INDEMARES project “Inventory and designation of marine Natura 2000 areas in the Spanish seas” was launched in January 2009 to assess offshore prospects for their possible inclusion in the Natura 2000 Network. The project studied ten big areas, three of them in the Atlantic region (Avilés Canyon System, Banco de Galicia and Chimeneas de Cádiz), five in the Mediterranean region (Seco de los Olivos, Isla de Alborán, Columbretes, Cañón de Creus and Canal de Menorca) and two in the Macaronesian region (Banco de la Concepción and South of Fuerteventura). Recently, these areas which represent approximately 4 million hectares were proposed to the Commission as 10 Sites of Community Importance (SCIs) and 39 Special Protection Areas for Birds (SPAs). INDEMARES represents an important contribution to increase knowledge on marine species and habitats. During the first four years of the project, the most relevant experts in benthic habitats, pelagic species and seabirds, belonging to the relevant institutions with the needed means to obtain a complete inventory of the studied areas, have undertaken more than 100 oceanographic campaigns. Moreover, in order to know the impact of Natura 2000 network on human activities, the project is made an important effort in terms of socio-economic studies, thus it has been carried out fishing footprint analysis and other economic activities whose results will be taken into account preparing the management plans. Project INDEMARES has been essential to identify marine ecosystems in Spanish seas in order to contribute to the protection and sustainable use of the biodiversity in the Spanish seas through the identification of valuable areas for the Natura 2000 Network. The final result was the declaration under the Natura 2000 Network of 8% approximately of the Spanish sea waters thus fulfilling to the reinforcement of international sea agreements that are currently in force in Spain (OSPAR, Barcelona).

Nowadays, the main challenge in this NATURA 2000 sites is their management and monitoring. It requires calls for technological innovations which offer us a wide variety of alternatives to conventional monitoring of the marine environment. Spain is currently working on the basis of providing management and monitoring for each of the study areas in the context of a new LIFE+ project to address that remaining issues in the coming future.

SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION
Fundación Biodiversidad coordinated this project together with 9 partners, including the Spanish Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Affairs and relevant institutions in the research, conservation and management sectors of the sea and its resources. The budget is 15.4 M€ and is 50% cofounded by the European Commission.

INDEMARES had a participatory approach, and included all of the relevant institutions in management, research and conservation in marine environments. Moreover it promoted the public participation of all the involved parties in marine research, conservation and sea management and its resources, including the sea users by participation workshops which took place in each Site.

KEY LESSONS LEARNT
The needed to implement scientific studies of marine areas, through oceanographic campaigns, for marine habitats and species (mainly cetaceans, reptiles and birds) in order to have the basis for the protection of the seas.

The usefulness of promoting the participation of all the involved parties in marine research, conservation and sea management and its resources, including the sea users in this kind of projects which really need it, as well as raising awareness in the population about conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity.

The helpfulness of good socio-economic studies in order to provide management and monitoring guidelines for each study areas.

USEFUL WEBSITES FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
http://indemares.es/en/project/description
   red-natura-2000-declaracion-lugares-LIC.aspx
The conservation status of priority habitat 1150* « Coastal lagoons » in France: A site level assessment methodology

CONTRIBUTORS
Fanny LEPAREUR (SPN-MNHN, France)
Farid BENSETTITI (SPN-MNHN, France)
Annabelle AISH (SPN-MNHN, France)

MAIN CONTACT
Name: Fanny LEPAREUR; E-mail: flepareur@mnhn.fr

SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY (max 300 words)

The assessment of the conservation status of Annex I habitats and Annex II species at a Natura 2000 site level is a requirement under French law (Article R.414-11 of the Environmental Code). To support these evaluations by site managers and allow comparisons/sharing of data between sites, the Natural Heritage Service of the French Natural History Museum (SPN-MNHN) has developed a standardised methodology for the priority habitat 1150* « Coastal lagoons », funded by the French Ministry of Ecology.

The methodology in its current form is intended to be dynamic and able to evolve following feedback from site managers and scientists over the short to medium term. It is designed to apply both to Atlantic and Mediterranean coastal lagoons across France, and be practical, reproducible and accessible to all users. The method also emphasizes the use of common indicators under the Habitats Directive and Water Framework Directive, where this is possible and relevant.

This presentation outlines how the methodology was developed with the support of French scientists, the associated indicators and protocols, its use in site management, as well as which aspects of the method may evolve over the next years.

SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION

Two steering committees (Atlantic and Mediterranean) and a regional working group (Mediterranean) composed of scientists and technical experts, site managers and local government authority representatives (DREAL, DDTM) were set up to support the development of this methodology within France.

At a European level, it would be valuable to compare this French methodology with other approaches to the assessment of lagoons in neighboring member states.

KEY LESSONS LEARNT

A crucial yet challenging aspect in the process has been engaging site managers and encouraging their feedback in the application of the assessment methodology (strengths, weaknesses, what could be improved etc.).

We would have also liked to conduct sampling in a greater number of case study sites in the development of the method.

USEFUL WEBLINKS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION


http://inpn.mnhn.fr/telechargement/documentation/natura2000/evaluation
SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY

During 2015, Ireland will complete the publication of site-specific conservation objectives for its inshore Natura 2000 sites. This is a programme of measures to ensure full compliance with a Judgment of the European Court of Justice against Ireland. In particular, this required making processes as to the extent to which they could continue to license economically important site activities whilst remaining compliant with the query from regulators “How much activity is too much at a site?”

The development of a robust framework to operationalise the legal requirements of the Habitats Directive at site level required a detailed assessment of the species that were undertaken at each site to underpin the objectives. Comprehensive packs are now available online providing offers guidance to applicants on their obligations. Online documents for each site are also available outlining how the objectives should be interpreted and applied during the decision-making process.

Some case studies from this work will be presented to illustrate some of the key management challenges that are now emerging.

While significant progress has been achieved in implementing the Habitats Directive across the marine sector in Ireland, a new focus on complementarity with Marine Strategy Framework Directive and Marine Spatial Planning.

SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION

- A critical review of the existing Article 17 reporting framework for habitats taking account of important differences between Member States. In so doing, this could facilitate greater synergies between Favourable Conservation Status and Good Environmental Status.
- The development of EU guidance that could inform a consistent approach by Member States to the development of Article 17 reports in a timely initiative.

KEY LESSONS LEARNT (max 150 words)

- A robust and defendable approach to conservation objective setting is necessary to underpin decision-making participatively.
- The development and publication of site-specific conservation objectives and accompanying guidance documents for the requirements of the Directives.
- The focus of conservation management efforts must be on stable ecological units. Avoid trying to capture too fine a scale of detail which can become over complicated.
- There is a perception amongst sectoral stakeholders that inconsistent implementation is creating competitive advantage.

USEFUL WEBLINKS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Example of site –specific conservation objectives
http://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/sac/000133
http://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/spa/004151
http://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/spa/002287
http://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/spa/004075

Fisheries and aquaculture appropriate assessments
http://fishingnet.ie/sea-fisheriesinnaturaareas/concludedassessments/

Strict protection of cetaceans and examples of petroleum-related assessment, MMO reporting and monitoring
http://www.npws.ie/marine/marine-species/cetaceans
http://www.dcenr.gov.ie/Natural/Petroleum+Affairs+Division/Statutory+Assessments+of+Environmental+Statements/2013
http://www.dcenr.gov.ie/Natural/Petroleum+Affairs+Division/Statutory+Assessments+of+Environmental+Statements/2014
**Standardized Management Model of the Italian Marine Protected Areas and Natura 2000 network**

**CONTRIBUTORS**
Eugenio Dupré, Benedetta Brecciaroli; Marco Costantini

**MAIN CONTACT**
E-mail: dupre.eugenio@minambiente.it

**SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY**
In Italy 27 marine protected areas (MPAs) protect more than 200,000 hectares of marine environment, while the 306 marine Natura 2000 sites cover a marine area of about 600,000 hectares. All MPAs are at least partially overlapping with Natura 2000 sites. Every MPA and Natura 2000 site is autonomously managed by local authorities.

The Italian Ministry for the Environment promoted, with the support of WWF Italy, a high level training support for adaptive management of all MPAs, to be extended also to marine Natura 2000 sites. The initiative, named ISEA, promotes the methodology of the Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation and it aims to promote efficient and effective management and conservation of marine and coastal areas. The Open Standards bring together common concepts, approaches, and terminology in conservation project design, management, and monitoring in order to help practitioners improve the practice of conservation. In line both with the Habitat and Birds Directives and with the CBD commitment to establish a representative network of MPAs effectively managed, this approach is consistent with international and national laws and is based on reliable biological and socio-economical information.

ISEA involves MPAs managers in a standardized MPA management plan that can be summarized in a conceptual model. The model identifies priority biodiversity values, threats, external factors, along with activities and strategies addressed to reduce anthropogenic threats and impacts. Each MPA submits to the Ministry its own programming plan every three-year, consistent with the strategies and activities established within the conceptual model.

This approach can ease the process of sharing information and good practices among MPAs, harmonizing conservation strategies and activities within the Network.

**SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION (proposed or implemented)**
A network of MPAs managed with similar and comparable management plans (tools) established at Mediterranean level could be very useful in order to reach successfully results for common issues, such as the Mediterranean Strategies on biodiversity conservation (e.g. according to the Barcelona Convention goals and the Alien Species large scale shared actions).

The aim of a collaborative network could be the establishment of a coordinated group of MPAs that could be engaged in similar and synergic set of activities.

**KEY LESSONS LEARNT**
Standardizing management processes is crucial for coherent and effective conservation activity of MPAs and Natura 2000 sites managed by different authorities.

Standardized management plans, conceptual models and adaptive management approaches are effective tools to summarize conservation strategies and activities and represent a way to show the funding needs for the successful protected areas management.

**USEFUL WEBSITE FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**
http://www.progettoisea.it/
**Deep-sea corals in need of management measures under Natura 2000**

**CONTRIBUTORS**  
Hanna Paulomäki, Nicolas Fournier, Christina Abel, Marta Carreras, Marin Pilar

**MAIN CONTACT**  
Name: Nicolas Fournier; E-mail: nfournier@oceana.org

**SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY**

Cold-water coral communities are biodiversity hotspots. These corals play an important role to preserve the resilience of marine species and ecosystems in deep environments and contribute to maintaining ecosystem functioning also acting as shelter or spawning areas for fish. Common reef-building and habitat-forming corals in cold waters include colonial stony corals (Scleractinian), true soft corals (Octocorallia), black corals (Antipatharia) and calcifying lace corals (Hydrozoa) such as: *Lophelia pertusa*, *Madrepora oculata*, *Leiopathes sp.*, *Antipathes sp.*, *Callogorgia verticillata*, *Dendrophyllia cornigera*, *Acanthogorgia sp.* among others. Many of them are also considered VMEs (Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems) due to their close relationship with fishing stocks conforming unique assemblages which make them even more likely to potential impacts coming from destructive fishing technics or gears associated.

Bearing in mind the Habitats Directive, deep-sea corals reefs have been already considered to fall under the 1170 habitat type. However, despite being insufficiently unknown to date, the increasing pressure on deeper ecosystems makes deep-sea corals one of the most threatened marine habitats worldwide as their fragility makes them vulnerable to physical impact. Consequently, the lack of management or mismanagement of these habitats may have permanent or irreversible consequences over their dependent species and it will likely affect the entire ecosystem.

Due to the lack of knowledge, innovative campaigns using advance technology (e.g. ROV) have been undertaken making possible to set new locations in EU waters (e.g. LIFE+ INDEMARES in Spain, HERMES project). However, despite that most of these campaigns aim to increase the marine N2000 network to deeper sites, a common strategy to achieve and maintain a Favourable Conservation Status for these habitats is still lacking. According to the Habitats Directive obligation, designated sites (SCIs) should have a management measures in place within six years at most. Consequently, Member States should agree on conservation objectives for these habitats under a common strategy based on information gathered and experiences in different regions.

**SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION**

Now there is a good opportunity to stablish under the MEG a set of guidelines to avoid the deterioration of these natural habitats under a common EU strategy which combines Habitats Directive and MSFD with the CFP implementation and the measures under articles 7 “Types of conservation measures” and 8 “Establishment of fish stock recovery areas” of its consolidated text.

**KEY LESSONS LEARNT**

Based on experiences from different off-shore sites already designated in different Member States, MEG meeting can provide guidance to elaborate a document on the common management guidelines to properly conserve deep-sea corals.
Protection and management of marine environment in “Västerhavet” (Swedish part of Skagerrak, Kattegatt and Øresund)

**CONTRIBUTORS**

Havs och vattenmyndigheten (HaV) / Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SwAM), and County Administrative board of Västra Götaland (West Gotaland), Regional Authority of Nature Conservation) and Foundations of Success (FoS)

**MAIN CONTACT**

Name: Lena Tingström; E-mail: lena.tingstrom@havochvatten.se

**SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY**

Dealing with national policies and international treaty obligations (OSPAR, HELCOM, Natura 2000, the MSFD) in MPA management is challenging. Policies and obligations are at best complementary, and often overlap and are couched in ambiguous language. Authorities responsible for the management of individual Marine Protected Areas and the network they form are struggling to practically interpret and implement these policies in their management efforts. SwAM in collaboration with various CABs and FoS teamed up to deliver a “proof of concept” for a method to help integrate these policies in a useful and practical standardized MPA Network design.

This pilot shows how this standardized design can be applied to a suite of individual MPAs. It also shows how this design enables meaningful roll-up of data across MPAs to inform management decisions on the MPA network level and to track the performance towards policy objectives and treaty obligations. Ultimately, this system will enable systematic conservation and learning within and across this network of MPAs.

The work of protecting areas for responsible authorities should move from working with individual areas and cases to a broader perspective on network level. The pilot project started with forming a common marine strategy for further protection and management of the marine environment and biodiversity in Västerhavet, the pilot area located on the west coast of Sweden. Today >10% of the marine area of Västerhavet is formally protected. The protection is unevenly distributed (mostly shallow coastal areas) and to a large part lacking sufficient management and regulation.

The pilot will assess how management and its measures achieves conservation objectives on several levels (individual MPAs and network of MPAs) in order to fulfil national and international obligations to reach the targets that is set up. It will provide a system that allows for these assessments. The presentation will show a test of the system in a pilot area, Västerhavet, to evaluate and refine it. This is done by using the adaptive management methodology Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation.

**SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION** (proposed or implemented) (max 150 words)

Scope area: “Västerhavet”, the west coast of Sweden, bordering to Danish and Norwegian waters. The pilot area includes three counties, Västra Götaland, Halland and Skåne. The authority responsible for management of protected areas in Sweden is the County Administrative Board.

The area contains around 60 Natura 2000 sites with marine habitats, 10 OSPAR MPAs and 10 HELCOM MPAs. Many of these areas are also nature reserves (one marine national park) on under national legislation. The geographic representativity of the areas are is very unevenly distributed, a majority of the MPAs are located in coastal and shallow areas. To create a coherent network of marine protected areas in this region there is a need for a common strategy for marine protection and management.

To make up a common strategy we use adaptive management based on the Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation (Conservation Measures Partnership and Foundation of Success) and the software tool Miradi and MiradiShare.

**KEY LESSONS LEARNT**

Starting up with building a common strategy the participants got a common view of threats and pressures in the whole area and a better understanding of the measures and management that can strengthen the marine conservation to the benefit of the whole area.

There is still a lack of knowledge of issues concerning ecological coherence and management effectiveness and how to assess these issues. Questions concerning larval distribution its contribution to favourable status for marine protected areas, bathymetry and habitat distribution, what new areas should be protected to have good representative of habitat species.
Setting and assessing conservation objectives for highly mobile species

CONTRIBUTORS
Peter G.H. Evans

MAIN CONTACT
Name: Dr Peter G.H. Evans; E-mail: peter.evans@bangor.ac.uk

SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY (max 300 words)
The following section will summarize the context, the issues (among them pressures and threats), the management requirements, measures and solutions proposed or implemented and any remaining issues to be addressed in the future.

The identification and management of Natura 2000 sites for highly mobile species presents particular challenges. That is probably the reason why spatial protection for mobile marine species under Annex II typically covers only a relatively small part of their range. Using marine mammals in particular as examples, this case study will address issues of population structure, movement patterns, home range sizes and uses, and the identification of critical habitats. Some environmental features that are important for marine species are more stable than others. These need to be recognised since they affect how management boundaries should be set. But even taking that into account, conditions may change and that means that management needs to be responsive. Resources have tended to be focused upon the MPA establishment process and rarely sufficiently cover monitoring and management needs, including ensuring compliance for any measures in place. SACs for mobile species generally need to be large, but with flexible management within those areas, relaxing restrictions in some parts through a zoning system reviewed at appropriate intervals. Monitoring should take place not only within but also beyond the SAC boundaries so as to reveal changes in status and distribution of the target species, with the intensity of monitoring/surveillance varying spatially. Pressures and threats similarly need annual surveillance. Although the formal establishment of an SAC is a long process, zoning of areas within that can be much more reactive to change. Assessment for whether a species is in Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) should be considered beyond national boundaries but also on a site-by-site basis. At present, the legislation requires only national reporting of FCS. Finally, it would be beneficial to look beyond the current selection of Annex II species when establishing SACs, and consider areas that are hotspots for a range of taxa.

SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION (proposed or implemented) (max 150 words)
There is great scope for management authorities, advisory bodies, and research scientists to work much closer together, and to engage with other stakeholders on a regular basis. The latter takes a lot of time and resources but is extremely important. Human activities (e.g. noise disturbance from, seismic and shipping, fisheries conflicts) well beyond Natura 2000 sites may nevertheless impinge upon those sites, so attention needs to be paid to them at this wider scale as well.

