

Videoconference: 11-13 October 2021

---

## Contents of the draft summary record

### Table of contents

Contents of the summary record.....	1
List of Annexes.....	2
Agenda Item 0 – Opening and representation at the meeting.....	3
Agenda Item 1 – Adoption of the Agenda .....	3
<i>Item 1.1 adoption of the agenda.....</i>	3
<i>Item 1.2 matters arising from other OSPAR bodies and the Bonn Agreement.....</i>	3
Agenda item 2 – Periodic review of measures and development of new measures.....	4
<i>Item 2.1 OSCOM Recommendation 80/1.....</i>	4
<i>Item 2.2 PARCOM Recommendation 88/1.....</i>	4
<i>Item 2.3 Contracting Parties national programme of measures.....</i>	5
<i>Item 2.4 ICG-MaRE.....</i>	5
Agenda item 3 – Interaction with the OSPAR Coordination Group including MSFD and cross-cutting issues.....	6
<i>Item 3.1 NEAES 2030 .....</i>	7
<i>Item 3.2 Support to ICG-QSR for the QSR2023.....</i>	8
<i>Item 3.3 Discharges to the marine environment from open circuit flue gas scrubbers.....</i>	9
<i>Item 3.4 ICG-OA 2021 .....</i>	9
Agenda Item 4 – Hazardous substances.....	9
<i>Item 4.1 Environmental and human health thresholds for contaminants in biota.....</i>	9
<i>Item 4.2 QSR thematic and indicators assessments.....</i>	10
<i>Item 4.4 MIME 2021 .....</i>	11
Agenda item 5 – Inputs.....	11
<i>Item 5.1 Progress on the RID database.....</i>	11
<i>Item 5.2 QSR thematic and indicators assessments.....</i>	12
Agenda Item 6 – Eutrophication.....	12

<i>Item 6.1 Revised Common Procedure and development of the COMPEAT.....</i>	12
<i>Item 6.2 ICG-EMO assessment thresholds .....</i>	13
<i>Item 6.3 QSR thematic and indicators assessments.....</i>	13
<i>Item 6.4 Assessment approaches for eutrophication in coastal areas for COMP4 / QSR2023.....</i>	14
<i>Item 6.5 Data submission to ICES and the COMPEAT databases.....</i>	14
Agenda Item 7 – Any other business.....	15
Agenda Item 8 – Adoption of the Summary Record.....	15

## List of Annexes

Agenda and list of documents .....	Annex 1
List of actions arising from the meeting.....	Annex 2
Terms of Reference for ICG-REACH.....	Annex 3
Comments on the revision of PARCOM 88/1 – The Netherlands.....	Annex 4
Draft eutrophication tasks for NEAES 2030 implementation plan.....	Annex 5
Draft hazardous substances tasks for NEAES 2030 implementation plan.....	Annex 6
Environmental and human health thresholds as assessment criteria for contaminants in biota.....	Annex 7
The Common Procedure for the Identification of the Eutrophication Status.....	Annex 8
Eutrophication assessment in WFD coastal waters.....	Annex 9

## Agenda Item 0 – Opening and representation at the meeting

HASEC HOD 21/0/1, HASECHOD 21/0/2, HASEC21/0/3, HASEC HOD 21/0/4

- 0.1 The 2021 meeting of the Heads of Delegation of the Hazardous Substances and Eutrophication Committee (HASEC HOD) was held from 11-13 October by videoconference.
- 0.2 The Chair of HASEC, Philip Axe (Sweden) welcomed participants to the meeting. Participants were thanked for joining by videoconference.
- 0.3 The meeting was attended by representatives from the following:
  - a. Contracting Parties: Belgium, Denmark, European Union represented by the European Commission Directorate General Environment, France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. Also, the Chair of Working Group MIME, and the Convenors of ICG-Eut, ICG-EMO, ICG-OA and ICG-QSR;
  - b. Guests: International Council for the Exploration of the Sea
  - c. Apologies from Spain and the Chair of Working Group INPUT.
- 0.4 A list of participants is at **HASEC21/0/4**.

## Agenda Item 1 – Adoption of the Agenda

HASEC HOD 21/1/1 Rev.1, HASEC HOD 21/1/1 Add.1 Rev.2, HASEC HOD 21/1/2 Rev.1, HASEC HOD 21/1/3 Rev.2, HASEC HOD 21/1/Info.1 Rev.1, HASEC HOD 21/1/Info.2, HASEC HOD 21/1/Info.3

### *Item 1.1 adoption of the agenda*

1.1 The Chair of HASEC gave an overview of the revised draft agenda and provisional timetable, which were adopted without amendment (HASEC HOD 21/1/1 Rev.1 and 21/1/1 Add.1). A copy of the agenda and documents submitted to the meeting are at **Annex 1**. A list of actions arising from the meeting is at **Annex 2**.

