

OSPAR Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic  
**Third Meeting of OSPAR Inter-Sessional Correspondence Group on Marine Litter  
(ICGML) – Ross on Wye – UK - November 29<sup>th</sup> & 30<sup>th</sup> 2008**

---

## Report of the meeting

### Agenda, participants and documents

1.1 The third meeting of the Intersessional Correspondence Group on Marine Litter (ICGML) took place on November 29<sup>th</sup> & 30<sup>th</sup> 2008 at the kind invitation of the Marine Conservation Society in Ross on Wye UK and was chaired by Mr Rick Nickerson. Four Contracting Parties, 1 Observer organisation and representatives from other organisations in The Netherlands and UK took part in the meeting; see the List of Participants at **Annex 2**.

1.2 Dr Sue Kinsey welcomed members of ICGML on behalf of the Marine Conservation Society (MCS). She advised that the organisation was celebrating its 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary (2008) and highlighted the activities of the organisation which represented over 4,000 members in the UK. The Chairman thanked the MSC for hosting the meeting and welcomed new delegates.

1.3 The meeting report from the second meeting in Shetland (ICGML (3) 08/1/1- ANNEX 3-E) had been adopted by correspondence. The Chairman outlined the change in procedure now that ICG ML had a more formal status within OSPAR, including uploading of the documents onto the OSPAR website and the adopting an OSPAR style Summary Record. The Netherlands suggested that items 5 and 6 were addressed in reverse order and this was agreed. The list of Documents is at **Annex 1**.

1.4 *It was agreed to accept the late document on micro plastic particles presented by KIMO International.*

### Agenda Item 2 – Terms of Reference (TOR)

2.1 The revised TOR (ICGML (3) 08/2/1-E) was presented for approval for final submission to BDC 2009. The UK reminded the group that countries should be referred to as Contracting Parties not member states. *It was agreed to alter 2(a) to ensure that surveys were done 4 times per year and to separate the actions in 4(d) into separate items.*

### Agenda Item 3 – Update on Task List

3.1 The draft action task list (ICG ML (3) 08/3/01) from the last meeting in Shetland, June 2008, was reviewed and updated. The Chairman requested an update on monitoring activities in 2008: The Netherlands had surveyed up to period 4 on all beaches using the 100m protocol, Spain had surveyed 6 beaches up to period 3 on 1km and 100m protocols, the UK had surveyed 13 beaches up to period 4 using the 100m protocol, in Germany monitoring had been carried out on 4 sites in 2008 and will continue at least until the end of 2009. Surveys of 100 and 1000m are carried out on all sites. Ireland had surveyed 4 beaches for periods 2 and 3 using the 100m protocol.

### CEMP/ASMO

3.2 A discussion was held on how to include marine litter monitoring in the CEMP. The Chairman thought that advice on how to proceed should be sought from the Secretariat. Germany enquired how the Fulmar

EcoQO was progressing and thought that it should be included in the same package. It was agreed to discuss it with the Secretariat.

## UNEP

3.3 The Netherlands was not sure when the draft UNEP guidelines would be published however UK (MCS) suggested that they would be published in January 2009.

## Monitoring Beach Litter

3.4 There were still problems in getting the data from the previous Swedish monitoring website. KIMO International suggested that any new site should include video clips explaining the difference between items on the monitoring sheet.

## Gaps in Knowledge

3.5 There were still some gaps in knowledge in the monitoring, particularly Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Portugal. The Chairman stated that there had been initial contact with both Iceland and Norway and he hoped they would participate in future. There was still no coverage in the High Seas.

## EcoQO and QO

3.6 KIMO International suggested the proposed EcoQO on marine litter should be changed to a QO, as it did not have an ecological aspect. This was agreed.

3.7 Germany informed the group that an assessment of the marine litter monitoring results for the Trilateral Wadden Sea was nearly complete and would be submitted to the next scientific meeting. The Netherlands stated that the EU Port Waste Reception Directive (2000/59/EC) review consultation would start next year with the outcome in 2010. Germany asked if the OSPAR monitoring data was being used in the review but The Netherlands was unsure.

## Agenda Item 4 – Feedback from OSPAR

4.1 The Netherlands reported back on progress from EIHA, MASH and MAQ meetings. A report on the EcoQO on Fulmars and an update on the Beach Litter EcoQO had both been submitted by the Netherlands to the MASH meeting. MAQ, the committee that is implementing the QSR, had provided some comments on the QSR chapter on marine litter. A drafting group at EIHA incorporated these comments although the figures were left unchanged until TAUW had completed its final analysis on the data. The Netherlands highlighted the BDC Work Programme stating that there were several work products for BDC 2009 including EcoQO on Litter, QSR Chapter, Monitoring Update, and Assessment of existing data. These should all be combined in one package with the report back from the group.