KEY LESSONS LEARNT (max 150 words)
• Make SACs large for mobile species, taking account of population structure
• Be prepared to zone activities within them
• Don’t be too restrictive, but ensure that the areas most important for life functions (e.g. breeding & nursery grounds) are well protected
• Monitor species populations beyond SAC boundaries
• Operate flexible management within SACs, responding in a timely fashion to change
• Provide adequate resources for monitoring and management; without those, SACs are little more than “paper parks”

USEFUL WEBLINKS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
http://www.seawatchfoundation.org.uk/publications/
### Case studies submitted under Theme 2: Reconciling Natura 2000 objectives and marine activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protecting Natura 2000 reefs. Implementing fisheries regulations through the CFP – a case study from Denmark.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTRIBUTORS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie-Louise Krawack, Danish Nature Agency &amp; Anja Gadgaard Boye, Danish AgriFish Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAIN CONTACT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: Marie-Louise Krawack; E-mail: <a href="mailto:makra@nst.dk">makra@nst.dk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Natura 2000-site has a list of species and habitats it is designated to protect. In Denmark new management plans and baseline analysis is completed for each area every six years. In this process the state of the habitat types and species within each area are identified, as are threats and pressures. In Denmark 65 sites are designated for reefs. One of the pressures identified is disturbances from bottom trawling fishing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to adequately protect the reefs a precise location and expansion of the reefs is needed. In 2011 a mapping campaign was begun to map the habitats within each Natura 2000 site. The mapping was carried out by the Danish Nature Agency. Habitat maps were given to the Danish AgriFish Agency, the agency is in charge of implementing fisheries regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through scientific advice adequate protection for each site was determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The procedure of applying fisheries measures in accordance with the Common Fisheries policy of joint recommendations was followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The case study will document the process from identification of pressures and threats through the implementation of fisheries regulation for 10 Danish sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION &amp; COLLABORATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project has required a strong collaboration between the Danish Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries and the Danish Ministry of the Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY LESSONS LEARNT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The requirements for background knowledge and content of a joint recommendation and the proposals for fisheries regulation is much better understood by Danish authorities after having written the first proposal for fisheries regulation under the CFP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Towards better practice in mitigation policy implementation for coastal and marine development projects in European and French contexts

**CONTRIBUTORS**

Jacob Céline, CREOCEAN – Centre d’Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive  
Bas Adeline, EDF-EN – UMR-AMURE  
Pioch Sylvain, Centre d’Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive  
Thorin Sébastien, CREOCEAN

**MAIN CONTACT**

Name: Jacob Céline; E-mail: celine.jacob@cefe.cnrs.fr

**SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY (max 300 words)**

The following section will summarize the context, the issues (among them pressures and threats), the management requirements, measures and solutions proposed or implemented and any remaining issues to be addressed in the future.

Although the mitigation policy implementation (i.e. avoidance, reduction, restoration and offsetting measures) for coastal and marine development projects should ensure the respect of the “no net loss” principle of biodiversity components, few data are available on its influence on slowing or stopping marine and coastal biodiversity loss. Our reviews of French marine and coastal Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) related to development projects consistently show that assessments of impacts are particularly intricate. In most cases, the analyses lead to a finding of no significant residual impacts and do not propose offsetting measures. A study conducted on EIAs related to different types of marine works including dredging, port extension, oil drilling, wastewater discharge, and offshore windfarms, in France, displayed a lack of offsetting measures and questioned the very few measures proposed to offset residual impacts in terms of equivalency and appropriateness. Thus, we consider that the main pitfalls of the mitigation implementation for coastal and marine projects appears to be (i) the unsuitability of the methodologies used to assess ecological losses resulting from a development project and ecological gains generated by a compensatory measure, (ii) the lack of knowledge concerning marine ecosystems functioning and (iii) the absence of suitable ecological engineering techniques. Through this communication, we propose a state of the art in the mitigation hierarchy implementation for coastal and marine projects and its results in terms of ecological equivalency. We then engage a broader discussion on the implications of an ‘environmental mitigation’ that would take into account the socio-economic context.

**SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION (proposed or implemented) (max 150 words)**

Need of a working group on marine and costal mitigation in order to promote better practice on:

- Losses and gains assessment
- Ecological engineering techniques use
- Key functional areas identification

Linkages should be further reinforced with people working on maritime spatial planning in order to develop tools that help identify key ecological areas, degraded areas that could be restored...
Evaluating the sensitivity of marine habitats to physical pressures: a key tool in assessing the risks posed by human activities in French Natura 2000 sites

**CONTRIBUTORS**

Marie La Rivière (SPN-MNHN, France)  
Annabelle Aish (SPN-MNHN, France)

**MAIN CONTACT**

Name: Marie LA RIVIERE; E-mail: mlariviere@mnhn.fr

**SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY**

In order to be able to analyse the vulnerability of Habitats Directive Annex I habitats to anthropogenic activities, we need to be able to assess their sensitivity to different types of pressures. This information can then guide the implementation of risk assessments, the prioritisation of monitoring programmes, and ultimately management decisions to help achieve favourable conservation status.

The Natural Heritage Service of the French Natural History Museum (SPN-MNHN) is currently coordinating the development of a methodology to assess the sensitivity of Natura 2000 habitats to physical pressures, funded by the French Ministry of Ecology (MEDDE). The Ministry has a particular interest in the use of this data to implement “fishing risk analyses” in every marine Natura 2000 site, in accordance with its memorandum published in 2013, and supported by the French MPA Agency.

The sensitivity evaluation methodology developed by the SPN-MNHN will be based on best available knowledge and aims to be applicable at a national scale, covering both Atlantic and Mediterranean habitats. In the interest of compatibility at a European scale in the context of Natura 2000 site management, we are pursuing links with similar processes underway in neighbouring countries. In this presentation we will outline how the methodology is being developed, its rationale and “rules”, as well as challenges and perspectives on its potential evolution.

**SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION**

The sensitivity data resulting from the application of this methodology will be used in the implementation of “fishing risk analyses” within marine Natura 2000 sites across France.

At a European level, it would be valuable to compare this French methodology with other approaches to the assessment of sensitivity within Natura 2000 sites.