### *Item 1.2 matters arising from other OSPAR bodies and the Bonn Agreement*

1.2 The Secretariat gave a brief update on matters arising from CoG, HOD and OSPAR 2021. The Secretariat noted that during the OSPAR Commission meeting, HASEC's draft Programme of Work was approved. OSPAR approved the list of OSPAR Other Agreements, publications and other outputs to be published, including the updates of HASEC Agreements 2016-04 on Hazardous Substances CEMP Guidelines and Agreement 2016-05 on Eutrophication, CAMP & RID CEMP Guidelines. (HASEC HOD 21/1/Info.2). The revised OSPAR Agreement 2019-01 was also adopted by OSPAR (HASEC HOD 21/1/Info.3). An update on the progress in the Quality Status Report (QSR) 2023 was given and an update on the Bonn Agreement was noted.

1.3 ICG-REACH met on 7 October 2021 to finalise CHARM factors and to discuss OSPAR Dec 2000/2 and it was highlighted at the meeting that it would be useful for several HASEC delegates to attend the meeting to contribute to the work. HASEC noted it would be useful for the co-convenors of ICG-REACH to attend HASEC. The Secretariat shared the terms of reference of ICG-REACH (**Annex 3**) and informed that the next meeting would be held on 9 November 2021.

1.4 The Chair added that another outcome of the OSPAR and Ministerial meeting was the agreement amongst Contracting Parties for a larger budget and the potential new position as Deputy Secretary to lead the climate change work and a role responsible for the management of new project proposals.

1.5 HASEC agreed to consider the Terms of reference of ICG REACH as in Annex 3 and propose experts to participate in the ICG.

## Agenda item 2 – Periodic review of measures and development of new measures

HASEC HOD 21/2/1, HASEC HOD 21/2/3, HASEC HOD 21/2/4

### *Item 2.1 OSCOM Recommendation 80/1*

2.1 The Netherlands presented the results of the questionnaire on heavy metals in sewage sludge (HASEC HOD 21/2/1). In follow-up to HASEC-2021, the questionnaire was filled in by Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden and the United Kingdom and it was evaluated by the Netherlands. Several Contracting Parties preferred to keep this recommendation and suggested to broaden its scope to cover emerging substances such as microplastics and PFAs.

2.2 In discussion;

- a) Ireland proposed to liaise with ICG-ML in relation to microplastics;
- b) Germany suggested to identify those issues of concern in the North-East Atlantic; update the EU in the revision of the WFD sewage sludge directive; and if necessary, perform work at OSPAR level;
- c) Denmark noted that it would be interesting to visualise the concentrations of PBDE in sewage sludge in similar graphs;
- d) The Netherlands noted that the document was very informative and gave a useful overview and HASEC delegates should circulate the document to colleagues involved in revising the guidelines for the EU process WFD sewage sludge directive.

2.3 The Netherlands was thanked for the useful document and HASEC agreed Contracting Parties would circulate the document to national experts involved in the EU process, noting that the Recommendation could be extended to include new substances such as PBDEs, PFAs and microplastics. The Secretariat would forward the document to ICG-ML. The Recommendation would be reviewed at HASEC2022.

### *Item 2.2 PARCOM Recommendation 88/1*

2.4 Sweden provided a presentation (HASEC HOD 21/p01) with Contracting Parties' inputs on the PARCOM 88/1 background document and encouraged other Contracting Parties to provide further inputs on their views regarding cooperation on commercial shipping considering the article 4 of OSPAR Convention's Annex V stipulating that Contracting Parties have a responsibility to cooperate with the IMO towards shared aims.

2.5 In discussion:

- a) Contracting Parties thanked Sweden for the presentation and highlighted the importance to collaborate with IMO and HELCOM on this specific issue;

- b) France suggested to split this recommendation into two to differentiate the small boatyards and marinas and the commercial ships to further collaborate with IMO and other organisations;
- c) the Netherlands provided written comments for further consideration (**Annex 4**) that would be complemented by France regarding the MSFD measures applied in small shipyards and marinas in France, and studies on discharges in sensitive areas such as marine protected areas and aquaculture sites;
- d) Ireland informed that the new ICG-ML proposed Regional Action Plan had a related action on preventing release of microplastics from sea-based sources (ship paints and antifouling);
- e) the Chair of HASEC informed Contracting Parties that the next joint group meeting on BALLAST waters would be held in Donostia-San Sebastian (Spain) on 23-24 November 2021.

2.7 Sweden was thanked for providing the presentation. HASEC agreed **the Secretariat would investigate whether this item could be further discussed in the context of the next joint group meeting on BALLAST. Sweden, the Netherlands and France would report on the work progress in HASEC2022.**

*Item 2.3 Contracting Parties national programme of measures*

2.8 The Chair of HASEC presented an overview (HASEC HOD 21/2/3) of Contracting Parties' national programmes of measures for eutrophication (MSFD D5) and hazardous substances (MSFD D8) highlighting that most Contracting Parties have or are developing new national Programmes of Measures, either under the MSFD or under similar national legislation to address eutrophication and hazardous substances.

