



Workshop on coordinated implementation of nature, biodiversity, marine and water policies

Background document

2 December 2014, 10:30 – 17:00

3 December 2014, 9:00 – 16:00

Maison des Associations Internationales (MAI)

40 Rue Washington, 1050 - Brussels



Table of Contents

1	OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP	3
2	BACKGROUND	5
2.1	Introduction	5
2.2	EU policy frameworks for nature, biodiversity, marine and water	5
2.3	Overview of similarities and differences	7
3	THE PLENARY SESSION – SETTING THE SCENE	10
4	THE PARALLEL SESSIONS.....	12
4.1	Parallel session 1: Objectives and assessment	13
4.1.1	Introduction	13
4.1.2	Selected case study presentations.....	14
4.1.3	Discussion points.....	15
4.2	Parallel session 2: Monitoring and reporting	15
4.2.1	Introduction.....	16
4.2.2	Selected case study presentations.....	17
4.2.3	Discussion points.....	18
4.3	Parallel session 3: Programme of Measures and public participation	19
4.3.1	Introduction.....	19
4.3.2	Selected case study presentations.....	20
4.3.3	Discussion points.....	22
5	EXPECTED OUTPUTS OF THE WORKSHOP AND FOLLOW-UP	23
6	ANNEXES	24
6.1	Annex I Case studies submitted	24
6.2	Annex II Implementation timeline	29
6.3	Annex III Documents of interest	30
	REFERENCES.....	31



1 OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP

This **background document** aims to provide participants to the workshop with an overview of the legislative and policy background relating to the key points of discussion, the details of the presentations of the case studies during each parallel session and key questions to guide the discussions.

At their meeting of December 2013 in Vilnius, the Nature, Marine and Water Directors recognised the need to further strengthen the coordination and cooperation between the three policy areas¹. As a result of this meeting, the decision was made to organise a joint event to discuss topics of common interest, lessons learnt and identify potential areas for future activities. The objective of this workshop is to **identify good practices for coordinated implementation and potential future activities of joint interest** for the nature biodiversity, marine and water policy fields. The approach is to focus on common lessons learnt, explore inter-linkages across different pieces of legislation, present case studies from Member States and elaborate on gaps and recommendations stemming from the practical examples discussed. This activity builds on earlier efforts to explore the links between the three policies (see section 2.3 and Annex III).

The EU policies and legislation to be discussed within the scope of the workshop include the overarching **EU Biodiversity Strategy 2020(BDS)**, the **Water Framework Directive (WFD)**, the **Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD)** and the **Birds and Habitats Directives (BHD)**.

The workshop is built in the following manner. The **plenary session** will set the scene for the **three parallel sessions** that are foreseen to look at possible integrated practices in **three thematic areas** relating to the directives covered. The themes covered are *Objectives and Assessment*, *Monitoring and Reporting*, and *Programme of Measures (including public participation)*. The outcomes of the discussions of the parallel sessions will then be presented at the **closing session** to all the participants and will form the basis of the overall output of the event.

The outcomes of the workshop will be developed into a consolidated reference document with recommendations, general lessons learnt, cross-cutting issues and areas for future work. The consolidated reference document will then be presented at the next Joint Nature, Water and Marine Directors meeting, which is planned to take place in November 2015 during the Luxembourg Presidency.

The workshop and its outcomes will be an important contribution towards the achievement of three priority objectives of the **7th EU Environment Action Programme**: 1 - To protect, conserve and enhance the Union's natural capital; 4-- to maximise the benefits of Union environment legislation by improving implementation; and 5 -- to improve the knowledge and evidence base for Union environment policy. The workshop also reflects the Commission's '**Smart Regulation**' agenda, in particular ongoing efforts to simplify and streamline obligations related to the implementation of EU legislation. The Commission has a role to play in advancing the Smart Regulation agenda in terms of reviewing and, where necessary, revising existing legislation to ensure it is fit for purpose, and thoroughly assessing the economic, social and environmental impacts of any new legislative proposals. Nonetheless, Member States and stakeholders are best placed to identify problems and

¹ Outcome of the 1st joint Directors' meeting On CircABC
<https://circabc.europa.eu/w/browse/d86ec3f9-c631-4376-aac2-3ad36255558e>



needs arising from their experience of implementing the *acquis* on the ground, and share best practice in view of improving implementation across the EU.

Finally, the workshop is intended to provide an opportunity to discuss how we can work together to improve the implementation of the current policy framework. It is not intended to propose or discuss changes to the policy or legislation, which is beyond the scope of this workshop.



2 BACKGROUND

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The sustainable use of water and marine resources and the protection of biodiversity are priorities of the EU's environment policy framework, and specific pieces of legislation are in place aimed at achieving each of these priorities. However, success in one area will invariably depend on progress made in the others. Coordinated implementation of interlinked environmental policies is rewarding in numerous respects. Firstly, it maximises the contributions of these policies to achieving higher quality of our environment. Secondly, it promotes better regulation both at EU and national levels by avoiding burdensome duplication of work, which can result from lack of dialogue between implementing bodies. Despite the progress already made towards streamlining implementation, further efforts are needed for a more coherent approach across the different legal frameworks in place for tackling water, marine and biodiversity issues.

Implementation of the EU environmental framework tends to be undertaken by a variety of separate departments at national level, which frequently work in policy 'silos'. This approach has logically led to the development of different methods, especially at management and maintenance levels. Before one can consider how best to enhance synergies between these different policy areas, it is important to first bear in mind the context in which the different instruments have been developed, the objectives that they aim to achieve as well as their specific functioning (definitions and core obligations).

This workshop builds on earlier efforts to explore the links between the four policies. Annex III of this background paper lists key documents developed in that respect. In order to ensure a constructive workshop based on a common understanding of what remains to be achieved, the following two documents are **highly recommended readings**.

- Developed in a bottom-up approach to respond to practical implementation questions, the document on the "**Links between the Water Framework Directive and the Nature Directives**"² should serve as a baseline working tool.
- In a similar manner, a frequently asked questions document has been developed on the "**Links between the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive and nature legislation**"³.

2.2 EU POLICY FRAMEWORKS FOR NATURE, BIODIVERSITY, MARINE AND WATER

This section summarizes the EU policy and legislation to be discussed within the scope of the workshop and provides a snapshot of the similarities and differences between the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD), the Water Framework Directive (WFD), the Birds and Habitats Directives (BHD) and the EU Biodiversity Strategy (BDS).

² <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/FAQ-WFD%20final.pdf>

³ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/marine/docs/FAQ%20final%202012-07-27.pdf>



Each of the four directives sets in place specific objectives/targets and requires the development of **measures, monitoring, periodic assessments and reporting**.

The **Habitats Directive (HD)**, together with the **Birds Directive (BD)**, forms the so-called ensemble of "Nature Directives" or **Birds and Habitats Directives (BHD)**, which is the legal basis for the creation of the Natura 2000 network of protected areas. The Habitats Directive aims to contribute towards protecting biodiversity in the EU, including in the marine environment, through measures designed to maintain or restore, to a favourable conservation status, natural habitats and species of wild fauna and flora of Community interest (Art. 2). The Birds Directive is concerned with the conservation of all naturally occurring wild bird species and covers their protection, management and control (Art. 1(1)). Whilst it does not include the term "favourable conservation status" as in the Habitats Directive, the aim (set out in Article 2) can be considered analogous to favourable conservation status (FCS) of the Habitats Directive.