**KEY LESSONS LEARNT**

This methodology is in the early stages of development, so key lessons learnt mainly pertain to lessons passed on by other member states (notable the UK).
**An ecological mooring area, a way to protect Posidonia beds. The case of Natura 2000 marine site Posidonies du Cap d’Agde, France**

**CONTRIBUTORS**
Renaud Dupuy de la Grandrive, Sylvain Blouet & Edouard Chéré, Ville d’Agde, marine service and Natura 2000 site Posidonies du Cap d’Agde

**MAIN CONTACT**
Name: Renaud Dupuy de la Grandrive; E-mail: renaud.dupuy@ville-agde.fr

**SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY**
Due to a very high touristic context - Cap d’Agde is one of the largest European coastal touristic area and harbour, 250000 tourists per day – some sectors of the MPA Côte agathoise, Natura 2000 site Posidonies du Cap d’Agde were under the pressure of many maritime stakeholders, particularly with the impact of the anchors of the boats. The most threatened habitats and species were *Posidonia* beds and fan mussel *Pinna nobilis*. The manager of the MPA – city of Agde - has set up a dialogue since 4 years between the parties in order to propose shared solutions. After a strong diagnosis, 38 ecological moorings were installed in a definite and administrative area in order to protect *Posidonia* meadows (priority habitat), shallow rocky habitats and *Pinna nobilis*, and prevent the arrival of invasive species. Another objective was to regulate the area to assure the security of the different stakeholders: local visiting ships, sailing, motor and recreational boats, spearfishing, swimmers, professional and recreational scuba divers...

The project links technical and administrative issues like ecological and scientific approaches and special local regulations with communication and public awareness through a small blue maritime patrol at sea during the summer and a series of classical communication tools.

To evaluate the efficiency of the mooring area in a science-based manner, indicators have been defined depending on the mooring aims. The MPA wants to develop indicators to provide a global vision of the mooring area management, both at the environmental socio-economical and governance ways. Several kind of indicators are used: biological (in situ scientific monitoring), related to uses (frequency monitoring), to knowledge and perception (obtained from field surveys), and to the MPA management. The governance is assured through an annual advisory council, where the representatives of the different stakeholders are setting, to review the work done and propose improvements.

This whole coast of the project is about 250000 € for 3 years, financed by the French Water Agency, French MPA’s Agency and the city of Agde. It is the biggest ecological mooring area of Languedoc-Roussillon region.

**SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION**
The project has been adapted in consideration with the maritime administration regional approach concerning the mooring strategy for the boats in the french Mediterranean sea. It has been shared with region Languedoc Roussillon and French Mediterranean MPA’s.

**KEY LESSONS LEARNT**
The project has been built closely with the stakeholders concerned during 4 years. It is based on a scientific approach: mapping of the habitats and species, high knowledge of the maritime activities (types of stakeholders, frequentation, duration,), diagnosis, solutions proposed.
Link protected of marine habitats and security of the mooring boats
High level of ecological materials used.
A whole project including : collaborative approach at the beginning, ecological technical solutions, public awareness, communication (general and on the field with the Blue patrol)
Monitoring to measure the efficiency of the mooring area by using indicators
An advisory council to share results... and new propositions for a better management

**USEFUL WEBLINKS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**
http://www.dailymotion.com/video/x23o432_la-zone-de-mouillages-ecologiques-de-brescou-le-cap-d-agde_news
Management of fishing in English European Marine Sites

CONTRIBUTORS
Dr Jean-Luc Solandt, Ms Sandy Luk

MAIN CONTACT
Name: Jean-Luc Solandt; E-mail: jls@mcsuk.org

SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY

Management of potentially damaging projects in EU marine protected areas - so-called Natura 2000 Sites - are meant to be subject to strict protection measures. Despite this, up until 2012, there was no strategic approach across the UK to regulate potentially damaging fishing in sites, regardless of case law, or the implications of damage from certain fishing gears (e.g. bottom trawls and scallop dredgers). In summer 2012 the UK Government revised its approach to how it implements Article 6 of the Habitats Directive with respect to fisheries in England which has led to a new scientific risk-based approach to managing potentially damaging fishing activities. Delivery of management has involved regulators, NGOs, government offices, statutory nature conservation agencies and fishing interests collaboratively populating a scientifically populated ‘risk matrix’. Inshore and offshore regulators are now managing sites pro-actively by bringing into force local by-laws and permitting arrangements that restrict potentially damaging fishing. This work has initially led to over 5,000km² of reef and seagrass SAC habitat being protected in May 2014. Work is now moving to protect ‘sandbank’ and other habitats by the end of 2016 in inshore and offshore waters. The work shows the ability for a number of different stakeholders to engage with improving the implementation of a law which is now over 20 years old, but which has generally been poorly implemented in the marine environment. It is an example of progressive protection that makes the marine Natura 2000 network more effective in achieving its conservation goals.

SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION

As the legislation is effectively the same for French authorities that regulate the same fisheries, there is direct application for such work in French waters. There are significant areas for collaborative opportunities with French agencies, and non-governmental agencies to create protection measures in French waters. Furthermore, as many sites (such as Bassurelle sandbanks, and White Barfleur) are shared competency under CFP, Article 11 applies. As such there are currently ongoing discussions between UK and French authorities (and other member states) on the likelihood of damaging fishing in these sites. So, the inshore progress that has been made to protect features should be discussed with other EU colleagues at such a meeting.

KEY LESSONS LEARNT

1. Problems at a specific local site can illustrate a systemic national failure.
2. The recognition that dealing with the national failure would result in conservation outcomes being more likely to be achieved across English marine Nature 2000 sites.
3. A visionary combination of the strengths of a traditional environmental NGO with ecological skills (MCS) with the technical legal skills provided by ClientEarth.
4. A willingness from all sides to see a gradual phasing in of the ‘new’ approach, rather than calling for an immediate cessation of fishing in order to achieve compliance.
5. Regulators want to follow the law, but when local politics is difficult, a strong legal incentive is required.
6. There is a need for national policy-makers to ensure that local regulators are supported in their decisions.