2.9 In discussion:

- a) Portugal noted that they were not able to provide information because their programs of measures were being finalised. The information would be provided as soon as it was available;
- b) Denmark remarked that they were still finalising measures, so additional hazardous substances measures would be provided in upcoming months;
- c) The Netherlands thanked Sweden for the useful document and noted that the 'hot items' should be the focus rather than the older recommendations;
- d) Germany noted the infographics (Figures 1 and 2) provided a comprehensive list of measures that contribute to MSFD, and some measures tackle specific measures for specific countries, so it would be good to address measures that are an issue for several Contracting Parties;
- e) Norway were interested in contributing to the questionnaire, but required additional time to complete it.

2.10 The Chair of HASEC was thanked for providing the useful document. It was agreed **Contracting Parties would send contributions and updates to the Secretariat and the document would be revisited at HASEC2022.**

*Item 2.4 ICG-MaRE*

2.10 The Secretariat reminded that ICG-MaRE remains without co-Convenors (HASEC HOD 21/2/4) and recalled the adopted terms of reference for ICG-MaRE and invited Contracting Parties to consider volunteering to co-convene the group to define and decide the next steps and prioritisation of tasks.

2.11 In discussion:

- a) Belgium nominated Saskia Van Gaever to support ICG-MaRE, France nominated Emmanuelle Thiesse who could contribute to lead the discussion on shipyard and small marinas;
- b) Denmark, Ireland, France, Germany and the Netherlands noted their interest in participating in the Group, however, did not have the resources available to co-convene;
- c) Contracting Parties supported the formation of the ICG, however, proposed to delay meeting in order to establish a mandate for the group to work on specific tasks with clearer objectives and linkages with the NEAES and to ensure the group was not doing work that conflicts with EIHA.

2.12 The Chair of HASEC concluded that a background document should be prepared for consideration by HASEC 2022 and that the work needed to be defined in consultation with EIHA to avoid duplications.

2.13 HASEC agreed **Germany would lead on identifying the prioritisation of tasks for HASEC 2022 and Contracting Parties were urged to contact Germany bilaterally to contribute.**

*Item 2.5 European Green Deal.*

2.14 The European Commission provided an update (HASEC HOD 21/p02) on the European Green Deal and related initiatives of interest for HASEC, including key actions in the Zero Pollution Action Plan, the communication on sustainable blue economy and the Marine Strategic Framework Directive review.

2.15 In discussion:

- a) The co-Convenor of ICG-QSR thanked the European Commission for the presentation and raised the issue that the Zero Pollution Action Plan and Farm to Food initiative did not match with the MSFD and Waste Water Directive approach as reductions on the concentrations of the pollutant sources did not mean the same reduction on the contaminant thresholds. The co-Convenor of ICG-QSR asked for clarification on which had the leading role, the European Green Deal or existing framework;
- b) The European Commission clarified that the revision of the MSFD was one of the actions to be considered under the zero-pollution action plan;
- c) Belgium had a number of concerns, including in relation to PFAS and the EU highlighted that there was a PFAS action plan;
- d) Germany was supportive of the green deal, and noted that it was ambitious and that the presentation highlighted the importance of Regional Seas Conventions;
- e) Sweden commented scope for more coherence of OSPAR goals of reducing nutrient inputs and the forthcoming emissions targets.

2.16 The Chair of HASEC thanked the European Commission for providing the presentation. HASEC agreed **Contracting Parties would submit further comments to the European Commission for review in conjunction with the comments submitted in follow up to HASEC 2021, the review of comments and potential funding opportunities for projects in the context of the EU Green Deal would be discussed at HASEC 2022.**

### Agenda item 3 – Interaction with the OSPAR Coordination Group including MSFD and cross-cutting issues

HASEC HOD 21/03/01, HASEC HOD 21/03/Info.01 Rev.01, HASEC HOD 21/03/Info.02, HASEC HOD 21/03/Info.03, HASEC HOD 21/03/02, HASEC HOD 21/03/03

### Item 3.1 NEAES 2030

3.1 The Secretariat presented the HASEC's NEAES implementation plan tasks (HASEC HOD 21/3/1), noting the outcomes of the discussion by COG(1) 2021 (§2-3 and Annex 1) and invited Contracting Parties to review and revise as appropriate the HASEC implementation plan tasks available in SharePoint.

