



**OSPAR  
COMMISSION**

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

The Aspect  
12 Finsbury Square  
London EC2A 1AS  
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) 20 7430 5200  
[www.ospar.org](http://www.ospar.org)

## Data call 2019

### Implementation reporting

### OSPAR threatened and/or declining species and habitats

7 June 2019

For the attention of:

OSPAR BDC Heads of Delegation  
ICG-POSH contact points

Cc: OSPAR Heads of Delegation

Dear Colleagues,

This is the data call for implementation reporting on the OSPAR Recommendations on listed threatened and/or declining species and habitats. Implementation reporting is required every 6 years for the Recommendations after an initial period. This round of implementation reporting is to be completed by 31 December 2019.

#### [Guidelines for implementation reporting](#)

This data call includes **guidelines to support implementation reporting (Annex 1)**. The guidelines have been developed with the aim of ensuring reporting consistency and reducing unnecessary workload of Contracting Parties in providing implementation reports. BDC 2019 agreed to use the guidelines for 2019 reporting (BDC 19/11/1 §4.57). The reporting guidelines comply with OSPAR Agreement 2003/23 (Standard Implementation Reporting and Assessment Procedure) which specifies the format of the Annex 1 reporting format of Recommendations. OSPAR Jurors and Linguists 2019 concluded that guidelines which comply with the above agreement can be used for implementation reporting. The guidelines are accompanied by **annotated guidance in Addendum 1** using the example of maerl beds.

#### [Reporting on collective actions](#)

Collective actions in the Recommendations are currently being implemented through the 'OSPAR 2017-2025 Roadmap for the implementation of collective actions within the Recommendations for the protection and conservation of OSPAR listed Species and Habitats'<sup>1</sup>. BDC 2019 agreed an approach where each Lead Party for a collective action would prepare the implementation report on behalf of all

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ospar.org/work-areas/bdc/species-habitats/implementation-of-species-and-habitat-recommendations>

Contracting Parties and present a draft report to ICG-POSH 2019 to allow all parties to consider the information before submission. A template for the collective actions will be issued to the Lead Party in due course. A summary of the reporting obligation is included in the guidelines Annex A and further details in Annex C of the reporting guidelines.

### Reporting template

Contracting Parties are requested to use the reporting templates that have been issued in accordance with the reporting requirements as specified in **Annex B** of the reporting guidelines. Contracting Parties confirmed at BDC 2019 that the national information in Annex B of the guidelines were correct. Based on this information, Contracting Parties only need to report against these particular Recommendations, and therefore have only been issued reporting templates for these ones.

**Reporting templates are available through the OSPAR website;**

**[www.ospar.org/work-areas/bdc/other/reporting-formats/implementation-reporting](http://www.ospar.org/work-areas/bdc/other/reporting-formats/implementation-reporting)**

### Use of the reported information

The information reported by Contracting Parties will be used to develop an implementation report in accordance with the requirements of OSPAR Convention Articles 22 and 23.

The information provided through by Contracting Parties implementation reporting will be used to develop components for the OSPAR Quality Status Report 2023.

### Submission of implementation reports

Contracting Parties are invited to respond to the data call by reporting information using the specified reporting formats and submitting the completed templates as follows;

**To: [secretariat@ospar.org](mailto:secretariat@ospar.org); [lena.avellan@ospar.org](mailto:lana.avellan@ospar.org)**

**By: end of business Tuesday 31 December 2019, strict deadline.**

Queries on the reporting are to be addressed to [secretariat@ospar.org](mailto:secretariat@ospar.org) and [lena.avellan@ospar.org](mailto:lana.avellan@ospar.org).

Yours sincerely,



Lena Avellan  
Deputy Secretary



Philip Stamp  
Deputy Secretary

*Note:*

*Annex 1 Reporting Guidance (incl Annex A-C)*

*Addendum 1 annotated reporting example*

## Annex 1. Guidance for 2019 implementation reporting

### Handling recommendations with multiple OSPAR listed habitats and species

1. Some of the Recommendations cover more than one component of the OSPAR list. In some cases the actions are generic to all of the features, but in some cases they are specific to one component. For example, Recommendation 2010/6 covers the angel shark, basking shark, common skate, and white skate but the actions don't all apply to each feature. Therefore the database has been adjusted to reflect the correct actions for each feature and reporting templates generated.