USEFUL WEBLINKS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

http://marinenvironment.blogspot.co.uk/2008/05/move-to-ban-scallop-dredging-in.html
http://www.southern-ifca.gov.uk/management-of-mpas
Lessons learnt in current MPA design processes from a stakeholder perspective in the Netherlands: a negative process regarding the Dogger Bank, and a hopeful development on the Central Oyster Grounds & Frisian Front

CONTRIBUTORS
Pim Visser, Wouter van Broekhoven, Jurgen Batsleer

MAIN CONTACT
Name: Wouter van Broekhoven; E-mail: wvanbroekhoven@visned.nl

SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY
The Netherlands initiated the FIMPAS (fisheries measures in protected areas) project in 2009, in which it was attempted to design a zoning proposal for the Dogger Bank in a participatory process. The legal framework was the Habitats Directive and the Common Fisheries Policy, and legal obligations for Member States NL, UK, and GER. Actors were the Dogger Bank Steering Group (MS, European Commission, ICES) and the North Sea Regional Advisory Council Focus Group (NGO’s and fishing industry), with facilitation from the MASPNOSE project. In a series of workshops by the NSRAC FG, evidence on benthic communities and fisheries distribution were gathered. In a joint fact-finding process, fishermen openly showed their tracks on laptops. A zoning proposal was developed (no-take, buffer, no restrictions). The workshop delivered valuable output in the form of a joint and supported zoning proposal. However, the process regressed from then on, with a lack of support from the DBSG in implementing the proposal, and interactions increasingly based on negotiations rather than content. The situation remains unresolved, but we are convinced that important lessons can be learnt from this case study in terms of requirements for a successful participatory process.

In the current development of an MPA on the Central Oyster Grounds and the Frisian Front on the Dutch Continental Shelf, additional area closures are to be implemented in order to reach the government’s per cent coverage targets. We are hopeful that lessons such as those learnt from the Dogger Bank process are being implemented in this process. The outcome is as yet unknown, but the process thus far has been more inclusive.

SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION (proposed or implemented) (max 150 words)

-  

KEY LESSONS LEARNT (max 150 words)
- Clear Terms of Reference must be determined at start of process (objectives, roles, rules, support, funding)
- Use best available “usable” data
- Full transparency (all data to all participants, and discuss any updates with all involved)
- Discussion should be based on content, not on negotiation
- Stakeholders should have clear mandate
Balancing economy and ecology in the absence of coherent data on the international Dogger Bank

**CONTRIBUTORS**

John Clorley, DEFRA, UK  
Ton IJlstra, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Netherlands

**MAIN CONTACT**

Name: Ton IJlstra ; E-mail: a.h.ijlstra@minez.nl

**SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY**

Balancing economy and ecology in the absence of coherent data on the international Dogger Bank

The process of developing fisheries measures for the International Dogger Bank started in 2011 with the establishment of a steering group consisting of representatives of four states which have part of their EEZ on the DB: Germany, Denmark, Netherlands, United Kingdom. The process started in the knowledge that ecological data on the DB were not recent. Economic information was virtually absent. What did these States do to obtain these data and how did relevant stakeholders participate in this and provided information? The effort of finding a common language between states and scientists of different disciplines will be described. Discussions were complex because of the presence of different types of fisheries (beamtrawl, twinrig, purse seines etc.) and different target species (flat fish, plaice, sandeel) and different economic interests among states. How was scientific advice obtained and which difficulties emerged in developing fisheries measures. In a reiterative process whereby observers from the industry and NGO’s and the NS RAC played an important role solutions were found, which in the end were not all supported by all participants. Our contribution will outline the stumble blocks and the solutions found and the lessons to be learned.

**SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION**

Dogger Bank is one of the first multilateral N2000 cases where States have to found solutions on environmental issues against the background of the new CFP. Experiences can be shared. For the development of Joint Recommendations some important conclusions can be drawn in a joint group.

**KEY LESSONS LEARNT**

- Find a common language with regard to the conservation objectives  
- Develop a long term view on acquiring knowledge with regard to marine systems  
- Establish economic databases which are up to date and which can be easily accessed to  
- Develop a code of conduct for stakeholders and states
**Why are fishing activities so difficult to manage in Natura 2000 areas? The Balearic Islands as a case study.**

**CONTRIBUTORS**  
Hanna Paulomäki, Nicolas Fournier, Christina Abel, Marta Carreras, Marin Pilar

**MAIN CONTACT**  
Name: Nicolas Fournier ; E-mail: nfournier@oceana.org

**SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY**

The sea around the Balearic Islands (Spain) is one of the most studied areas in the Mediterranean Sea and where many species and habitats listed in the Habitats Directive are distributed, having 57.800 ha declared as SCI. However, all this knowledge is not being used effectively to develop the required management plans to these sites, which often ignore measures for an activity often described as the main threat to the conservation of marine species/habitats: commercial fishing.

Oceana will present an example of an integration planning tool to evaluate with a simple methodology the potential threats from different fishing gears could mean for species and habitats conservation in Balearic N2000 sites. This practical methodology build on the Matrix approach could be used to develop appropriate management plan for fisheries while avoiding spatial conflicts in the Natura 2000 network in the Balearic Islands and probably in other areas. Also, different possible solutions will be presented to make fisheries activity more compatible with habitats and species conservation, based on scientific studies, projects carried out by the administration, regulations developed, etc. We intend to specifically focus on the problems of bycatch of loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) and conflicts between bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) with the artisanal fleet, proposing possible solutions and alternative measures.

Examples like the Balearic Islands, where there is a lack of an adequate fisheries management in the Natura 2000 sites, highlight the necessity to improve the implementation of Article 6 of the Habitats Directive and to ensure the marine habitats and species conservation. Oceana trusts this approach can also be replicated elsewhere Europe, and in particular in neighbouring Mediterranean Member States.

**SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION**

Examples of lack of fishing management in Natura 2000 sites would help to show why this activity is so difficult to take into account in marine conservation and find solutions to solve this problem in different countries. Analysing pros and cons of different possible management measures to ensure marine conservation, could give common ideas on how to deal with fishing management in Natura 2000 sites.