3.2 In discussion:

- a) the Chair of HASEC mentioned that the Implementation Plan would replace the Programmes of Work by the end of 2022. HASEC was required to define the tasks under the strategic objectives on eutrophication and hazardous substances of the NEAES 2030 to be able to raise any issue on lack of resources;
- b) the Co-convenor of ICG-EMO asked whether only internal resources were available to work on the tasks or whether outside resources could be also considered; for instance, the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission had the capacity to run catchment modelling. The Chair of HASEC clarified that OSPAR should have an active role and think on internal resources; a communication channel with the EU HOD could be established to explore using ISPRA's resources. The Chair of HASEC proposed to reflect any knowledge gaps in the OSPAR Science Agenda;
- c) Germany supported to further develop HASEC tasks, those under operational objectives 2 and 3. Planning was key to identify the resources needed from the modelling community or to specify for EMEP where nutrients were coming from. Intersessional work could be done prior to HASEC 2022;
- d) on S2O1, MIME could consider additional tasks on LCPA and considering the CONNECT project; the Secretariat informed that LCPA and potential inputs from CONNECT would be further discussed at MIME 2021;
- e) the Secretariat also highlighted that the next COG meeting would discuss a risk methodology for the tasks of the Implementation Plan;
- f) The ICG EMO Convenor presented a eutrophication task proposed by a drafting group<sup>1</sup> on a model approach for S1.O2 and S1.O3. The Chair suggested to have an OSPAR Agreement reflecting the method to calculate the maximum sustainable nutrient once the thresholds were agreed. The Netherlands mentioned these figures affected economies and individuals. The ICG EMO Convenor clarified that the work could take longer than that needed for the calculation of thresholds; it required a step wise approach;
- g) Belgium presented the inputs to hazardous substances' tasks proposed by a drafting group<sup>2</sup>. Considering the intervention from the Netherlands in plenary in relation to tasks **S2.O1.T1** and **S2.O1.T2**, further discussions would be held in the context of the next meeting of MIME in November 2021 on the LCPA and LSPC review and assessment criteria. In relation to task **S2.O3.T1**, the drafting group provided additional contents to the task description and rationale to further discuss by MIME and INPUT, in cooperation with EIHA and the ICES Working Group on Shipping Impact in the Marine Environment;
- h) Germany proposed to have by HASEC 2022 a clear understanding of what HASEC wants to achieve under the NEAES 2030, by defining as many tasks as possible. Although the implementation plan was a living document and tasks could be included later on, it was

---

<sup>1</sup> Chair of HASEC, Convenor of ICG-EMO, Germany, Denmark, France, supported by the Secretariat

<sup>2</sup> Belgium, the Netherlands, supported by the Secretariat

convenient to have a structured process; some tasks could require the involvement of other groups or projects.

- i) The Chair of HASEC suggested that additional eutrophication and hazardous substances tasks should be discussed by those subsidiary bodies involved prior to HASEC 2022.

### 3.3 HASEC agreed:

- a. the draft tasks on eutrophication (**Annex 5**) and hazardous substances (**Annex 6**) which would be revisited at HASEC 2022;
- b. Contracting Parties would send additional comments to the proposed tasks to be considered by subsidiary bodies prior to HASEC 2022; and**
- c. WG MIME, WG INPUT and ICG Eut would draft additional tasks proposals for HASEC 2022 to have a structured process under the NEAES 2030;**
- d. the Chair of HASEC and the Secretariat would invite Contracting Parties to lead certain tasks.**

### *Item 3.2 Support to ICG-QSR for the QSR 2023*

3.5 The Secretariat reported on the progress in the development of HASEC's three thematic assessments and the lack of resources issues identified by TG-COMP (5) (HASEC HOD 21/3/2). The Coordinator of the QSR 2023 presented the guidance documents available for the preparation of the QSR products (HASEC HOD 21/p03) and referred to the support available from ICG-EcoC, ICG ESA and CCEG when drafting the thematic assessment. HASEC was invited to provide feedback and guidance as appropriate.

### 3.4 In discussion:

- a) the Coordinator of the QSR 2023 clarified that the process of the peer review would be agreed by the ICG-QSR on 25 October. The intention was that the Committees would have time to take into account any feedback from the peer review;
- b) on the lack of resources identified at TG-COMP, the Netherlands proposed to cover the lack of leads in three parts: (1) the introductory text, which could also be supported by other Contracting Parties; (2) the impacts' section could use some of the NEA-PANACEA work linking eutrophication with biodiversity as a first input although it could take some time; and (3) the climate change section in close interaction with the CCEG;
- c) on the length of the thematic assessments, the Coordinator of the QSR 2023 confirmed that 30-40 pages were an ideal number as these documents were high-level products for policymakers;
- d) the Co-convenor of ICG-EMO suggested to consider changes on nutrient inputs related to catchments and how the measures to reduce nutrients could be enhanced or taken backwards by climate change in the marine environment;
- e) the Coordinator of the QSR 2023 would provide the liaison from ICG-EcoC, ICG ESA and CCEG to support HASEC in the drafting of the thematic assessments; and
- f) on the Eutrophication Thematic Assessment, Germany recalled that at the last TG COMP they proposed to write text on the nutrient assessment and impacts; nevertheless, more Contracting Parties should join to share the workload. Timing was a concern. although progress had been made with the COMPEAT tool, the thresholds still needed to be established. And the new structure of the thematic assessments was a new barrier as the cross-cutting issues

required communication with other OSPAR groups. Germany proposed that TG COMP could take the lead.