The main objectives of the **Water Framework Directive (WFD)**, adopted in 2000, are to prevent any deterioration of the current status and to reach Good Ecological Status and Good Chemical Status in all surface waters. For groundwater the WFD establishes the objective of Good Chemical and Good Quantitative Status, which includes the protection of associated surface water and terrestrial ecosystems. As a rule the good status objectives need to be reached by 2015. Through the concept of WFD protected areas, the Directive also integrates additional requirements necessary to ensure the protection of water-dependent habitats and species and specific uses such as drinking water, bathing water and shellfish (Articles 4(1)c, 6 and 7). All environmental objectives (including those for protected areas) need to be monitored (Article 8 and Annex V section 1.3.5) and a Programme of Measures should be established to achieve them (Article 11).

Adopted in 2008, the **Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD)** establishes a framework within which Member States take the necessary measures to achieve or maintain Good Environmental Status in the marine environment (Art. 1(1)). The purpose of the Directive is to protect, preserve, prevent deterioration of or, where practical, restore Europe's ocean and seas where they have been adversely affected and to prevent and reduce inputs in the marine environment (Art 1(2)(a) & (b)). The directive provides an integrated response and a long-term policy vision for Europe's marine environment. The MSFD establishes an ecosystem-based approach to the management of activities using and affecting the ocean and seas. It sets the goal of achieving 'Good Environmental Status' (GES) for European marine waters by the year 2020, thus protecting resources on which marine-related economic and social activities depend. The MSFD addresses all aspects of biodiversity within the marine waters of EU Member States (excluding transitional waters covered by the Water Framework Directive), and takes a regional approach to the delivery of its actions.

Adopted in 2011, the **EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 (BDS)** has the overall goal of halting the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services in the EU by 2020, restoring them in so far as feasible, while stepping up the EU contribution to averting global biodiversity loss, in accordance with the 2020 headline target for biodiversity set by EU Heads of State and Government in March 2010. The BDS also reflects the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)⁴ and its global Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The Strategy includes six targets and 20 actions

⁴ <http://www.cbd.int/>



encompassing nature conservation and restoration and, among other issues, marine and water protection. It also calls for an integrated monitoring and reporting framework. This offers an opportunity for streamlining and avoiding the risk of overlaps and unnecessary administrative burden across the supporting directives listed above. The BDS operates as an integration tool in certain aspects, e.g. full implementation of the Birds and Habitats directives constitutes a specific target of the BDS, yet many others still lie in a twilight zone of coordination. A **Working Group on Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services (MAES)** was set up under the Common Implementation Framework for the EU Biodiversity Strategy. WG MAES supports the implementation of Action 5 of the BDS, i.e. Member States mapping and assessing the state of ecosystems and their services in their national territory. Work on MAES includes marine and coastal ecosystems; it draws on a common conceptual framework and a set of agreed indicators.⁵ MAES can identify priority actions delivering synergies to nature and biodiversity, water and marine policies from ecosystem-based solutions such as Green Infrastructure⁶ and Natural Water Retention Measures⁷.

2.3 OVERVIEW OF SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

The WFD, MSFD, BHD and BDS all aim at protecting and improving the environment. Therefore, generally speaking, action taken under one of the instruments will be beneficial for the others. For example, action taken under WFD to reduce nutrient loads will combat eutrophication of the marine environment and will improve the chances for fish protected species to reproduce sustainably. Actions under the Habitats Directive to restore valuable riparian habitats will improve the hydromorphological condition of water bodies and will therefore improve their status.

The **protection targets** are however differently set in the various instruments. The WFD establishes ecological and chemical objectives for all water bodies on the basis of a concrete list of quality elements (hydromorphological, physico-chemical and biological). The MSFD covers whole marine environment, including coastal waters where it overlaps with the WFD. The MSFD builds on WFD objectives for coastal waters but is much broader in scope, encompassing a number of descriptors that go beyond the WFD quality elements (fish, mammals, noise, litter, etc.). The BHD protect specific habitats and species and aim at achieving Favourable Conservation Status for them. Some of the water-dependent protected habitats and species are actually part of the WFD quality elements (e.g. certain protected fish or macrophytes species). The network of protected sites is designed as a tool to ensure that the objectives for the protected habitats and species are achieved at the level of biogeographical region. The WFD and MSFD integrate the BHD objectives through the concepts of WFD and Marine Protected Areas respectively. One common feature is that all four Directives include non-deterioration provisions.

The **scales** at which the objectives are determined and assessed are also different. The WFD objectives of Good Status are set at EU level, specified at biogeographical levels for each type of water body and then assessed at water body level. The MSFD objectives of Good Environmental Status are set at the level of Marine region or sub-region and assessed by Member States on the basis of an indicative list of characteristics, pressures and impacts. The HD sets the objective of Favourable Conservation Status at the level of biogeographical region and assessed by Member

⁵ <http://biodiversity.europa.eu/maes>

⁶ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/ecosystems/index_en.htm

⁷ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/archives/water/adaptation/ecosystemstorage.htm> ; <http://www.nwrn.eu/>



States at the level of species and habitats. In all three cases, the Commission carries out its own assessment of progress in implementation on the basis of information reported by Member States. The BDS headline target of halting the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services by 2020 is an EU-level target, which is monitored by the Commission together with Member States and the EEA through an integrated monitoring, assessing and reporting framework. The EU 2010 biodiversity baseline and set of biodiversity indicators are key components of this framework.

The Directives have also different requirements as regards monitoring, reporting and assessment. The MSFD builds on the WFD for those descriptors which are relevant to the MSFD. The WFD requires specific monitoring of water-related objectives in protected areas. Moreover the Directives require MS to adopt programmes of measures (WFD and MSFD) and/or conservation management measures (BHD), and public consultation procedures.

An overview of the main similarities and differences across the Directives is presented in Table 1 below.

Directive/ Policy	Biodiversity Strategy	Marine Strategy Framework Directive	Water Framework Directive	Habitats Directive	Birds Directive
Objectives to be achieved	Headline target: halting the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services in the EU, and restoring them in so far as feasible	Good Environmental Status (GES) of marine environment	Prevent status deterioration. Good Ecological Status and Good Chemical Status in all water types. Good Chemical and Quantitative status in groundwater. Additional requirements for protected areas.	Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) of protected habitats and species.	Status of population which corresponds to ecological, scientific and cultural requirements (similar to FCS concept)
Timetable	Headline target by 2020; separate timelines for six more specific targets	Achieve GES, by 2020	WFD environmental objectives, including those linked to the achievement of FCS in water-dependent Natura 2000 sites, by 2015	No formal timetable set for achieving FCS according to the HD but quantified targets under Target 1 of Biodiversity Strategy.	No formal timetable set for achieving equivalent measures for wild birds but quantified targets under Target 1 of Biodiversity Strategy
Measures	Twenty specific actions addressing the different targets	Measures are taken to achieve or maintain GES by 2020	Measures in order to achieve the environmental objectives, including a set of compulsory basic measures and the necessary supplementary measures.	Measures designed to maintain or restore, at favourable conservation status, natural habitats and species of wild fauna and flora of Community interest (Arts.2 and 3) Priorities for N2000 sites (Art. 4.4) and conservation measures (Art. 6.1). Measures for species (Art. 12 and 13).	Measures to maintain the population of wild bird species at a level which corresponds in particular to ecological, scientific and cultural requirements, while taking account of economic and recreational requirements or to adapt the population of these species to that level (Art.2 and 3). Measures for habitat management (Art. 4), species