4.2 The Chairman expressed his concern that litter was being discussed at EIHA rather than BDC. In response to a question for the UK he thought that the more appropriate people attended BDC and it had been agreed some years ago that BDC was the appropriate forum for this work. It was agreed to ask OSPAR to ensure BDC was the main forum for marine litter. The UK entered a study reservation.

## QSR

4.3 The Netherlands raised the BA-6 cumulative impacts assessment for the QSR. All the activities, pressures and ecosystem elements had been entered into a matrix to identify the relative impacts so they can then be mapped. Marine litter was one of the pressures that needed to be quantified in relation to shipping, fishing and tourism. The Chairman thought that a combination of shipping density maps and ocean currents would identify the pressure area from shipping. The UK (MCS) thought that marine litter pressure from fishing could also be identified in a similar way. The Netherlands agreed to produce marine litter pressure maps and then place them on Base camp for approval.

4.4 The Chairman gave the group an update on ICG Bergen, which was reviewing the OSPAR strategies and preparing for the Ministerial Meeting in 2010. He highlighted the conference, which was being held in Brest on Good Environmental Status in relation to the MSFD. The UK enquired how the work of the ICGML could feed into the development of the GES descriptor on marine litter and asked the group to consider what

role it was able to play a role in developing the marine litter descriptor. However, it was unclear whether the Commission was intending to establish a working group for the descriptor on marine litter and therefore how ICGML could feed into the development process. It was agreed that the UK and The Netherlands would identify what the mechanism would be for establishing the expert groups for each descriptor and KIMO International would report back from the Brest Seminar.

## Agenda Item 6 – Statistical Analyses of OSPAR Beach Litter Data (2001 – 2008)

5.1 The Netherlands introduced the report, as no TAUW representatives were able to attend the meeting, and gave a presentation on the results. TAUW had highlighted that there were some problems with the existing data sets such as there were not continuous records for all beaches, the lengths monitored were not always consistent and some of the data was missing from the beach questionnaires. Germany said it was possible to rationalise the length of the beach to 100m by dividing the number of items by the same ratio. The UK (MCS) wanted some clarification as to exactly what data was missing. The UK wanted to know what was the minimum number of beaches required for a proper analysis. It was agreed that The Netherlands, Germany and the North Sea Foundation would meet with TAUW to discuss the issues that had been raised before the report was finalised.

5.2 Spain thought that the data is always very complicated and that it was difficult to obtain more accurate information. The selection of beaches also needed to be looked at to ensure that the results were comparable. The UK reminded the group that it was important that whatever the group decided should fit in with the requirements of the MSFD. Also if the results were significantly different from the previous report it was important that this was explained clearly.

5.3 The Netherlands did not think Chapter 2 of the report, a comparison of the OSPAR and UNEP guidelines, was relevant as the UNEP guidelines had changed since the report was finalised and therefore needed updating. Germany thought that the UNEP guidelines should be used for the selection of beaches. The UK also raised the issue of whether the beaches were cleaned or not during monitoring. It was agreed that The Netherlands would look at the OSPAR guidelines and compare them to UNEP to see if any amendments were required and a rewrite of chapter 2 with TAUW would be considered

5.4 During the discussion on Chapter 3 Germany stated that data from beaches, which were monitored over 100m, should be included but corrected accordingly. The Chairman thought it should be 100m but asked Germany to discuss it with TAUW during their meeting. The Netherlands wanted to know if the trend data would be included in the final report as it contradicted the previous report. The UK raised the issue of indicators items, as was concerned that some Contracting Parties might decide to only monitor them and not undertake a full survey.

5.5 It was agreed that in the week of the December 11<sup>th</sup> December, Germany, and the Netherlands would meet with TAUW to go over the correlation graphs to gain more confidence in the results. A deadline of the 15<sup>th</sup> of Jan was set for finalisation of the TAUW report.

### Draft Monitoring Guidelines

5.6 The Chairman suggested that the document should be reviewed page by page and amendments suggested. Germany wanted usually and/or frequently litter removed from the beach selection criteria and also thought that the 1km survey should be removed. The Netherlands believed that analysis of the difference between the 1km and 100m surveys are undertaken first and the UK thought that the 100m surveys should be undertaken in the same area as the 1km survey.