**KEY LESSONS LEARNT**

Fishing management in Natura 2000 is not being developed properly in some places. A lack of coordination between environment and fishing administration is probably one of the main responsible facts. An improvement on article 6 development is needed to ensure marine habitats and species conservation. There are controversial measures to diminish conflicts between fishers and marine conservation. It is needed a better transfer between knowledge and management, to develop proper conservation measures. It’s needed a better monitoring and surveillance in fishing.
**Fisheries management measures for reefs: comparative analyses of implemented measures inside different Natura 2000 areas**

**CONTRIBUTORS**
Hanna Paulomäki, Nicolas Fournier, Christina Abel, Marta Carreras, Marin Pilar

**MAIN CONTACT**
Name: Nicolas Fournier; E-mail: nfournier@oceana.org

**SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY**

Article 6 of the Habitats Directive requires Member States to take appropriate measures to avoid the deterioration of habitats and species for which protection the area has been designated. Commercial fisheries have been identified as one of the threats which can form a threat to these features and in maintaining those in favourable conservation status. Therefore the effect of fisheries is required to be assessed, and, when necessary managed accordingly to reduce the negative impacts. In addition the renewed Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) has provisions on fisheries management inside Natura 2000 sites in its Article 11. The European Commission has issued guidance on a consistent approach to implement these two.

This case will compare different fisheries management guidelines developed or implemented to Natura 2000 sites to protect reefs in different EU Member States. We present the impact of fisheries on the reefs in these areas, compare the management guidelines and methodologies used, list potential shortcomings of the fisheries measures and definitions of the habitat concerned. Based on these we draw conclusions and recommendations to manage fisheries on reefs better. Presentation will also provide an insight for fisheries regulation under the CFP.

The cases include for instance the recently implemented trawling bans for Danish and Scottish Natura 2000 sites, as well as, yet to be developed measures for other types of reefs (such as deep sea coral), which are in desperate need of proper fisheries management measures.

**SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION** *(proposed or implemented) (max 150 words)*

Development of fisheries management measures for marine protected areas should include both fisheries and nature conservation directors since the beginning. Ideally other stakeholders are also included from the early stage. In order to develop coherent approaches, existing regional structures, like regional sea conventions, should be used as a platform for this work.

**KEY LESSONS LEARNT** *(max 150 words)*

Often these plans are developed in isolation, country by country. We believe it would be beneficial if wider, regional considerations were included. It is also important to have well documented, comparable methodologies for fisheries management inside marine protected areas. The planned measures should also have monitoring included in order to assess the effectiveness of measures.
INTRODUCTION TO CASE STUDY (max 150 words)
The UK boasts a diverse marine environment, containing vast number of valuable habitats and features, including many of those listed in Annex I of the Habitats Directive. The diversity of our marine environment extends to 3 zones inshore (0-6 nautical miles), managed by local regulators, nearshore (6-12 nautical miles), managed by a national organisation and offshore (12-200) managed under the CFP. There are different legislative drivers and procedural processes governing the implementation of management for fisheries within marine protected areas in these separate zones.

This case study examines the differences in legislation, stakeholder engagement, procedure and approach to management for sites within both areas for the implementation of management measures for fisheries in European Marine Sites and Marine Conversation Zones in inshore and offshore UK territorial waters.

ISSUES, PRESSURES & THREATS (max 150 words)
There are differing issues, pressures and threats for the inshore and offshore areas:

Inshore:
- Ensuring adequate protection is in place for sites most at risk of damage by fishing activity through a risk based, phased approach
- Protection is in place for remaining habitats and species by 2016 (European Marine Sites and first tranche Marine Conservation Zones)
- Sufficient resources available to bring these measures into effect within the timescale
- Further refinement of process for additional tranches of Marine Conservation Zones.

Offshore:
- Obtaining agreement from other Member States for the proposed management measures in line with the legal requirements of the reformed Common Fisheries Policy before submission to the European Commission
- Ensuring management recommendations are submitted within the required time
- Acceptance of management proposals by the EC
- Sufficient resources available for this process.

MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS, MEASURES & SOLUTIONS (proposed or implemented) (max 150 words)

For the inshore area:
Using a matrix process we defined high medium and low risk interactions between gear types and habitats based on sensitivity. We have brought into force 17 new byelaws between November 2013 and May 2014 to afford protection to features we have identified as being the most sensitive to certain fishing activities. We will continue to use a risk based phased approach with the aim of having in place effective management, where necessary, by the end of 2016 across European Marine Sites and first tranche Marine Conservation Zones.

For the offshore area
We are currently developing recommendations to the EC containing management proposals that have been developed with the input of stakeholders, including representation from the administration and industry of the Member States concerned. These proposals mainly adopt an adaptive management approach and to an extent, are able to take into account the effect of closures to the fishing industry when designing the proposals.

**SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION** *(proposed or implemented) (max 150 words)*

For the inshore area
- Engagement with national stakeholders and Non-Government Organisations through quarterly meetings
- Working closely with national regulatory bodies to ensure consistent implementation of the fisheries management across Marine Protected Areas.

For the offshore area
- Gain input from industry and administration stakeholders for the development of management proposals through stakeholder events
- Work closely with other Member States in the development of recommendations for implementation for the Commission
- Explore possibility of a coordinated approach with other Member States where this results in Marine Protected Areas having a shared proximity.

**KEY LESSONS LEARNT** *(max 150 words)*
- Early engagement with stakeholders is essential to enable their input to be incorporated into the recommendations.
- Communication with other Member States following the same procedure is beneficial to ensure we are aligned in the submission of joint recommendations to the EC, particularly as this is the first year of the new reformed Common Fisheries Policy and corresponding new procedure.
- Effective forward planning ensuring that resources are allocated to ensure the delivery of the 2016 deadline, particularly for the inshore area.

**USEFUL WEBSITES FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**
Case studies submitted under Theme 3: Regional integration of Natura 2000 issues

Towards coherent management plan for MPAs in the Channel between UK and France. A work undertaken in the INTERREG PANACHE project.