					protection (Art. 5, 6, 7)
Reporting	<p>2012 "Largely" completing Nature 2000 network, incl. marine areas (Action 1a)</p> <p>2014 First mapping and assessment of status of ecosystems and services;</p> <p>2015 COM mid-term assessment of EU 2020 Biodiversity Strategy</p>	<p>2012: initial assessment of marine waters, definition of GES and establishment of environmental targets;</p> <p>2014: establishment of the monitoring programmes;</p> <p>2015: establishment of the programmes of measures (PoMs);</p> <p>2018: update of 2012 reporting</p> <p>2021: update of the PoMs</p>	<p>MS reports:</p> <p>06/2004: administrative arrangements</p> <p>03/2005: pressure and impact and economic analysis</p> <p>03/2007: monitoring programmes</p> <p>03/2010 and every six years thereafter: RBMP</p> <p>12/2012 and every six years thereafter: progress on implementation of measures</p> <p>COM reports:</p> <p>2007: on the basis of the 2004/2005 MS reports</p> <p>2009: on the basis of the 2009 MS reports</p> <p>2012 and every 6 years thereafter: on the basis of 2010 reports</p> <p>2015 and every 6 years thereafter: on the basis of the 2012 reports</p>	<p>2013 MS report under Art. 17 (HD) and Art. 12 (BD) (conservation status)</p> <p>2015 COM report on conservation status</p> <p>2019 MS report under Art. 17 (HD) and Art. 12 (BD) (conservation status)</p> <p>2021 COM reports on conservation status</p>	

Table 1 Overview of the similarities and differences across the Biodiversity Strategy, the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, the Water Framework Directive and the Birds and Habitats Directives



3 THE PLENARY SESSION – SETTING THE SCENE

The numerous inter-linkages between the WFD, MSFD, HBD and the BDS have already been recognised and efforts already made to coordinate and streamline work on implementation.⁸ At the EU level, for instance, this is happening through the different Working Groups and Technical Groups established in the context of the implementation strategies developed for the directives and the BDS. For example, the 2014 “Work Programme for 2014 and beyond” of the MSFD specifies that the Working Group GES will tackle cross-cutting areas, either by collaborating with other existing Groups⁹ or by taking into account work already done under other Directives that led to, among others, the following documents:

- Common understanding on the application of descriptor 5 on eutrophication (through the work carried out under the WFD ecological status e.g. through the WFD Eutrophication Guidance Document).
- Common understanding on the application of descriptors 8 and 9 on contaminants including additional work on criteria 8.2, if necessary (through the work carried out under the WFD priority substances e.g. in the respective WFD working group).
- Common understanding on coherence and representativeness of MPAs in support of GES (through Marine Expert Group under the Habitats Directive).

However, as acknowledged by the Water and Marine and Biodiversity and Nature Directors in Vilnius, more can and should be done to avoid the risk of duplication and reduce unnecessary administrative burden, at EU, sub-regional, regional (Regional Sea Conventions and River Basin) and Member State levels.

This session will introduce streamlining approaches undertaken by the Member States, for instance through the establishment of integrated monitoring programmes that comply with the obligations of the different directives. Given the potential for increased coordination of implementation, the introductory session will set the scene for the three parallel discussions on objectives and assessment, monitoring and reporting, and programmes of measures and public participation.

In terms of timing, many of the key milestones for these directives often coincide and may present opportunities for practical synergies, as illustrated in Table 2 below.

Year	Biodiversity Strategy	Marine Strategy Framework Directive	Water Framework Directive	Birds and Habitats Directives
2012	"Largely" completing Nature 2000 network, incl. marine areas (Action 1a)	Art. 8, 9, 10 MS reports (initial assessment/ GES/ targets)	Art. 11 MS reports (progress on implementation of PoM)	
2013		Art. 12 COM report (assessment of MS 2012 reports) Art. 13(6) MS reports (MPA establishment)	Updated pressure and impact analysis (Article 5)	Art. 17 (HD) and Art. 12 (BD) MS reports (Conservation Status)

⁸ See <http://naturstyrelsen.dk/media/nst/Attachments/Backgroundpolicypaperbiodivwatermarine.pdf>

⁹ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/marine/eu-coast-and-marine-policy/implementation/pdf/MSFD%20CIS%20future%20work%20programme%202014.pdf>



2014	First mapping and assessment of status of ecosystems and services (Action 5a)	Art. 11 MS reports (monitoring programmes) Art. 21 COM report (MPA progress)	Publication of draft updated RBMP for consultation (Article 14)	
2015	MSY in all EU-fished areas (Target 4). Mid-term assessment of EU 2020 Biodiversity Strategy	Art. 12 COM report (assessment of monitoring programmes)	Adoption of 2 nd River Basin Management Plan (Article 13) and 1 st Flood Risk Management Plan	Art. 17 COM & EEA report on conservation status Mid-term assessment of Biodiversity Strategy.
2016		Art. 13 & 14 MS reports (Programme of Measures, Exceptions) Art. 16 COM report (assessment of PoMs & Exceptions)		
2018		Art. 17 MS reports (assessment /GES /targets update) Art. 18 MS reports (PoMs update)	Art. 11 MS reports (progress on implementation of PoMs)	
2019		Art. 20 COM report (progress report)	Updated pressure and impact analysis (Article 5)	Art. 17 (HD) and Art. 12 (BD) MS reports (conservation status)
2020	Halting BD loss (Headline target) Other actions and targets	Art.1 Achieving GES	Publication of draft updated RBMP for consultation (Article 14)	
2021			Adoption of 3 rd River Basin Management Plan (Article 13) and 2 nd Flood Risk Management	Art. 17 COM & EEA report (conservation status)

Table 2 Key milestones across the Biodiversity Strategy, the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, the Water Framework Directive and the Birds and Habitats Directives¹⁰

¹⁰ Document for the meetings of the Biodiversity/Nature Directors and Water/Marine Directors [04/05/2012] <http://naturstyrelsen.dk/media/nst/Attachments/Backgroundpolicypaperbiodivwatermarine.pdf>



4 THE PARALLEL SESSIONS

After the morning plenary session, three parallel sessions will be organised to enable in-depth discussions on coordinated actions under three themes: **Objectives and Assessment, Monitoring and Reporting**, and **Programme of Measures** (including public participation). These were identified as a result of good practice examples from national programmes, which Member States provided to the Preparatory Group following the first preparatory meeting for this workshop.

The three sessions are organised in a similar manner. They are co-chaired by Member States and the Commission, and aim to present a number of case studies, facilitate a discussion around them, and draw out conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations for future coordinated actions.

The sessions will open with an **introduction** from the Chairs, who will set the scene in terms of the general framework in place, the details of the commonalities across the directives and the potential they present for coordinated action. The Chairs will also introduce the selected case studies that will be presented and describe the general direction of the discussion that is to follow.