5.7 Germany suggested that the monitoring periods which were numbered 1- 4 should be changed to winter, spring, summer and autumn and this was agreed. Spain wanted the monitoring time moved back by one month for the south of Spain. It was agreed that there should be some flexibility in the dates and that this should be reflected in the monitoring guidelines.

5.8 The Netherlands raised the issue of items that could go into more than one category such as plastic bags and balloons. The Netherlands and Germany thought that a piece of plastic bag should be counted as a plastic bag, the UK did not agree with this point. There was also a general discussion as to what

constituted a piece of rope and it was agreed to discuss this with TAUW and that everyone would upload pictorial examples to Base camp. It was agreed to follow the UNEP guidelines where anything under 2.5cm<sup>2</sup> would be considered a piece of plastic. It was also agreed that the GPS coordinates of each monitoring area should be included and The Netherlands was to check which system OSPAR used.

5.9 On the beach surveys the Chairman suggested that the shipping section should be removed and included in the guideline. It was agreed to add a section on shipping data to 4.1 Selection of reference beaches. The Netherlands would redraft the document and a final draft would be available by the 15<sup>th</sup> Jan.

5.10 There was a discussion of protocols for seabed and floating litter. Germany thought that the UNEP protocol for seabed litter should be used. The UK would check with Cefas to see if it would be practical. The Netherlands would bring back the report on the protocol for floating litter to the next meeting and Germany would report back on the aerial surveys that had taken place in Germany.

5.11 The UK raised the issue of marine litter data being collected for ICES during International Bottom Trawl Surveys, and asked if other countries were aware of litter data being collected for this purpose as this may provide a source of data on offshore marine litter data. The UK has asked Cefas to collate and analyse the litter data it has collected for ICES and during other trawls. It was agreed that seabed monitoring using research vessels would be raised, as a voluntary programme at BDC and Germany was to investigate with ICES to see if they had historical seabed monitoring data.

5.12 Presentation by Rebecca Hoskins - Rebecca gave a presentation on her successful campaign to make her hometown of Modbury, North Devon, plastic bag free after filming a BBC documentary on the amount of plastic on Midway and Hawaii in the Pacific. The scheme had been very successful and was now being copied worldwide by many other towns. More information on the campaign is available at [www.plasticbagfree.com](http://www.plasticbagfree.com). The Chairman thanked Ms Hoskins for a very positive presentation.

## Agenda Item 5 – OSPAR QSR Chapter on Marine Litter

6.1 KIMO International explained that there was only scope for minor changes to the QSR Chapter and the main change would result from the additional analysis that TAUW was undertaking. He suggested that the levels of micro plastics recorded off the Swedish west coast by KIMO Sweden should be included as an example. A draft would be circulated by The Netherlands after the TAUW amendments were made. It was also agreed to remove the pictures from the Fulmar EcoQO case study and just leave the graph as suggested by MAQ.

## Agenda Item 7 – Data Handling

7.1 The Chairman suggested that the group should recommend to OSPAR that the Secretariat take over the management of the monitoring database, as this would ensure continuity and security of the database. Germany was concerned about who would be managing the quality control in that case. It was agreed that Germany would discuss it with TAUW and KIMO International would discuss it with the OSPAR Secretariat. In relation to [www.marielitternet.org](http://www.marielitternet.org) The Netherlands had received an email that the site had been deleted. It was agreed that the Chairman should make one last effort to contact the Swedish Contractors to see if they would transfer the data. It was agreed that consideration of how to monitor marine litter in the High Sea region of OSPAR would be discussed at the next meeting however the Chairman undertook to investigate if any monitoring was carried out on the Azores.

## Agenda Item 8 – Fishing for Litter

8.1 KIMO International presented the final report from the Fishing for Litter Scotland 05/08 project, which highlighted successes and areas for improvement in the initiative. It was agreed to discuss whether the monitoring data from the project was suitable for analysis with TAUW. Germany suggested that the proposal to undertake monitoring with research vessels should not be referred to as Fishing for Litter as it was confusing. It was agreed to send a proposal to BDC.

## Agenda Item 9 – Microscopic Plastic

9.1 KIMO International introduced a research proposal that was being developed by Plymouth University and was being supported by KIMO. It was investigating the biological impacts of micro plastics and the transfer of hazardous substances to biota. Funding for the three-year project was being sought from the UK National Environmental Research Council (NERC) and other funding bodies.