3.5 the Chair welcomed the involvement of Contracting Parties in the preparation of the QSR although there were concerns on the high workload and highlighted the importance of agreeing on thresholds to continue making progress.

#### *Item 3.3 Discharges to the marine environment from open circuit flue gas scrubbers*

3.6 The Secretariat presented the results of the scoping study on ship scrubbers and the collected information by the questionnaire on discharges to the marine environment from open circuit flue gas scrubbers (HASEC HOD 21/3/3). HASEC was invited to further consider the scoping study and define next steps attending the feedback received by national shipping experts.

3.7 In discussion:

- a) Contracting Parties supported preparing a common OSPAR document for IMO to consider. The meeting was informed that OSPAR 2021 agreed the submission to the IMO sub-committee on Pollution, Prevention and Response in April 2022 of the information paper on discharges from open circuit flue gas scrubbers on ships in the OSPAR maritime area. The EU advised that a coordination process was not required;
- b) Contracting Parties referred to the ongoing modelling study under EIHA; a first draft was expected by December 2021 and the final report on 28 February 2022. The aim of the study was to improve the data on the PAHs and metals released by scrubber waters in the different OSPAR regions.

3.8 HASEC agreed to follow up the issue on discharges from gas scrubbers at HASEC 2022.

#### *Item 3.4 ICG-OA 2021*

3.9 The ICG-OA Co-convenor (Ireland) gave a verbal update on the outcomes of ICG-OA 2021 that was held online on 20 and 21 September back-to-back with the Atlantic Hub of the GOA-ON Initiative. The adopted summary record was available on the OSPAR meeting website<sup>3</sup>. Regarding the OA other assessment, the ICG was working in liaison with the CCEG and a draft would be ready by HASEC 2022. Experts from the academia were contributing to the work; the information on trends was not very solid and the ICG was looking for map products to be included. The progress on monitoring would be presented at HASEC 2022.

3.10 The Chair of HASEC noted that the voluntary commitment to the UN Sustainable Development Goal 14: Life below water on ocean acidification was adopted at the Ministerial Meeting. He also referred to the OA operational objectives under the NEAES 2030, which should be reported by HASEC and not CoG.

3.11 HASEC agreed that the Chair of HASEC, the ICG-OA Co-convenor and the Secretariat would propose tasks under the OA operational objectives of the NEAES 2030.

## Agenda Item 4 – Hazardous substances

HASEC HOD 21/04/01, HASEC HOD 21/P05, HASEC HOD 21/04/05,

#### *Item 4.1 Environmental and human health thresholds for contaminants in biota*

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.ospar.org/meetings/archive/intersessional-correspondence-group-on-ocean-acidification-1>

4.1 The Chair of MIME presented the environmental and human health thresholds for contaminants in biota (HASEC HOD 21/4/1).

4.2 In discussion;

- a) Spain provided written comments and agreed to use environmental and human health thresholds for the annual CEMP assessment and for the QSR 2023 thematic assessment;
- b) Denmark had a number of reservations towards the OSPAR thresholds, however noted that it was encouraging to see the transition towards using the EU thresholds, which should help with harmonisation with HELCOM and the national work related to WFD. There were discussions at HELCOM over the threshold values for cadmium and Lead because they were based on EU levels so it would be worthwhile to consider these thresholds;
- c) Contracting Parties supported the idea to align OSPAR and HELCOM assessments;
- d) Germany requested a clarification on how substances that were not indicated would be handled. Germany and Denmark suggested using the EU value for PBDE and the Chair MIME clarified that the threshold in the Annex for PBDE would be updated to reflect the EU value;
- e) The co-Convenor of ICG-QSR noted that with regards to Centralised reporting, EU member states were responsible for reporting their results, but although its unconfirmed its expected the EEA would be able to assist with prefilling country reporting formats;
- f) The United Kingdom and Belgium thanked the Chair and MIME WG and supported the approval of thresholds on time for the QSR;
- g) The Netherlands, Belgium and Ireland highlighted the importance to clarify how the information would be shown for those countries not supporting OSPAR thresholds in order to understand the consequences with respect to the coherence of QSR reporting. There should be OSPAR threshold values rather than national ones to ensure the use of the QSR report for MSFD reporting;
- h) The Chair of MIME clarified that there would not be different thresholds displayed in the same results because the OHAT tool allows the user to 'toggle' to display results using the different thresholds.