Several Member States will then **present case studies** of coordinated approaches at the national level that relate to the three above-mentioned themes. During their presentations they will cover the following themes: What types of challenges have been addressed (legal, administrative, technical)? What were the solutions proposed? Can the benefits of cross-cutting approaches implemented be evaluated? What are the gaps and recommendations for the future?

The floor will then be opened for a **moderated discussion** with the aim of producing a concrete set of lessons learnt and recommendations for further action, to be **reported back to the general closing session**. All workshop participants are strongly encouraged to share their experiences or examples of best practice, problems encountered, and ideas for improvement.

The leaders and co-leaders will act as moderator and rapporteur, unless agreed otherwise during the parallel session. They will accompany the session to manage the consolidation of the outputs.



4.1 PARALLEL SESSION 1: OBJECTIVES AND ASSESSMENT

Chaired by:	The Netherlands and European Commission
Preparatory team:	Marc de Rooy, Hayo Haanstra (NL), Ronan Uhel (EEA), Angelika Rubin, Patrick Murphy, Jorge Rodriguez Romero and David Connor (DG ENV)
Thematic Focus:	<p>Objectives and assessment</p> <p>This session aims to focus on identifying issues that relate to objectives set across the directives, and discuss potential bottlenecks and practical solutions.</p> <p>The WFD, MSFD, BHD and BS aim at protecting and improving the environment. Therefore, generally speaking action taken under one of the instruments will be beneficial for the others. However, the protection targets, the scale of assessment and the objectives are differently set and defined under the different directives. This may lead in some instances to conflicting views on how the different directives and policies should work together. How best to approach the coordination of objectives and assessments under the various directives and policies?</p>

4.1.1 Introduction

The BHD, WFD, MSFD and BDS all aim at the protection and improvement of the environment. Yet significant differences exist in their protection targets, definitions, assessments and scale at which the objectives are applied.¹¹ These differences result in a complex read across the various objectives. Generally, the achievement of the objectives under one Directive will not guarantee the achievement under others. In some cases it may be a necessary condition, but not sufficient (e.g. WFD Good Status in coastal waters may be necessary but not sufficient to achieve Good Environmental Status under the MSFD). In some instances these differences also result in conflicting views on how the objectives could or should work together. The Directives have also different requirements as regards assessment. The MSFD strongly builds on the WFD for its relevant descriptors, although the scale of the assessment is different (water body vs marine region or sub-region). The WFD requires specific monitoring of water-related objectives in protected areas.

Many protected species under the Habitats Directive are water-dependent. This means they require certain quality of water in sufficient quantities. The WFD objective of Good Ecological and Chemical Status may or may not be sufficient for specific species. This is why the WFD requires additional integrates the additional standards and requirements through the concept of protected areas. Given the logical differences in objectives between the directives, the question is how to build synergies in the implementation process.

This session aims at addressing conflicting situations such as the ones where a choice need to be made between suppressing a dam to restore WFD ecological continuity and keeping it to have a BHD wetland. Consideration could also be given to the role of actions under the BDS, such as green infrastructure, or the requirement to restore 15% of degraded ecosystems by 2020.

¹¹ See section 2.2.2 "Overview of similarities and differences".



4.1.2 Selected case study presentations

Case study	
Name	Robust estuarine system Grevelingen (NL)
Relevance	WFD, HD, BD
Summary	<p>Future-proof nature policy strives for robust and climate proof nature in synergy with other sectors and interests like agriculture, recreation, water security and energy. This case study highlights the fact that the WFD provides a framework under which it is possible to change objectives for specific species.</p> <p>This approach is materialising in the development of a realm strategy towards Grevelingen - Volkerak Zoommeer. The strategy offers the chance for developing a robust estuarine system with a high biodiversity leaving an unnatural and unstable system behind and losing existing values. Reintroducing a tidal system (50cm) into Grevelingenmeer through an opening in the Brouwersdam results in a better water quality and solves i.a. the problems with cyanobacteria. This ecological motivated change faced legal challenges in national courts and risks in the context of Natura 2000.</p> <p>This case study touches upon the issue of site-management of a Natura 2000 site whose conservation priorities have to be changed in the frame of a project that was targeting at an overall better environmental situation of the estuarine habitat under the WFD. There was a conflict between the existing Natura 2000 conservation objectives and the WFD objectives in the Grevelingen Lake. This is a lake that has been cut off from the Sea as a consequence of the delta works in the 1960s. It is now a large salt water lake, but water quality has been deteriorating. The objective now is to restore some tidal influence by partly opening the dykes. This will lead to an increase of the salinity and to an improvement of the water quality. It will also impact some species and habitat types protected by the Birds and Habitats Directives. While on the one hand, the project will benefit water quality, make the ecosystem more robust and increase its ecosystem services (eg. oyster and mussel fisheries will be possible again), on the other hand, some species and habitat types protected under the BHD and which had developed there since the 'lake' was cut off from the sea by the Delta works will be deteriorated. In this particular case the interest to give more room to natural processes and achieve an overall more resilient ecosystem was judged higher than the interest to conserve the existing situation for some protected species that have used the lake. Such situations must be judged a case-by-case taking into account various aspects including the status assessments of features affected. The BHD directives do not prevent such choices but require that the conservation objectives are then newly defined and consideration is given to the achievement of a favourable status on the level of the biogeographic region in NL.</p>



4.1.3 Discussion points

The following discussion points aim to introduce the general aspects with the support of the session leaders. The cases studies that will be presented will further develop the technical aspects for each session.

- Do participants have examples that exposed a conflict of objectives, and how were those solved?
- Are there commonalities among the conflicting cases?
- What is considered to be the most difficult aspect? What action is required to facilitate coordinated implementation?
- Which MS have established systems that ensure the management of marine and freshwater sites in full coordination with Natura 2000 site objectives where the sites overlap?
- Are the clarifications given in the FAQ documents on the link between the BHD and WFD/MSFD sufficiently clear and detailed, or is further guidance needed?
- How can the status assessment be made more joined up, accepting that there are important differences given in the legislation?
- Where are the areas / parameters of interest to all or several directives? How can those be dealt with in a joint up way?
- Do the Directives have mechanisms to reconcile and overcome these difficulties?
- How to address the different scales? E.g. how can BHD water-related objectives be made operational for the purpose of their inclusion in the WFD RBMPs and MSFD Strategies?

4.2 PARALLEL SESSION 2: MONITORING AND REPORTING

Chaired by:	Belgium and the European Commission
Preparatory team:	Geert Raeymaekers (BE), Ronan Uhel (EEA), Vedran Nikolic, Patrick Murphy (DG ENV)
Thematic Focus:	<p>Monitoring and reporting</p> <p>There is a potential for integrating certain aspects of monitoring and reporting across the three directives. While there are differences in scope and elements that need to be monitored under WFD, BHD and MSFD; there are cases where integration of monitoring could be beneficial, such as in the case of joint monitoring for coastal waters (WFD, MSFD, BHD) and similar requirements for nutrients and contaminants (WFD, MSFD, RSCs). More recently, the work on mapping and assessment of terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems undertaken by Member States with the assistance of the Commission under Action 5 of the EU 2020 Biodiversity Strategy is using the information currently available, and aims to improve integration and promote synergies. The Commission is planning to examine some of the related technical and policy issues with the support of an external contractor.</p> <p>Wherever possible, joint monitoring should be arranged in order to save resources and allow an assessment based on a common data set. This approach is particularly relevant in a trans-boundary context, and has an intrinsic added value.</p> <p>The aim of this session is to look for commonalities and to provide examples and advise how the integration of the monitoring and reporting activities under the</p>



directives can be improved in practical terms. The remaining issues to be solved and possibilities for further streamlining should be identified. To profile the linkages and benefits for effective implementation of water, marine and nature directives and to demonstrate the links to the EU Biodiversity Strategy and in particular Action 5 of the Strategy and policy relevance to other policy areas such as climate change, disaster prevention and response, cohesion policy, agriculture, transport and health.