### Reporting implementation the collective actions in the Roadmap by lead parties via ICG POSH 2019

2. In 2016 Contracting Parties had to report against both individual and collective actions in the Recommendations. At OSPAR 2017 the 'Roadmap for the implementation of collective actions within the Recommendations for the protection and conservation of OSPAR listed species and habitats' was adopted.

3. As this is now the means of delivering the collective actions then it should follow that they be collectively reported against. An initial version of a template for the approach was prepared and discussed at ICG-POSH 2018 is shown in Annex A. This was subsequently adopted at BDC 2019, where it was agreed that the Lead Party for actions should provide the information. Please note that a separate template will be issued to Contracting Parties for this in due course. This information should be provided in time to meet the ICG-POSH 2019 reporting deadline (ICG-POSH 18/6/1 §2.16).

### Guidance for reporting to increase consistency and comparability

#### 1. Keeping responses succinct

4. Whilst reporting significant volumes of information seem like a good idea it creates a challenge for analysts to identify the key message and then summarise across all Contracting Parties. It is recommended that Contracting Parties limit themselves to a maximum of 100 words for each action, and ideally seek to minimise the amount of text where possible. This should be kept in a single paragraph as this helps to ensure that there are no database reading errors as the reports are ingested. A mock-up example has been prepared in **BDC 19/4/12 Addendum 1** using the UK report on maerl beds in 2016 as a basis of an example. In the form all un-editable text fields are shaded grey. These contain contextual information to assist Contracting Parties, or reference information for ingesting the information back into the database.

#### 2. Categorising action type

5. A key issue from 2016 reporting that needs to be considered was the interpretation of the "Means of Implementation" which are outlined in the Format for the Implementation Reports as detailed in Appendix 1 of all the Recommendations. The means of implementation are: by legislation, by administrative action and by negotiated agreement. In the 2016 reporting templates it was possible to select any possible single or multiple combination of these means for each individual measure.

6. In particular, Contracting Parties had different interpretations of the term "by negotiated agreement", which made comparison and analysis of reporting on Recommendations difficult. BDC 2018

therefore drafted descriptive text for these terms and agreed to seek advice from JL that it was consistent with the general OSPAR interpretation.

7. The descriptions drafted at BDC 2018 were:

**“by legislation”** An action implemented through the adoption of specific legislation within a Contracting Party where compliance is required by legal provision.

**“by administrative action”** An action implemented through a non-statutory provision where compliance is voluntary.

**“by negotiated agreement”** An action implemented through an agreement with a person or other legal entity, which has rights to or ownership of an area or resources, and a Contracting Party.

8. It should be noted that JL 2018 did not provide a view on whether these descriptions were consistent with the general OSPAR interpretation because there is no agreed definition of the terms. Interpretation was considered to be a matter of national competence of Contracting Parties. They also questioned whether the interpretations devised by BDC were sufficiently clear.

9. ICG POSH 2018 discussed this matter and decided that instead of reporting against each individual measure that instead reporting should be at Recommendation level (ICG-POSH 18/6/1 §2.22). This would be consistent with the Annex to each Recommendation which sets out the reporting information requirements. Using this approach means it is likely that all three implementation approaches will be used for many of the recommendations and therefore any differences in how the Contracting Parties interpret the terms becomes less relevant. Therefore BDC 2019 agreed that reporting means of implementation should be done at Recommendation level and the reporting templates reflect this change.

### 3. Standardising text response to certain measures

10. Across the Recommendations there are common themes within the measures adopted. In many cases Recommendations adopted at the same time have the same action, or very similar text. Therefore coming up with a standardised format and content for responding should reduce the burden on contracting parties.

11. For example, almost all the Recommendations include individual actions regarding Marine Protected Areas. Therefore having a clear and consistent format for responding to these actions should reduce the burden. A potential format is set out below using zostera beds as the example:

“Zostera beds are a protected feature in [xx] MPAs which form part of the OSPAR network.”

12. There may be variants on this where the habitat or species is present in an MPA but is not a protected feature of the designation, or in some cases they may be protected by an MPA which is not in the OSPAR MPA network. This could be addressed by using the following formats:

“Zostera beds are present in [xx] MPAs which form part of the OSPAR network.”