4.3 HASEC agreed to use the environmental and human health thresholds for the annual CEMP assessment and for the QSR 2023 thematic assessment as in **Annex 7**.

4.4 The Chair of MIME presented the mercury regional assessments according to Guidance document number 27 for deriving EQS (HASEC HOD 21/4/5 at Annex 1).

#### *Item 4.2 QSR thematic and indicators assessments*

4.5 The Chair of MIME gave a verbal update on the status of the QSR thematic and indicator assessment, noting that the extraction of data had been taken from OHAT in preparation to produce the assessments. Additional contacts would be done prior to MIME 2021 to update the assessments with the newest information available to discuss further at the next MIME meeting. A new extraction of data was expected in January or February 2022 if there were major problems for some contaminants to prepare the final draft for HASEC 2022.

4.6 HASEC noted the information on inputs for the QSR.

#### *Item 4.3 OSPAR Hazardous Assessment Tool (OHAT)*

4.7 ICES provided an update (HASEC HOD 21/P05) on the work for the OHAT, highlighted that it was possible to download the DOME raw data extractions and that these downloads have DOIs that could be

referenced forever. The accessions tab shows Contracting Parties whether the data had been submitted, when it was submitted and the status of submission which allows a clear picture on the data flow.

4.8 Next steps were aligned with OSPAR, AMAP and HELCOM cooperation on the continuous development of assessment script code to integrate it as part of the transparent assessment framework where different settings could be specified for the application in an easier way. This would allow a better organisation of the data, access to methods and results used in ICES assessments

#### *Item 4.4 MIME 2021*

4.9 The Chair of MIME noted verbally that MIME would meet in hybrid format on 22 – 26 November 2021 in Copenhagen (Denmark) and online. The Chair highlighted that the objectives of MIME 2021 would include progressing the QSR assessments and developing the approach to complete the DAPSIR framework and the CHASE assessment.

4.10 In discussion,

- a) The Chair of HASEC highlighted the need to advance with the review approach to managing the OSPAR Lists of Chemicals for Priority Action and Substances of Possible Concern (LCPA and LSPC). Discussion together with CONNECT, which would meet the requirements for product 54 of the HASEC programme of work and the preparation of tasks S2.O1.T1 and S2.O1.T2 of the implementation plan;
- b) the Co-convenor of the ICG QSR (the Netherlands) mentioned that the impact and response part should be addressed not only by ICG-ESA but by MIME experts in collaboration with ICG-ESA;
- c) with regards to the CONNECT products, Germany agreed with the analytical method used but not with the interpretation of the results. Several Contracting Parties requested access to data and results prior to MIME 2021 to review it in advance of any further discussion; and
- d) Denmark proposed to allocate time during MIME 2021 to consider a brief presentation on the scrubber project that would be initiated, and a short presentation could be given in this context. Further discussions could also be undertaken on sediment thresholds and the work progress in HELCOM.

4.11 The Chair of HASEC concluded that the next MIME meeting would discuss the CONNECT and the Scrubber projects.

## Agenda item 5 – Inputs

### *Item 5.1 Progress on the RID database*

5.1 The Chair of HASEC on behalf of the Chair of INPUT gave a verbal update on the progress with the project proposal on the RID database. An excel system was developed to report INPUT trends for the last QSR. Because of its inflexible structure, the RID taskgroup was looking for an alternative. A proposal would be prepared in January for INPUT 2022 based on HELCOM's system, which reduced the workload for the database manager.

5.2 In discussion,

- a) the Netherlands had concerns on how the annual load of the river would be calculated in the new database considering that the flow was measured twice every year. The Chair of HASEC clarified that both systems, NIBIO and HELCOM, did the same calculation; and

- b) the Secretariat proposed to involve the Secretariat Data Team in the development of the database to ensure its output was compatible with ODIMS and to increase its visibility.

5.3 HASEC noted that the review of the database would be discussed at INPUT 2022 and agreed that **the Secretariat would participate in the development of the database.**

#### *Item 5.2 QSR thematic and indicators assessments*

5.4 The Chair of HASEC gave a verbal update on the QSR thematic and indicators assessments. The nutrient and metals input factsheets were referred to. The ambition for the nutrients indicators was to cover more regions than in the Intermediate Assessment (I to IV) and to present flow-normalised data for each Contracting Party made on the catchment level. For the latter, checks were needed to make sure that the input from each river added up the national value. On impacts of heavy metals, mercury and cadmium would be covered in the Greater North Sea and in other regions if possible; trends could be affected by the measurement limits used by different contractors in the period assessed. The meeting was informed that EMEP's report on nitrogen atmospheric inputs would be used in the QSR. Regarding the Thematic Assessment, the TG-IQSR had had monthly meetings; the next one was scheduled for 27 October 2021. The structure of the report had been defined including case studies for significant catchments.