4.2.1 Introduction

The MSFD requires Member States to establish coordinated **monitoring programmes** which should be compatible within marine regions or subregions and should build upon, and be compatible with, relevant provisions for assessment and monitoring laid down by Community legislation, including the Habitats and Birds Directives, or under international agreements (Article 11). Furthermore, it requires that Member States coordinate with neighbouring states and notify the Commission of the monitoring programmes by October 2014. Contrary to the MSFD, the Birds Directive and the Habitats Directive (BHD) do not provide specific details with respect to monitoring. However, detailed reporting requirements have been developed that dictate what data are needed and therefore what needs to be monitored. Article 11 of the Habitats Directive requires that Member States undertake surveillance of the conservation status of the natural habitats and species referred to in Article 2, with particular regard to priority natural habitat types and priority species. The WFD Article 8 contains very detailed monitoring requirements for surface waters in terms of types of monitoring, elements to be monitored, monitoring frequencies, etc. In addition, Article 8 mentions that these monitoring programmes "*shall be supplemented by those specifications contained in Community legislation under which the individual protected areas have been established*" (Art. 8.1, 3rd indent, and Annex V, 1.3.5). The biological quality elements or organism groups that need to be monitored under WFD and BHD also differ, as does the scope (including geographical scope) of the directives. Finally, the MSFD covers new topics such as noise and litter, which the others do not cover.

The MSFD requires that Member States **report** on the status of the marine environment (starting in 2012, followed by a 6-year cycle) and on the monitoring programme and the programme of measures. The Habitats Directive (Article 17) and the Birds Directive (Article 12) require that Member States report on the state of conservation. The first EU level conservation status report under the Habitats Directive (for the period 2001-2006) was produced in 2009, based on national reports following an agreed format. A second conservation status report (for the period 2007-2012) was produced in 2013 by Member States in parallel with a report on the status of birds in order to be synchronised with the HD reporting cycle. Together, the reports under the Habitats and Birds Directive will be summarised in a composite EU-level report produced by the European Commission in 2015. Information from the MS reports under the nature legislation, as well as reports on marine protected areas as agreed by the EU or Member States concerned in the framework of international or regional agreements, were integrated in the reports under the MSFD in 2013 (Art. 13 (4) & (6)). MSFD has a much broader scope (than the Habitats and Birds Directives) as it aims, inter alia, to achieve and maintain GES, which includes all marine biodiversity, whilst BHD focus on the conservation of particular habitats and species (including all wild birds) in the whole territory of the EU. The WFD provides a number of deadlines by which Member States have to fulfil particular reporting obligations, including the need to report on the implementation, monitoring programmes, programme of measures, river basin management plans, etc.



The **mapping and assessment of ecosystems and their services (MAES)** is one of the keystones of the EU 2020 Biodiversity Strategy (see Action 5 of the Strategy). To this end, the working group MAES oversaw the development of a coherent analytical framework and associated indicators with the objective to promote consistent approaches at national and EU levels. The MAES analytical framework links the state of European ecosystems to human well-being through the delivery of ecosystem services. It also includes a typology for ecosystems and ecosystems services. The assessment of ecosystems and their services is, to the extent possible, based on existing legal reporting obligations and other, existing data sources. The extensive reporting under the Habitats and Birds Directives is relevant to all ecosystem types. Data reported under other pieces of environmental legislation such as the Water Framework Directive, the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and the Air Quality Directive are highly relevant for specific ecosystem types. Other data sources e.g. available statistics on soil, land cover and land use, agriculture and forestry statistics and outcomes from relevant research projects are also used.

4.2.2 Selected case study presentations

Case study 1	
Name	MONIT.BE (BE)
Relevance	MSFD – WFD – Natura 2000
Summary	<p>In view of the MSFD and the obligation to develop monitoring programmes, researchers and managers are faced with a number of issues in the design of a monitoring system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) to cover the parameters to assess the state of the 11 descriptors of the MSFD; (b) to include and /or to be complementary to the monitoring requirements of the WFD (coastal waters) and Natura 2000 directives; (c) to build upon the existing monitoring data and to identify where and what additional monitoring is required (gap analysis); (d) to include data of the regional (Flemish) authorities in charge of the fishery policy (Data collection framework); (e) and to identify the role of the academic world and stakeholders in the process. <p>The Belgian monitoring programme (MONIT.BE) aims to take into account these above-mentioned criteria so as to make the monitoring cost-effective, feasible, informative and well-focused.</p> <p>The case study presentation will cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The preparation plan of monit.be ('stappenplan'); • The list of existing monitoring programmes; • The monitoring fact sheet; • Integration of "biodiversity" descriptors MSFD-Natura; • MSFD Belgian monitoring website: http://www.msfd-monitoring.be/2014/ • A biological indicator for benthic ecosystem functioning.

Case study 2	
Name	Cross cutting approach for EU reporting processes (FR)
Relevance	WFD/HFFD/FD/MSFD



Summary	<p>After the WFD reporting exercise in 2010, due to the significant time and resource spent to report, it was decided to organize feedbacks from all people involved in reporting as well as managers in RBD, with the purpose to better structure the whole process in the view of 2016. The goal was also to capitalize, to secure process and content and to make reporting more professional.</p> <p>Then 6 steps were defined, identifying who is responsible for each one : preparation at both local and national levels (the most important phase), providing reporting at RBD level, data management at national level, delivery to the Commission (Reportnet) at national level, feedback from the Commission and a transversal step to pilot the reporting exercise at national level.</p> <p>Now, based on a quality approach, we are enlarging this approach to marine, nature and other water directives. For that, a network of national reporting pilots has been set up, in particular, to work on linkages between the directives, find synergies and avoid duplication of reporting.</p> <p>The presentation will cover the next reporting under the WFD and MSFD in 2016, expected to be improved and adjust the process itself and develop synergies between the directives.</p>
---------	---

Case study 3	
Name	Outcomes of integrated monitoring projects (BALSAM, JMP NC/CS, IRIS-SES)
Relevance	MSFD/HBD
Summary	<p>Integrated monitoring programmes by default combine requirements from related policy frameworks in search for efficiency and cost-effectiveness. The EU funded pilot projects JMP NS/CS, BALSAM and IRIS-SES have trialled several approaches that support integration, ranging from shared databases for monitoring metadata to improving spatial and temporal coverage for monitoring of common indicators through international co-operation. The projects are still ongoing (until April 2015).</p> <p>The presentation will highlight promising outcomes and lessons learnt so far.</p>

Case study 4	
Name	Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and Services (MAES)
Relevance	HBD/WFD/MSFD/BDS
Summary	<p>MAES supports the implementation of Action 5 of the BDS, i.e. Member States mapping and assessing the state of ecosystems and their services in their national territory. Work on MAES includes marine and coastal ecosystems; it draws on a common conceptual framework and a set of agreed indicators. MAES operates as an integration tool for monitoring and reporting across the supporting directives and help identify priority actions delivering synergies to nature and biodiversity, water and marine policies from ecosystem-based solutions such as Green Infrastructure and Natural Water Retention Measures.</p>



4.2.3 Discussion points

The following discussion points aim to introduce the general aspects with the support of the session leaders. The cases studies that will be presented will further develop the technical aspects for each session.