“Zostera beds are a protected feature in [xx] MPAs which are part of the OSPAR network.”

13. In the case of these formats it may be that Contracting Parties need to combine these into a single response.

14. Another notable example of a regularly occurring theme, is the introduction of national legislation. This could be dealt with relatively easily as follows, using zostera beds and text from the UK as the example:

“The following national legislation protects zostera beds - the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009; the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010; the Marine Act (Northern Ireland) 2013; the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, and the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 1995 (as amended); The Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981); Environment (Northern Ireland) Order 2002; Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006; Wildlife and Natural Environment Act (Northern Ireland) 2011; and the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004.”

15. A further example is “acting for the fulfilment of the purpose of this Recommendation within the framework of relevant competent authorities” which seemed to cause some confusion in 2016 reporting. If implemented, this could be reported very simply as follows:

“implemented”

16. Another example is in relation to awareness raising, which appears in many recommendations. For zostera beds the action is to “raise awareness of the importance of Zostera beds among relevant management authorities, the fishery sector and the general public.” This could be reported against as follows (using text from Spain as the example):




“Seminars, workshops and meetings have been held with relevant fisheries management authorities, the fishery sector and/or the general public, in order to raise awareness of the importance of seagrass beds”



## Annex A – Collective action reporting

Table 1: Summary of the collective actions where a Lead Party is available and for which an implementation report is expected.  
See **Annex C** for further details.

Lead Party(ies)/ responsible for 2019 implementation reporting	Collective action number
Secretariat	1, 4, 6, 21, 46
United Kingdom	2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 36, 40
Germany	12, 13, 36
France	26
Netherlands	11, 29, 42
Spain	32, 43
Norway	11, 39, 40

Table 2: Example of Reporting implementation the collective actions in the Roadmap  
NB: templates will be issued directly to Lead Parties in due course.

No	Action	Habitats/Species	Lead Party(ies)/ other relevant OSPAR Bodies	Has action sheet been developed?	Has implementation begun?	Has action been completed?	Comments
1	Building on existing material (e.g. OSPAR website) develop and implement a phased communications strategy for OSPAR listed species and habitats to:  •Share knowledge including on	All	Secretariat, supported by Sweden  ICG-POSH				

	<p>status and threats to help promote action by others;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Share knowledge and experience on measures that have been implemented and lessons learned, among both relevant management authorities and general public</li> </ul>						
36	Establish collaboration with ICES WG Bird on data collection, storage and analysis	<i>Black backed gull;</i> <i>Little shearwater;</i> <i>Balearic shearwater;</i> <i>black-legged kittiwake;</i> <i>Roseate tern;</i> <i>Iberian guillemot;</i> <i>thick-billed murre</i>	Germany and United kingdom, supported by France and Norway  ICG-COBAM	No			Established JWG Bird with ICES and Helcom

## ANNEX B – Detailed analysis of reporting requirements

Table 4 shows the reporting requirements based upon regions under threat where each Contracting Party has waters under national jurisdiction.

Table4: Applicable regions for each Contracting Party

Contacting Party	Applicable Regions
Belgium	II
Denmark	I,II,V
EU	None
Finland	None
France	II,III,IV
Germany	II
Iceland	I,V
Ireland	III,V
Luxembourg	None
Netherlands	II
Norway	I,II
Portugal	IV,V
Spain	IV,V
Sweden	II
Switzerland	None
UK	I,II,III,IV,V

Table 4: Contracting Party reporting obligations

Rec. No	Feature name	Regions under threat	Contracting Parties to report	Contracting parties not required to report
2015/4	Allis shad	II;III;IV	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Iceland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2010/6	Angel shark, basking shark, common skate, and white skate	II;III;IV	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Iceland, Luxembourg, Switzerland



Rec. No	Feature name	Regions under threat	Contracting Parties to report	Contracting parties not required to report
2016/3	Atlantic salmon	I;II;III;IV	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2015/2	Azorean limpet	V	Denmark, Iceland, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, UK	Belgium, EU, Finland, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland
2011/4	Balearic shearwater	II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2011/5	Black-legged kittiwake	I;II	Belgium, Denmark, France, Iceland, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland
2013/9	Blue whale	I;II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2013/8	Bowhead whale	I	Denmark, Iceland, Norway, UK	Belgium, EU, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland
2014/10	Carbonate mounds	V	Denmark, Iceland, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, UK	Belgium, EU, Finland, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland
2014/14	Cod	II;III	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Iceland, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland
2010/9	Coral gardens	I;II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland

Rec. No	Feature name	Regions under threat	Contracting Parties to report	Contracting parties not required to report
2014/12	Cymodocea meadows	IV	France, Portugal, Spain, UK	Belgium, Denmark, EU, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland
2010/10	Deep-sea sponge aggregations	I;III;IV;V	Denmark, France, Iceland, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, Spain, UK	Belgium, EU, Finland, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland
2014/15	European eel	I;II;III;IV	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2014/1	European sturgeon	II;IV	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Iceland, Ireland,
2013/4	Flat Oyster and ostrea edulis beds	II;III;IV	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Iceland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2014/3	Gulper shark	I;II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2013/11	Harbour porpoise	II;III	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Iceland, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland
2014/16	Iberian guillemot	IV	France, Portugal, Spain, UK	Belgium, Denmark, EU, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland
2016/2	Intertidal mudflats	I;II;III;IV	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland

Rec. No	Feature name	Regions under threat	Contracting Parties to report	Contracting parties not required to report
2015/1	Intertidal <i>Mytilus edulis</i> beds on mixed and sandy sediments	II;III	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK	EU, Iceland, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland
2011/2	Ivory gull	I	Denmark, Iceland, Norway, UK	Belgium, EU, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland
2014/4	Leafscale gulper shark	I;II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2013/6	Leatherback turtle	I;II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2011/1	Lesser black backed gull	I	Denmark, Iceland, Norway, UK	Belgium, EU, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland
2011/3	Little shearwater	V	Denmark, Iceland, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, UK	Belgium, EU, Finland, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland
2013/1	Littoral chalk communities	II	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland
2013/7	Loggerhead turtle	IV;V	Denmark, France, Iceland, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, UK	Belgium, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden
2012/3	Long-snouted seahorse	II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2010/8	<i>Lophelia pertusa</i> reefs	I;II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland

Rec. No	Feature name	Regions under threat	Contracting Parties to report	Contracting parties not required to report
2014/13	Maerl beds	III	France, Ireland, UK	Belgium, Denmark, EU, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland
2013/3	Modiolus modiolus beds	I;II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2013/10	Northern right whale	I;II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2013/5	Ocean quahog	II	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland
2014/11	Oceanic ridges with hydrothermal vents and fields	V	Denmark, Iceland, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, UK	Belgium, EU, Finland, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland
2010/7	Orange roughy	I;V	Denmark, Iceland, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, Spain, UK	Belgium, EU, Finland, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland
2014/6	Porbeagle shark	I;II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2014/5	Portuguese dogfish	I;II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2011/6	Roseate tern	II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2013/2	Sabellaria spinulosa reefs	II;III	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK	EU, Iceland, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland

Rec. No	Feature name	Regions under threat	Contracting Parties to report	Contracting parties not required to report
2015/3	Sea lamprey	I;II;III;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2014/9	Seamounts	I;IV;V	Denmark, France, Iceland, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, Spain, UK	Belgium, EU, Finland, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland
2010/11	Sea-pen and burrowing megafauna communities	II;III	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK	EU, Iceland, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland
2012/2	Short-snouted seahorse	II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2014/7	Spotted ray	II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2014/2	Spurdog	I;II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2013/12	Steller's eider	I	Denmark, Iceland, Norway, UK	Belgium, EU, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland
2011/7	Thick-billed murre	I	Denmark, Iceland, Norway, UK	Belgium, EU, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland
2014/8	Thornback ray	I;II;III;IV;V	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland
2012/4	Zostera beds	I;II;III;IV	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK	EU, Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland

## ANNEX C

Extract from the Species and Habitats Roadmap for collective actions, including details on the collective actions. For further details and Action Sheets, please see the ospar.org website (<https://www.ospar.org/work-areas/bdc/species-habitats/implementation-of-species-and-habitat-recommendations>)