## Agenda Item 10 – UNEP/OSPAR assessment on marine litter

10.1 The group welcomed the report

## Agenda Item 11 – Programmes and Measures/ Regional Action Plan

11.1 The Netherlands introduced a paper on what programmes and measures could be implemented by OPSAR. The paper divided measures into different sections relating to specific sources. *This was an initial list and it was agreed it would be brought back to the next meeting for further discussion.*

## Agenda Item 12 – Communication Strategy

12.1 The Chairman explained that discussion during that last ICG meeting regarding the development of promotion material suggested that to enable this matter to proceed, consideration of a number of issues needed to be undertaken such as who the target audience is, what the message is and what media will be targeted. Germany inquired about publishing an article about marine litter issues in Germany and the Netherlands however though we should not become involved in individual public campaigns but focus more on targeting policymakers. *It was agreed that an invitation be sent to Ms Audrey Baconnais-Rosez the OSPAR Information Officer to attend the next meeting to discuss how an ICGML communication strategy could integrate with OSPAR's. It was also agreed to table a draft strategy to the next meeting.*

## Agenda Item 13 – Any Other Business

13.1 There was no other business

## Agenda Item 14 – Date and Location of next Meeting

14.1 Both the location and date of the next meeting were to be confirmed at a later date however *it was agreed that now the group had a more formal OSPAR footing, and on the advice of HOD's, the meetings would be held during the week rather than over the weekend.* It was also hoped this would encourage participation from more Contracting Parties.



**OSPAR  
COMMISSION**

*Protecting and conserving the  
North-East Atlantic and its resources*

Agenda Item 1

ICGML(3) 08/1/1- ANNEX 1-E(L)  
English only

OSPAR Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic  
Third Meeting of the Intercessional Correspondence Group on Marine Litter (ICGML)  
Ross on Wye - UK (Marine Conservation Society): November 29<sup>th</sup> & 30<sup>th</sup> 2008

---

### **Document List**

#### **Agenda Item 1 - Adoption of the agenda**

ICG ML (3) 08/1/1 rev - E (L) - Draft agenda and annotations  
ICG ML (3) Annex 1- E – (L) List of meeting documents  
ICG ML (3) Annex 2 – E – (L) Draft list of participants  
ICG ML (3) Annex 3 – E – Summary Record from the ICG meeting (Shetland)  
June 2008

#### **Agenda Item 2 - Terms of Reference (TOR) for OSPAR ISCG on Marine Litter**

ICG ML (3) 08/2/1 - E – Draft Terms of Reference (TOR) for OSPAR ICG on  
Marine Litter

#### **Agenda Item 3 - Update of progress on Task List**

ICG ML (3) 08/3/1 - E - Draft action task list from the last meeting in Shetland,  
June 2008

#### **Agenda Item 4 – Feedback from OSPAR**

ICG ML (3) 08/4/info 01 – E – Report by KIMO International on ICG Bergen  
Meeting 11<sup>th</sup> November 2008

#### **Agenda Item 5 – OSPAR QSR Chapter on Marine Litter**

ICGML (3) 08/5/1 – Draft Sections of Chapter 8 of the QSR 2010  
ICGML (3) 08/5/2 - Draft case Study on the EcoQO on Plastic particles in the  
stomachs of seabirds

### **Agenda Item 6 - Statistical Research Marine Litter (Tauw)**

ICG ML (3) 08/6/1 – E - Draft Report Statistical Research Marine Litter (Tauw)  
ICG ML (3) 08/6/2 – E - Development of Guideline for Monitoring Marine Litter on Beaches in the OSPAR Area  
ICGML(3) 08/6/info 01 – E – (L) UNEP/IOC Operational Guidelines on Survey and Monitoring of Marine Litter

### **Agenda Item 8 - Fishing for Litter**

ICG ML (3) 08/7/info 01 – E – Final Report of Fishing for Litter Scotland project 2005 – 2008

### **Agenda Item 10 - OSPAR / UNEP Assessment of the Marine Litter Problem in the North East Atlantic**

ICG ML (3) 08/10/1 – E - OSPAR/UNEP Assessment of the Marine Litter Problem in the North East Atlantic

OSPAR Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic  
 Third Meeting of the Intercessional Correspondence Group on Marine Litter (ICGML)  
 Ross on Wye - UK (Marine Conservation Society): November 29<sup>th</sup> & 30<sup>th</sup> 2008