General aspects:

- Are there monitoring / reporting issues for which there is a need to establish a common understanding in order to enable streamlining/coherence?
- Does the MSFD provide a framework to integrate properly the monitoring needs of the Habitats and Birds Directives as regards marine features? Can MSFD benefit from data reported under BHD? How comprehensive should the integration be? Which win-win solutions can be created?
- How can the Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and Ecosystem Services (MAES) activity under the EU Biodiversity Strategy make the most effective use of information and data collected under the 4 Directives and to the greatest mutual benefit of the different constituencies concerned?
- What improvements/arrangements would be useful under the existing European framework to facilitate the coordination? Are the clarifications given in the FAQ documents on the link between BHD and WFD/MSFD sufficiently clear and detailed or is further guidance needed?
- How to set up joint monitoring/reporting programmes: legal, financial and administrative possibilities. What are possible obstacles?
- How can we improve the transboundary cooperation in monitoring programmes?
- What are the issues that remain to be solved?

Technical aspects:

- Are the monitoring needs for MSFD, WFD and BHD proportionally balanced in the monitoring programmes?
- The MSFD and the WFD include both biodiversity and non-biodiversity related indicators (noise, pollution, hydrology, litter). The Habitats and Birds Directives target a specific biodiversity set of habitats and species. Can the broader biodiversity indicators of the MSFD be used in the monitoring of the FCS of the species and habitats under the BHD in the marine environment, and vice versa?
- Can the non-biodiversity related indicators of the MSFD and WFD be used in the monitoring of the FCS of the species and habitats under the BHD?
- How to balance the spatial monitoring – inside versus outside Natura 2000 areas?
- Technical barriers to the effective integration of the data/information collected under the 4 Directives within the MAES framework.
- Can we streamline procedures and timetables to make monitoring and reporting more (cost-) effective within the existing legal framework?
- How can the monitoring programmes contribute in assessing the value of GES, GecS and FCS thresholds to inform on the “state of the environment”?



4.3 PARALLEL SESSION 3: PROGRAMME OF MEASURES AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Chaired by:	France and European Commission
Preparatory team:	Nicolas Rouyer, Emmanuel Steinmann (FR), Branwen Rhead (UK), Fotios Papoulias, Juan Pablo Pertierra (DG ENV)
Thematic Focus:	<p>Programme of Measures (PoM) and public participation</p> <p>Programmes of measures and, as appropriate, public consultations are required by the European environmental pieces of legislation and policies. As fresh water, marine water and biodiversity are interlinked, a coordinated approach between processes such as programmes of measures (elaboration, endorsement, and implementation) or public consultations (duration, content, and target) should contribute to more effective environmental protection on the field and to less public spending overall.</p> <p>The aim of this session is to explore the inter-linkages in the efforts of designing and implementing coordinated PoMs as well as public participation activities, keeping in mind trans-boundary aspects.</p>

4.3.1 Introduction

The BDS sets out the measures ("actions") to be implemented under each target and indicates whether it is to be taken by Member States or the Commission, or both. Under the WFD and MSFD, programmes of measures must be developed by the MS under the WFD and MSFD. Under the BHD, conservation management measures are required for Natura 2000 sites and for strictly protected species. As fresh water, marine water and biodiversity are interlinked, a coordinated approach between programmes of measures (elaboration, endorsement, implementation) and related public consultations (duration, content, target) can be beneficial and cost-effective, contributing to more environmental protection on the ground and to less public spending overall. For instance, France intends to start a common public consultation for the MSFD and WFD PoMs this December 2014. It is expected that this coordinated exercise will trigger an increased awareness and interest of citizens, more consistency between the measures and that the cost of implementation will be lower.

As regards **public consultation**, coordinated approaches can be hindered by the following issues:

- **Timing:** Under the WFD, the public consultation timeline is six months, while for the MSFD there is no obligatory timeline and Member States determine the starting point, with the result that consultations vary greatly across countries.
- **Scope:** The coverage of the public consultation also happens to be different: under the WFD, the public must be consulted on the draft RBMP and PoM, whereas for the MSFD only the summary of the PoM must be subject to consultation. With regard to the BHD, there is no explicit requirement for public consultation; this is left to the discretion of Member States according to national provisions. Moreover the geographical scope is generally not the same: WFD and MSFD have a wide territorial scope, while BHDs have a local scope as regards Natura 2000 sites. Finally, consultation processes need to be adapted according to different cultures and stakeholders.

Concerning **programmes of measures**, the complexity associated with the multiple environmental objectives is in itself a real challenge. It requires a holistic understanding of the three areas and an adequate set up of measures. Non-legally binding recommendations for implementation and



reporting on POMs under the MSFD have recently been developed¹² with a view to ensuring the coherent and harmonious implementation of the Directive across the EU. It focuses on methodological questions for which a common understanding is needed among experts involved in implementing the MSFD in the marine regions. The relationship between the POMs and the 15% restoration target and the integrated deployment of Green Infrastructure measures under the EU Biodiversity Strategy should also be taken into account.

There are a number of applied tools and actions in the PoMs themselves which guarantee mutual benefits when implemented. Natural Water Retention Measures (NWRM) and other Green/Blue Infrastructures (e.g. Water blueprint¹³ and BDS action 6b) are per se multifunctional and contribute to the implementation of the WFD, the BHD and the Biodiversity Strategy. Whilst these actions exist and are successfully implemented mainly on local levels, they must be actively promoted by authorities and stakeholders to be included in integrated strategic planning.

At operational level, contradictions between the measures can appear: how to choose between removing a dam to restore WFD ecological continuity and keeping it in case it has developed a wetland protected under BHD?

4.3.2 Selected case study presentations

Case study 1	
Name	Partnership working: Moors for the Future (UK)
Relevance	WFD, HD, Floods Directive
Summary	<p>England’s Environment Agency is part of the Moors for the Future Partnership which also includes water companies, government bodies and environmental NGOs. The partnership is delivering a programme of work that totals nearly £4.7million in the Peak District and South Pennines. The programme has undertaken the initial treatment of 2700 hectares of severely damaged blanket bog including 1005 hectares of bare peat stabilisation. The restoration of the South Pennines Moors has delivered a wide range of benefits including improvement to water quality, reduced flood peak, and improved habitat for biodiversity. Benefits for others include reduced treatment costs for water companies, increased tourism and recreation.</p> <p>The case study presentation will cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of measures to improve peatland damaged by more than 200 years of industrial pollution, wildfires and historic overgrazing. • Demonstration of successful partnership working with a wide range of government, third sector and private sector organisations to deliver multiple benefits across WFD/FD and HD. • Examples of local community engagement.