No	Action	Habitats/Species	Region	Lead Party(ies)/ responsible for 2019 implementation reporting	No lead in place, no implementation reporting in 2019
1	Building on existing material (e.g. OSPAR website) develop and implement a phased communications strategy for OSPAR listed species and habitat	All	All	Secretariat	
2	Improve the OSPAR habitat mapping database in relation to all Habitats, and publish regularly updated quality assessments and distribution records	<i>All habitats: Zostera beds, littoral chalk communities, Ostrea edulis beds, Cymodocea meadows, intertidal Mytilus edulis beds, Sea-pen and burrowing megafauna, Sabellaria spinulosa reefs, Modiolus modiolus beds, Maerl beds, intertidal mudflats, Lophelia pertusa reefs, coral gardens, deep sea sponge aggregations, hydrothermal vents/fields occurring on oceanic ridges, seamounts, carbonate mounds</i>	All	United Kingdom	
3	Develop and implement an appropriate monitoring and assessment strategy addressing the distribution, extent and condition of coastal habitats, coordinating activities to build on existing monitoring work and where possible developing synergy with monitoring of other species and habitats.	<i>Sabellaria spinulosa reefs; littoral chalk communities; Ostrea edulis beds; Zostera beds; Modiolus modiolus beds, Cymodocea meadows and Maerl beds</i>	All	United Kingdom	
4	Request and review ICES advice, and other fisheries assessments based on monitoring and fisheries survey information	<i>Sturgeon, Allis shad, European eel, cod, orange roughy, sea lamprey), common skate species</i>	All	(Secretariat and/or ICG-POSH conveners)	No Lead Supported by

		<p>complex, white skate, Angel shark, basking shark, spurdog, gulper shark, leafscale gulper shark, Portugese dogfish, porbeagle, spotted ray, thornback ray, <i>quahog</i>, <i>Azorean limpet</i>, <i>harbour porpoise</i></p> <p><i>ICES advice in progress for Gulper shark, Leafscale gulper shark, Portugese dogfish</i></p> <p><i>OSPAR 2019 to consider ICES advice request for 1) Angel shark, Common skate complex (Flapper skate and Blue skate), Spotted ray, Thornback ray/skate and White skate 2) Basking shark, Porbeagle and Spurdog</i></p>			<p>Norway, Sweden and United Kingdom</p> <p>ICG-COBAM, ICG-POSH</p>
5	<p>Develop and implement a monitoring strategy, as part of the JAMP, leading to the periodic assessment of the status of species, to promote and coordinate the collection of information on distribution, status of, threats to and impacts on the species, using as appropriate information from other competent authorities</p>	<p>Loggerhead turtle, leatherback turtle, bowhead whale, blue whale, Northern right whale, lesser black-backed gull, ivory gull, little shearwater, Balearic shearwater, black-legged kittiwake, Roseate tern, thick-billed murre, Steller's eider, Iberian guillemot, <i>Ostrea edulis</i>, long snouted Seahorse, short snouted seahorse</p>	All		<p>No Lead</p> <p>JWG-Bird will address bird species. For other species Lead Contracting Party(ies), supported by France and United Kingdom. ICG-COBAM, ICG-POSH</p>
6	<p>In the context of Article 4 Annex V of the Convention and in line with the common understanding (OSPAR 13/13), cooperate with relevant competent organisations to develop a strategy to encourage commercial fishermen to report incidental by-catches key habitat forming species, including information about location and date.</p>	<p><i>Lophelia pertusa</i> reefs, coral gardens, deep sea sponge aggregations, seapen and burrowing megafauna,</p>	All	Secretariat	

7	Carrying out appropriate periodic monitoring, where appropriate this could include visual observation e.g. video of habitat presence and condition at selected sites, and evidence of pressures such as trawling damage, ghost fishing and percentage cover of live and dead or destroyed coral	Carbonate mounds, <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reefs	III, V	United Kingdom	
8	Compile evidence on the species and habitats that form on carbonate mounds, hydrothermal vents and seamounts in the OSPAR maritime area and assess which are threatened by on going and potential human activities	Carbonate mounds; hydrothermal vents; seamounts	V		No Lead  Supported by France, Norway and the United Kingdom , ICG-COBAM
9	Evaluate the extent to which ecological data from commercial Nephrops stock assessment and commercial video footage and photographic evidence can be used to assess the status of sea-pen and burrowing megafauna communities, and as appropriate develop protocols for assessment purposes.	Seapen and burrowing megafauna	II, III	United Kingdom	
10	Monitor key pressures including loss and change of substratum, levels of eutrophication, removal of species, introduction and spread of non-indigenous species and physical damage	Littoral chalk	II		No Lead
11	Gather contextual information on activities, such as aggregate dredging, offshore development or fishing, likely to have an effect on <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reefs in the vicinity of areas selected for monitoring;	<i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reefs	II, III	Netherlands, UK and Norway	