**CONTRIBUTORS**
Benjamin Ponge and Gwendal Dorel (French Agency for Marine Protected Areas)

**MAIN CONTACT**
Name: Benjamin Ponge  E-mail: benjamin.ponge@aires-marines.fr

**SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY (max 300 words)**
The INTERREG PANACHE project was conducted between British and French partners over three years (2012-2015) to contribute to structure the Channel Marine Protected Areas network both in human and ecological terms. Among others, a work package was dedicated to management plans. As the whole project, it did not target Natura 2000 sites only, but they represent a vast majority of Channel MPAs.

This work aims at providing tools for MPAs manager to facilitate management but also to improve coherence among British and French MPAs. The work entails a glossary and a step by step management plan tutorial aiming at framing a management toolbox in the near future. It is crucial that different MPA managers have a common understanding of the key terms and what does it mean in both countries: inventory, long term objectives, action plan, monitoring or assessment for instance. The tutorial identifies the key steps to set up the management plan and provide guidance for implementing those key steps:

- What are the main ecological features at stake? How to prioritise the objectives in my MPA?
- For the selected features, what kind of long term objectives could be set?
- What are the main categories of measures?
- How to monitor the level of achievement of the long term objectives?
- What are the main resources (stakeholders and tools) to support management plan implementation in the United Kingdom and France?

The future toolbox should be complemented first for marine Natura 2000 sites, with additional tools like a list of existing measures or common monitoring and assessment tools.

**SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION (proposed or implemented)**
This project stands for an example of use of the INTERREG fund to work on MPAs management plan with the objective of improving coherence between different countries which share the same ecological responsibilities.

Even if it was not dedicated to Natura 2000 sites only, further projects could be set up with more focus on Natura 2000:
- Joint management of cross-border Natura 2000 sites;
- Implementation of common management methodology on pilot Natura 2000 sites in different countries;
- Common observatories at regional level for birds, marine mammals, habitats to pool resources and methodologies regarding monitoring and assessment of Natura 2000 sites effectiveness;
- Create a network of managers of marine Natura 2000 sites (or all MPAs).

The development of a MPA database was part of this project which benefits from the experience of a similar project that took place in the Atlantic (INTERREG MAIA project). This MPA database format has also been selected by the OSPAR Commission and could be further spread out. This database enables to display information about management such as the ecological features at stake, the regulations, the management plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY LESSONS LEARNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work on management plans shows that important discrepancies arise in the implementation of similar instruments (MPAs) even when they aim at protecting the same features (Natura 2000 sites). This type of work, especially meeting each other and putting on the table what exists in each country, is very useful to clarify basic information like the terminology but further effort are required to build tools to support a more coherent and collective management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USEFUL WEBLINKS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANACHE MPA database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIA MPA database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSPAR MPA database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel seabirds observatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Mediterranean MPA network: how it contributes to the implementation of marine Natura 2000 objectives.

CONTRIBUTORS
Marie Romani and Chloë Webster, MedPAN

MAIN CONTACT
Name: Marie Romani; marie.romani@medpan.org (copy: chloe.webster@medpan.org)

SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY
This proposal aims to emphasize the importance of regional networks of MPA managers to achieve the marine Natura 2000 targets. The regional “Human” networks, like MedPAN for the Mediterranean Sea, support the development of ecological and effective networks of MPAs that respond to Aichi target to protect 10% of Regional Seas including Natura 2000 marine sites.

This support takes several forms including advocacy at the regional, European and international levels, networking of different actors in charge of creating new MPAs and extending existing MPAs, enhancing common understanding and scientific knowledge at the regional level through sharing and collaboration, developing regional databases and analyses of MPAs to give an overview of existing MPAs, their ecological coherence and gaps and formulating recommendations for a better integration of the ecological network of MPAs into Marine Spatial Planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management frameworks. In particular, at the Mediterranean level, MedPAN, together with the RAC/SPA, developed a regional database of MPAs, MAPAMED and produces every 4 years a regional analysis of the level of protection and management. This work is done in close collaboration with MPA database at national level (French MPA Agency), European level (with the European Environment Agency) and International level (WCMC / WDPA) and with other Seas (OSPAR/Maia...). Human networks also improve MPA management effectiveness through capacity building, exchanges among MPA managers, promoting lessons learnt and best practices, promoting participative governance, and developing management guidelines etc...

The proposal will highlight the role of regional networks of MPA managers to support the effectiveness of the marine Natura 2000 network. A set of key recommendations and actions will be drafted to show the role that can plays the regional MPA network to support the establishment of biogeographic “working groups” for the management of Natura 2000 marine sites and to support a marine Natura 2000 permanent technical network.

SCOPE FOR CO-OPERATION & COLLABORATION
Cooperation must be found between different regional MPA networks in Europe (MedPAN, Maia, Panache...), their close collaboration with Regional Seas Conventions (RAC/SPA UNEP/MAP, OSPAR...), and their concrete support to future biogeographic “working groups” for the management of Natura 2000 marine sites and to support a marine Natura 2000 permanent technical network.

In the case of the Mediterranean, MedPAN can provide its tools (website, MPA database, newsletter, contacts directory, monitoring protocols database, virtual library, collaborative space) and events (workshops, trainings, exchange visits, MPA Forum every 4 years...) to support biogeographic “working groups” for the management of Natura 2000 marine sites and Natura 2000 permanent technical network.

KEY LESSONS LEARNT
Importance of human regional MPA networks to reach effective management of MPAs including marine Natura 2000 sites. Efficiency of regional MPA networks is linked with concrete and technical actions close to the needs of MPA & marine Natura 2000 managers at local level.
Important to develop synergies with Regional Seas Conventions and partnerships (eg.WWF, IUCN, GFCM, ACCOBAMS) at regional or sub-regional levels to reinforce the effectiveness of networking and its concrete impacts. Ensuring long-term regional MPA networks existence requires strong governance, interactivity with members of the network, and sustainable financial mechanisms (trust fund for example).

USEFUL WEBLINKS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
http://www.medpan.org
http://www.mapamed.org