Case study 2

¹² The Recommendations will be published on CIRCABC after they have been validated by Marine Directors at their meeting on 25 November 2014.

¹³ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/blueprint/pdf/brochure_en.pdf



Name	National instructions for coordinated implementations (FR)
Relevance	WFD, MSFD and BHD
Summary	<p>The ecosystem-based approach in the marine environment management is a central feature of the MSFD. The MSFD is the first EU legislative instrument explicitly related to the protection of marine biodiversity as a whole. Many EU policies are connected to the marine environment with WFD and BHD in first row. The MSFD aims at ensuring the consistency and integration of measures taken pursuant to various other EU legal instruments in order to meet good environmental status.</p> <p>The presentation at the workshop will give the opportunity to show the strategic decisions which have been made in France regarding the coordination of the programmes of measures (e.g. on funding, MSFD contaminants / WFD coastal waters, litter), public participation (common consultation on WFD / Flood Directive / MSFD) or marine protected areas in the MSFD programmes of measures.</p>

Case study 3

Name	National program of measures for marine threatened species and habitats (SE)
Relevance	HD, SD, MSFD Species and Regional Sea Conventions
Summary	<p>Within the framework of Programmes of Measures for MSFD Sweden is currently developing a set of national programs for marine threatened species and habitats. The overarching aim of these programs is to improve the status of threatened species and habitats, via specific measures that can be carried out on a regional level e.g. removal of migration barriers, restoration of habitats etc. The selection of species and habitats is based on a comprehensive analysis of species/habitats listed in the EU Directives, Regional Sea Conventions and national redlists. In the analysis measures addressed in e.g. OSPAR and HELCOM recommendations have been taken into account.</p> <p>Specific programs aimed at gathering knowledge in order to identify relevant measures will also be developed. All programs are time limited and will be evaluated on termination.</p> <p>The case study presentation will cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination of the work among six different authorities to plan the consultation process together of five river basin water district.

4.3.3 Discussion points

The following discussion points aim to introduce first the general aspects with the support of the session leaders, the cases studies that will be presented will further develop the technical aspects for each session.

- Nature, water, marine European legislation: what are the legal requirements regarding PoMs and public consultation? What are the similarities? What are the differences?
- What can be the added value of a coordinated implementation between the marine, nature and water areas?
- What kind of coordination can happen under the existing European framework?
- What coordination actions can be undertaken in the short term at MS level? In the long term? At the EU level?



- What are the gaps identified in the existing framework?
- What improvements/arrangements would be useful under the existing European framework to facilitate the coordination? Are the clarifications given in the FAQ documents on the link between BHD and WFD/MSFD sufficiently clear and detailed or is further guidance needed?
- What are the linkages between POMs developed and implemented under the Directives and the 15% restoration target and the deployment of GI as foreseen under the EU Biodiversity Strategy?



5 EXPECTED OUTPUTS OF THE WORKSHOP AND FOLLOW-UP

The workshop is expected to provide demonstrations through case studies and the sharing of experiences that better coordinated implementation of the EU water, marine and biodiversity/nature policies and legislation is both desirable and achievable. It will have also generated new ideas on how to take this agenda forward.

With this objective in mind, the following key questions should drive the workshop and its outputs:

- What are the benefits of coordinated implementation?
- What are the bottlenecks preventing better coordination?
- What suggestions can be brought forward so as to overcome these identified bottlenecks?

After the workshop, the Preparatory Group will gather suggestions and draw lessons from these shared experiences and perspectives, continue its work to consolidate the outcomes, as well as serve to communicate the timeline for the activities leading up to the submission of the consolidated set of documents to the Joint Directors meeting under the Luxembourg presidency in late 2015. Follow-up meetings for the Preparatory Group are envisioned in early 2015. The follow-up process entails to integrate the outcome of the workshop at various levels at EU, sub-regional, regional (RSC, RB) and Member State levels) in order to ensure the most adequate implementation.

It is envisioned that the outputs of the workshop will include a reference document with recommendations, general lessons learnt, cross-cutting issues and areas for future work.

6 ANNEXES



6.1 ANNEX I CASE STUDIES SUBMITTED

Examples or case studies of coordinated or joined up implementation submitted by Member States.

Session	Legislation covered	Title of the project	Member State	Brief Description
Objectives and Assessment Leader: The Netherlands Co-leaders: COM	MSFD – Natura 2000	Establishing common indicators for MSFD and Natura 2000	Belgium	Pooling together the descriptors that relate to marine biodiversity under the MSFD (descriptors 1, 4 and 6). By using parameters, criteria can be merged and applied to monitor both legislations.
Objectives and Assessment	MSFD	A biological indicator for benthic ecosystem functioning	Belgium	The project shows functional attributes of macrofaunal species, summarised in a single index, it allows future routine monitoring of ecosystem functioning
Objectives and Assessment	WFD/HFFD	Common monitoring methods for WFD & HFFD	France	Establishment of species & habitat indicators for a definition of the method to identify N2000 sites with water related issue
Objectives and Assessment	WFD, HD, BD	Robust estuarine system Grevelin-gen	The Netherlands	Exactly this approach is materialising in the development of a realm strategy/ vision towards Grevelingen Volkerak Zoommeer . The strategy offers the chance for developing a robust estuarine system with a high biodiversity leaving an unnatural and unstable system behind and losing existing values.
Objectives and Assessment	WFD, HD	Fish migration river in the 'Afsluitdijk'	The Netherland	Observations of devastating effects on some species due to the building of the 'Afsluitdijk' (enclosure dam) in the 'Zuiderzee', forming a harsh separation of the fresh water of the newly formed 'IJsselmeer' and the salt water of



Session	Legislation covered	Title of the project	Member State	Brief Description
				the Wadden Sea
Objectives and Assessment	WFD, HD and BD	Management Plans	Malta	Integration of WFD objectives into Natura 2000 management plans where water dependent habitats and species are present.
Monitoring and Reporting	MSFD – WFD – Natura 2000	MONIT.BE integrated monitoring of the marine environment	Belgium	Integrated monitoring of the marine environment
Leader Belgium				
Co-leaders: COM				
Monitoring and Reporting	MSFD – Natura 2000	Establishing common indicators for MSFD and Natura 2000	Belgium	Pooling together the descriptors that relate to marine biodiversity under the MSFD (descriptors 1, 4 and 6). By using parameters, criteria can be merged and applied to monitor both legislations.
Monitoring and Reporting	MSFD	A biological indicator for benthic ecosystem functioning	Belgium (UGent)	The project allows future monitoring of ecosystem functioning to functional attributes of macrofaunal species.
Monitoring and Reporting	WFD/HFFD	Common monitoring methods for WFD & HFFD	France	Definition of a method to identify N2000 sites with water issue: establishment of indicators for water dependent species & habitat (including terrestrial)
Monitoring and Reporting	WFD/HFFD/FD/MSFD	Cross cutting approach for EU reporting processes	France	network of national reporting coordinators and general mapping on reporting processes under development
Monitoring and Reporting	WFD, MSFD, HD, BD, MEDPOL and NBSAP	Coordinated implementation of monitoring requirements	Malta	Monitoring factsheets' are being compiled for specific themes or elements pertaining to the marine environment and reflecting the MSFD Good Environmental Status descriptors as