12	Analyse whether any of the key areas justify selection as MPAs for the protection of whales populations and whether such areas may become a component of the OSPAR MPA network	Bowhead whale, blue whale, Northern right whale, harbour porpoise	All	Germany	
13	Evaluate the extent to which critical habitat for the following species are already included within the OSPAR network of marine protected areas, and whether this coverage can be improved as a complementary measure to other conservation and management measures	Spurdog, gulper shark, leafscale gulper shark, Portuguese dogfish, porbeagle shark, spotted ray, thornback ray, harbour porpoise, Atlantic salmon	All	Germany	
14	Promote their inclusion as a protected species in other relevant biodiversity conventions	Sea lamprey, Allis shad, European eel, sturgeon, orange roughy, Atlantic salmon, common skate, white skate, Angel shark, basking shark	All		Lead Contracting Party(ies), Supported by France and the Netherlands  ICG-POSH, BDC
15	In the context of Article 4 of Annex V of the Convention and in line with the common understanding (OSPAR 13/13), draw to the attention of relevant competent organisations instances where fishing activities constitute a threat to relevant species and habitats and where appropriate encourage those organisations to take appropriate measures	<i>Lophelia pertusa</i> reefs, coral gardens, and deep sea sponge aggregations, carbonate mounds, hydrothermal vents, seapen and burrowing megafauna, seamounts; maerl beds, <i>Ostrea edulis</i> beds Cymodocea, <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reefs, <i>Modiolus modiolus</i> beds sturgeon, Allis shad, European eel, cod, orange roughy, sea lamprey, Atlantic Salmon, Common skate, white skate, Angel shark, basking shark, spurdog, gulper shark, leafscale gulper shark, Portuguese dogfish, porbeagle, spotted ray, thornback ray, Iberian guillemot, <i>Ostrea edulis</i> and <i>Ostrea edulis</i> beds	All		Lead Contracting Parties for status assessments, Supported by France and the Secretariat  ICG-POSH, BDC
16	In the context of Article 4 of Annex V of the Convention and in line with the common	Hydrothermal vents; seamounts; <i>Ostrea edulis</i> beds, Cymodocea, <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reefs.	All		Lead Contracting Parties, supported

	understanding (OSPAR 13/13), draw to the attention of relevant competent organisations instances where other physical disturbance to seafloor (e.g. mineral extraction, biological and geological sampling, construction) constitute a threat to relevant habitats and where appropriate encourage those organisations to take appropriate measures				by France Norway and the Secretariat  ICG-POSH, EIHA
17	In the context of Article 4 of Annex V of the Convention and in line with the common understanding (OSPAR 13/13), draw to the attention of relevant competent organisations instances where ship noise and ship strikes constitute a threat to relevant species and where appropriate encourage those organisations to take appropriate measures	Northern right whale, blue whale, bowhead whale, harbour porpoise, loggerhead turtle, leatherback turtle	All		Lead Contracting Party(ies), supported by France  ICG-Noise  ICG-POSH, EIHA
18	In the context of Article 4 of Annex V of the Convention and in line with the common understanding (OSPAR 13/13), draw to the attention of relevant competent organisations instances where entanglement and ingestion of marine Litter and ADLFG constitute a threat to relevant species and where appropriate encourage those organisations to take appropriate measures	Leatherback turtle, loggerhead turtle, leafscale gulper shark, Portugese dogfish, blue whale, bowhead whale, Northern right whale	All		ICG-ML supported by France
19	In the context of Article 4 of Annex V of the Convention and in line with the common understanding (OSPAR 13/13), draw to the attention of relevant competent organisations instances where pollution from oil and hazardous substances constitute a threat to relevant species and where appropriate encourage those organisations to take	Loggerhead turtle, leatherback turtle, European eel, Iberian guillemot	All		Co-Conveners to raise with HASEC and OIC supported by France and [Spain]  HASEC