5.5 HASEC noted the information on inputs for the QSR.

## Agenda Item 6 – Eutrophication

HASEC HOD 21/06/01, HASEC HOD 21/06/01 Add.01, HASEC HOD 21/06/02 Rev.01, HASEC HOD 21/P04, HASEC HOD 21/06/02 Add.01, HASEC HOD 21/06/02 Add.02, HASEC HOD 21/06/02 Add.03, HASEC HOD 21/06/02 Add.04, HASEC HOD 21/06/02 Add.05, HASEC HOD 21/06/04, HASEC HOD 21/P06.

#### *Item 6.1 Revised Common Procedure and development of the COMPEAT*

6.1 The Co-convenor of ICG-Eut (the Netherlands) gave an update on the development of a revised Common Procedure for the identification of eutrophication (COMP) for the fourth application of the COMP (HASEC HOD 21/6/1 and Add.1), including development of the COMPEAT.

6.2 The Chair of HASEC gave an outline on the essential products presented Table 1 in Annex 1, in particular it was noted that product 1 was a routine product from EMEP and the results would feed into the Factsheets for nutrient inputs.

6.3 In discussion,

- a) Germany noted that there was a lot of work involved in revising the COMP, and could agree to publish the agreement subject to minor corrections such as recent changes to names of areas, Germany noted that the Annexes still required further work;
- b) The Chair of HASEC noted that the Annexes could be finalised without affecting the approval of the agreement;
- c) The Netherlands agreed with Germany and requested further clarification on the person responsible for the calculation of EQR values;
- d) Denmark was unable to review the agreement in full, and therefore placed a study reservation;
- e) France and Ireland thanked TG-COMP for the extensive work in revising the agreement and agreed to approve the adoption of common procedure and the use of COMPEAT tool, however noted the thresholds would need to be finalised;

6.4 TG-COMP was thanked for the work involved with revising the agreement. HASEC agreed to approve the agreement (**Annex 8**) in principle subject to a sense check to be addressed at an additional HASEC HOD meeting 10 December 2021.

*Item 6.2 ICG-EMO assessment thresholds*

6.5 The Chair of ICG-EMO gave a presentation of the ICG-EMO report (HASEC HOD 21/p04) on the model setup, the weighted ensemble approach and the overview on threshold estimates.

6.6 In discussion,

- a) ICG-EMO clarified in response to queries from Contracting Parties that the weighting would be done per parameter and confirmed the historic scenario had the same boundary condition as the current state run;
- b) Spain and Portugal could not take a national position because their national waters were not included in the modelling exercise and therefore establishing a national position on assessment threshold was not applicable;
- c) Denmark, Sweden, Ireland and the United Kingdom were not able to clarify national positions;
- d) France validated the approach combining models and would further evaluate the implications of these new thresholds for the QSR and the classification of coastal waters;
- e) the Netherlands would submit written comments to ICG-EMO Convenor for discussion at the next TG-COMP meeting.

6.7 Germany gave a presentation on the evaluation of the new modelling results to facilitate the discussion and determine positions and next steps. Germany highlighted that HS2 thresholds for chlorophyll-a along the coast are substantially higher than those used in the last assessment.

6.8 HASEC thanked ICG-EMO for the work progress and agreed:

- a) **ICG-EMO would provide feedback to TG-COMP(6) following discussions on what was achievable and by when at the ICG-EMO meeting Friday 15 October;**
- b) **ICG-EMO would provide to the Secretariat a revised product by 15 November 2021;**
- c) **Contracting Parties would revise the updated product from ICG-EMO by submitting comments to the Secretariat by 1 December 2021;**
- d) **HASEC HoDs would meet on Friday 10 December 2021 to approve the reference and threshold values proposed by ICG-EMO and TG-COMP.**

*Item 6.3 QSR thematic and indicators assessments*

6.9 The authors of the indicator assessments provided an update on the status of the QSR thematic and indicator assessments on winter nutrient concentrations, growing season concentrations of chlorophyll-a, concentrations of dissolved oxygen near the seafloor and the overall integrated eutrophication assessment.

- a) Winter nutrient concentrations – the timeframe had been agreed and the mean would be used as the metric, the work had not started due to finalisation of the threshold values. Concerns were raised on how to accommodate the results of the indicator within the template, since there were so many areas, there would potentially be a lot of information to present;
- b) Growing season concentrations of chlorophyll-a – satellite data were available, drafting had not yet started and calculations would be done through COMPEAT;
- c) Concentrations of dissolved oxygen – discussions have taken place on the suitable metric and noted the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile rather than the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile would be used, threshold levels were

discussed, the assessment areas were too large so would develop a gridded approach, but decision would still need to be made on threshold;

- d) Integrated eutrophication assessment – work had not started, due to the finalisation of the Common Procedure.