**Participants**

**CHAIR**

Mr Rick Nickerson  
 KIMO  
 Infrastructure Services Department  
 Grantfield  
 Lerwick  
 Shetland  
 ZE1 ONT

Tel : 00 44 (0)1595 744 825  
 Fax : 00 44 (0)1595 744 804  
 Email : [rick.nickerson@kimo.shetland.org](mailto:rick.nickerson@kimo.shetland.org)

<p><b>GERMANY</b></p> <p>David M Fleet                  Landesbetrieb für Küstenschutz                  Nationalpark und Meeresschutz                  Nationalparkverwaltung                  Schlossgarten 1                  D-25832 Tönning</p> <p>T: 04861 616-43                  F: 04861 616-69                  Email: <a href="mailto:David.Fleet@lkn.landsh.de">David.Fleet@lkn.landsh.de</a>  <a href="http://www.wattenmeer-nationalpark.de">www.wattenmeer-nationalpark.de</a>  <a href="http://www.lkn.schleswig-holstein.de">www.lkn.schleswig-holstein.de</a></p>	<p><b>KIMO INTERNATIONAL</b></p> <p>Mr John Mouat                  KIMO Secretariat                  Infrastructure Services Department                  Grantfield, Lerwick                  Shetland                  ZE1 ONT</p> <p>T: 00 44 (0)1595 744 826                  F: 00 44 (0)1595 744 804                  Email : <a href="mailto:info@kimo.shetland.org">info@kimo.shetland.org</a></p>
<p><b>KIMO UK</b></p> <p>Mr Tom Piper                  KIMO UK                  c/o Planning Policy &amp; Environment                  Woodhill House                  Westburn Road                  Aberdeen                  AB16 5GB</p> <p>T: +44(0)1224 664725                  Mobile: +44(0)7789 790775                  Email: <a href="mailto:tom.piper@kimo.shetland.org">tom.piper@kimo.shetland.org</a></p>	<p><b>NETHERLANDS</b></p> <p>Barbara Wenneker                  RWS Noordzee                  Postbus 5807                  2280 HV Rijswijk                  The Netherlands</p> <p>T: 31-70-3366741                  F: 31-70-3194238                  Email: <a href="mailto:Barbara.wenneker@rws.nl">Barbara.wenneker@rws.nl</a></p>



<p><b>NETHERLANDS</b></p> <p>Lex Oosterbaan Sr Adviseur Directie Water en Scheepvaart RWS Noordzee Postbus 5807 2280 HV Rijswijk The Netherlands</p> <p>T: 31-70-3366846 F: 31-70-3194238 Email: <a href="mailto:lex.oosterrbaan@rws.nl">lex.oosterrbaan@rws.nl</a></p>	<p><b>NORTH SEA FOUNDATION</b></p> <p>Mr Merijn Hougee Drieharingstraat 25 3501 BH Utrecht The Netherlands</p> <p>T: 0031 302340016 F: 0031 302302830 Email: <a href="mailto:m.hougee@noordzee.nl">m.hougee@noordzee.nl</a></p>
<p><b>SPAIN</b></p> <p>Fernando Lahuerta Mouriño Asociación Ollalomar Rúa Tarela 40 36350- Nigrán-Galicia Spain</p> <p>T: +34 9863 68050 Mobile: +34 6552 64377 Email: <a href="mailto:ollalomar@telefonica.net">ollalomar@telefonica.net</a></p>	<p><b>UNITED KINGDOM</b></p> <p>Mrs Alison Kerrigan Policy Advisor Marine Monitoring and Assessment Defra Area 2E, Nobel House 17 Smith Square London SW1P 3JR</p> <p>T: 00 44 (0) 20 7238 5338 Email: <a href="mailto:alison.kerrigan@DEFRA.GSI.GOV.UK">alison.kerrigan@DEFRA.GSI.GOV.UK</a></p>
<p><b>UNITED KINGDOM</b></p> <p>Dr Sue Kinsey Adopt-a-Beach Officer Marine Conservation Society Unit 3, Wolf Business Park Alton Road Ross-on-Wye Herefordshire HR9 5NB</p> <p>T: 00 44 (0) 1989 567807 Email: <a href="mailto:sue.kinsey@mcsuk.org">sue.kinsey@mcsuk.org</a> <a href="http://www.mcsuk.org">www.mcsuk.org</a> <a href="http://www.adoptabeach.org.uk">www.adoptabeach.org.uk</a></p>	