Session	Legislation covered	Title of the project	Member State	Brief Description
				listed in Annex I of the Directive
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation) Leader: France Co-leaders: COM	WFD, FFH, BD	Water-related LIFE-projects in Lower Austria	Austria	Coordination of LIFE-related projects has been done in the planning and implementation of restoration measures and public participation projects.
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	HD, BD, MSFD RSC (soft legislation)	National program of measures for marine threatened species and habitats	Sweden	Improve the status of threatened species and habitats, via specific measures that can be carried out on a regional level, (measures addressed in e.g. OSPAR and HELCOM have been taken into account).
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	MSFD/HFFD	Enhancement of MPA through MSFD PoM	France	extension of the N2000 at sea network and more « improved spatial protections »
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD Floods Habitats	Moors for the Future	UK	The restoration of the The project has delivered a wide range of benefits including improvement to water quality, reduced flood peak, and improved habitat for biodiversity.
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD (and others)	Catchment Based Approach	UK	The primary reason for implementing CaBA in England was to enhance the implementation of the WFD, catchments are also an ideal vehicle to deliver other environmental interventions as well such as management of flood risk and water resources, biodiversity and more.
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD Floods Habitats	Synergies project: overview	UK	The project undertook a comprehensive study of how more integrated delivery could be achieved for the objectives different legislations. The final report was published in 2013.



Session	Legislation covered	Title of the project	Member State	Brief Description
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD Habitats Floods	WFD implementation: Rural Diffuse Pollution Plan for Scotland	UK	DPMAG includes representation from stakeholders with a rural interest in WFD implementation.
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD MSFD Habitats	Integrated planning for Natural Resource Management	UK	This approach sits within a new national policy framework that includes the establishment of long-term sustainable development goals for Wales.
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD/HFFD	Merging of WFD & HFFD environmental impact assessment	France	Integration of the impact assessment on N2000 sites in the water impact assessment document.
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD/HFFD	Merging of the water & N2000 authorisation procedures	France	Instruction of the impact assessment on N2000 sites under the umbrella of the water authorisation.
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD/MSFD	National instructions on WFD & MSFD : programme of measures contents	France	Coordination in the WFD & MSFD PoM contents: - on MSFD contaminants / WFD coastal waters. Example of measures in the careening areas in MSFD PoM
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	MSFD/HFFD	Inclusion of the MPA in the MSFD PoM	France	Inclusion of MPA in the MSFD PoM: coordination of the process, development, simplification.
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD/HFFD	LIFE project on groundwater dependant terrestrial ecosystem	France	Groundwater dependant terrestrial ecosystem: identification of a proper WFD/GWD combination through a LIFE project.
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD/MSFD/FD	Governance on the Médoc Lakes	France	Joint organisation for the elaboration of WFD RBMP-PoM and MSFD PoM



Session	Legislation covered	Title of the project	Member State	Brief Description
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD/HFFD	Governance Public consultation	France	Integration of the impact assessment on N2000 sites in the water impact assessment document
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD/MSFD	Working together between MSFD and WFD in the public participation process on the Programme of measures	Sweden	Coordination of the work among six different authorities to plan the consultation process together of five river basin water district.
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD, MSFD and NBSAP	Coordinated development of programme of measures dealing with coastal and marine waters	Malta	The WFD programme of measures (coastal measures) is partly based on the outcome of the initial assessment of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and identified gaps therein. It is also intended under the WFD to feed into that of the MSFD once the programme of measures under the MSFD has been identified.
Programme of Measures (incl. public participation)	WFD, HD and BD	Integration of WFD objectives into Natura 2000 management plans where water dependent habitats and species are present	Malta	WFD objectives together with the conservation objectives of particular habitats and species are being integrated within relevant Natura 2000 management plans. Any relevant measures that are selected after the programme of measures cost-effectiveness analysis of the WFD are to also be included in the second River Basin Management Plan



6.2 ANNEX II IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

The timeline for the collection of case studies extends beyond the workshops and it aims to be an “open-ended” process up until Spring 2015. More case studies are requested from Member States and they are asked to follow up and submit cases from their national programmes.

The geographical coverage of the case studies needs to be extended, and for that reason case studies from Member States who have not yet submitted any is highly encouraged.

The compilation of the case studies will be part of the consolidated package of report that is aimed to be submitted to the Joint Directors meeting in November 2015.



6.3 ANNEX III DOCUMENTS OF INTEREST

This Annex presents a list of documents that are relevant to the work being undertaken in the context of this workshop.

- Links between the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD 2008/56/EC) and the Nature Directives (Birds Directive 2009/147/EEC (BD) and Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC (HD)): Interactions, overlaps and potential areas for closer coordination.
(<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/marine/docs/FAQ%20final%202012-07-27.pdf>)
- Links between the Water Framework Directive (WFD 2000/60/EC) and Nature Directives (Birds Directive 2009/147/EC and Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC): Frequently Asked Questions
(<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/FAQ-WFD%20final.pdf>)
- “The implementation of the Birds and Habitats Directives in estuaries and coastal zones”
(<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Estuaries-EN.pdf>)
- “Common methodology for assessing the impact of fisheries on marine Natura 2000”
(<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/marine/docs/Fisheries%20methodology.pdf>)
- Fisheries measures for marine Natura 2000 sites
(http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/marine/docs/fish_measures.pdf)
- Integrating biodiversity and nature protection into port development
(http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/sec2011_319pdf.pdf)
- Guidance on aquaculture and Natura 2000
(<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Aqua-N2000%20guide.pdf>)
- Overview on how Member States have treated the Protected Areas concerning Species and Habitats in the making of the 1st River Basin Management Plans under the Water Framework Directive. Integrated environmental policy for the marine environment, Document of MSCG 11/2013/16, n.8 (work in progress).
- Review of the GES Decision 2010/477/EU and MSFD Annex III – cross-cutting issues, Document of GES_12-2014-03, n.6a (work in progress).



REFERENCES

- Apitz, S.E., Elliott, M., Fountain, M., Galloway, T.S., 2006. European environmental management: moving to an ecosystem approach. *Integr. Environ. Assess. Manage.* 2 (1), 80–85.
- Boyes, S.J., Elliott, M., 2014. International law, European directives & national implementation. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 86 39–47
- EC, 2008. Council Directive 2008/56/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 establishing a framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy (Marine Strategy Framework Directive).
- EC, 2011. Study on the Economic Effects of MSP. European Commission, Luxembourg.
- Moran, D., Dann, S., 2008. The economic value of water use: implications for implementing the water framework directive in Scotland. *J. Environ. Manage.* 87, 484–496.
- Elliott, M., Boyes, S.J., Burdon, D., 2006. Integrated marine management and administration for an island state—the case for a new Marine Agency for the UK. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 52 (5), 469–474.
- Holt, A., Godbold, J.A., White, P.C.L., Slater, A.-M., Pereira, E.G., Solan, M., 2011. Mismatches between legislative frameworks and benefits restrict the implementation of the ecosystem approach in coastal environments. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 434, 213–228.