6.10 HASEC noted the information on inputs for the QSR.

*Item 6.4 Assessment approaches for eutrophication in coastal areas for COMP4 / QSR2023*

6.11 Germany presented an assessment approach for eutrophication for coastal areas to be used in COMP4/QSR 2023 (HASEC HOD 21/6/4). Contracting Parties were invited to indicate their preferences on the proposed options for spatial aggregation and assessment frameworks for the coastal areas as in table 1 and 2 of HASEC HOD 21/6/4. Contracting Parties in a tour-de-table informed about their most likely approaches for coastal areas which is reflected in **Annex9**.

6.12 In discussion:

- a) the meeting thanked Germany and the Chair of HASEC for preparing the useful document;
- b) Contracting parties had concerns on the calculation of the confidence index; and noted that there was no clear guidance from the European Union and suggested to take this issue to the WG-GES.

6.13 HASEC agreed that TG COMP would revise how the spatial aggregation and assessment frameworks for the coastal areas could be implemented taking into consideration the preferences indicated by Contracting Parties as in **Annex9**.

*Item 6.5 Data submission to ICES and the COMPEAT databases*

6.14 ICES gave a presentation (HASEC HOD 21/p06) giving an update on the development of the COMPEAT, data submission to ICES and next steps in the development of COMPEAT database.

6.15 In discussion,

- a) ICES clarified that the issue of how to combine in situ and satellite chlorophyll data would be discussed at TG-COMP(6). ICES noted that the COMPEAT link would not display the up to date results but that the results could be viewed by running the R code and ICES would update the tool with the results from R code;
- b) Germany noted it was useful having access to the R code as they were able to run the code and view the results.

6.16 The Secretariat informed Contracting Parties about the preparation of the shared workspace in SharePoint and the status of the satellite data of RBINS work, under contract with the Secretariat, and ARGANS.

6.17 In discussion,

- a) Germany welcomed collaboration with HELCOM and noted that they had funds available to assist in the development of the shared workspace and highlighted the importance of developing a stable infrastructure since it would be used for years.

6.18 HASEC thanked ICES and agreed **the Secretariat would finalise the estimated resources required to set up and develop the workspace and feedback to TG-COMP(6).**

## Agenda Item 7 – Any other business

7.1 The Secretariat highlighted that HASEC was the only OSPAR Committee with no Vice-Chair and informed the meeting that no nominations had been received. The Chair of HASEC encouraged Contracting Parties to propose candidates for HASEC 2022 to support the work and share tasks.

7.2 HASEC agreed to return to the election of Chair and Vice-chairs at HASEC 2022

7.3 Spain confirmed their intention to host the next HASEC 2022 meeting face-to-face in Madrid COVID-19 permitting on 28 March-1 April 2022.

7.4 HASEC thanked Spain for offering to host HASEC 2022 and noted the calendar on next meetings provided by the Secretariat. Germany offered to organise ICG-Eut and WG-INPUT meetings back-to-back in Berlin although had concerns organising meetings in hybrid format, in response, Sweden offered to host the ICG-Eut and INPUT meetings in hybrid format and the location would be confirmed as soon as possible. It was agreed that there would be overlap with the groups, to enable meeting together, Wednesday 26 January 2022.

Meeting	Date	Full name	Country	City
CoG	16-17 November 2021	Coordination Group	Secretariat	London
HOD	18 November 2021	Heads of Delegation	Secretariat	London
MIME	22-26 November 2021	Working Group on Monitoring and on Trends and Effects of Substances in the Marine Environment	ICES Headquarters	Copenhagen
HASEC HOD (2) 2021	10 December 2021	Meeting of the HASEC Heads of Delegation	Online	
ICG-OA	18-19 January 2022	Intersessional Correspondence Group on Ocean Acidification (Drafting meeting)	Secretariat	London
ICG-Eut	24-26 January 2022	Intersessional Correspondence Group on Eutrophication	Sweden	To be confirmed
INPUT	27-28 January 2022	Working Group on Inputs to the Marine Environment	Sweden	To be confirmed
ICG-OA	9 February 2022	Intersessional Correspondence Group on Ocean Acidification	Online	
HASEC	28 March–1 April 2022	Hazardous Substances and Eutrophication Committee	Spain	Madrid

7.5 The Secretariat gave an update on the discussions held at the last OSPAR Commission meeting related to hybrid participation at meetings; clear guidance was expected from the HOD meeting in November. Ideally, Committees would be meeting face to face once a year.

## Agenda Item 8 – Adoption of the Summary Record

HASEC HOD 21/8/1, HASEC HOD 21/08/Info.1

8.1 The Summary Record of the meeting was adopted in written procedure, according to the Rules of Procedure (52-54).