	appropriate measures				
20	Cooperate and coordinate with other relevant competent international organisations and bodies, drawing upon the actions and measures suggested in the Background Document (OSPAR publication 2010/480) to address threats from aquaculture activities	Cymodocea, maerl beds, Atlantic salmon	All		Co-Conveners to raise with EIHA supported by Norway  EIHA
21	Cooperate and coordinate with other relevant competent international organisations and bodies, drawing upon the actions and measures suggested in the Background Document (OSPAR publication 2010/480) to address threats from habitat alteration or loss, obstacles to migration and pollution	European eel, Atlantic salmon	I, II, III, IV	Secretariat	(action not initiated)
22	Identify whether further measures to maintain or improve water quality (contaminants and nutrients) are necessary to safeguard relevant habitats and implement if required	Maerl beds, zostera beds, <i>Mytilus edulis</i> beds, Cymodocea; Intertidal mudflats	I, II, III, IV		Lead Contracting party for Status assessment  HASEC
23	Consider whether existing and new measures to manage the impacts of pressures both within and outside waters under their national jurisdiction require additional action through the OSPAR Commission;	Littoral chalk, <i>Ostrea edulis</i> beds	II, III, IV		Lead Contracting Party(ies), supported by Belgium  ICG-POSH
24	Developing, within the competence of OSPAR, effective mitigation actions against further anthropogenic threats to whale populations and incorporate them into appropriate measures for the	Blue whale, bowhead whale, Northern right whale	All		Lead Contracting Party(ies), supported by France

	protection of these species;				EIHA, ICG-Noise, ICG-ML
25	Develop and incorporate appropriate measures to mitigate habitat destruction (e.g. caused by degradation of spawning habitats through silting due to agriculture intensification or dams; maintenance dredging and sand and gravel extraction) and degradation of the water quality in estuaries;	Sea Lamprey, sturgeon	I, II, III and IV		EIHA
26	Develop and/or refine relevant measures and strategies for preventing and reducing impact on turtles of entanglement in and ingestion of marine litter (in particular plastic bags), pollution, collision and bycatch	<i>Leatherback turtle, loggerhead turtle</i>	All	France	
27	Advocate management measures (for example, management measures in marine protected areas such as Natura 2000 sites, OSPAR MPAs or address necessary measures under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) with the appropriate authorities.	Ocean quahog	II		Co-Conveners to raise with ICG-MPA supported by the Netherlands and United kingdom  EIHA, ICG-MPA
28	Where applicable, ensure the implementation of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, by working to achieve good environmental status of habitats essential to the life cycles of cod and the cod stocks, including age and size structure of cod populations, as well as their role in the marine food web.	Cod  BDC 2018 summary record:  The meeting discussed whether Action 28, on the implementation of the MSFD in relation to habitats essential to the lifecycles of cod and the cod stocks, could be considered completed. The EU highlighted that Article 8 of the Common Fisheries Policy provide member states a mechanism to identify and take management action on Critical Habitats. The Netherlands highlighted the link to the MPA eco-	II and III		BDC, CoG

		coherence connectivity and lifecycle analysis that they were undertaking, highlighting that cod was one of the species where they had the best data.  BDC agreed that Action 28 should remain in the roadmap and a link should be made to the work on eco-coherence in ICG-MPA.			
29	Develop guidelines on how to minimise the disturbing and/or harmful acoustic effects to harbour porpoises especially from seismic surveys, pile driving, shipping traffic, military activities and underwater explosions;	Harbour porpoise	II and III	Netherlands	
30	Take measures to further reduce discharges, emissions and losses of relevant hazardous substances to a level, that is compatible with breeding success of European eel, referred to in the background document;	European eel	I, II, III and IV		Lead Contracting Party(ies), supported by France  HASEC
31	Develop measures within OSPAR's competence to reduce or eliminate the impact of habitat alteration from human activities on the <i>Ostrea edulis</i> and <i>Ostrea edulis</i> beds through bottom disturbance	<i>Ostrea edulis</i> and <i>Ostrea edulis</i> beds	II		Lead Contracting Party(ies), supported by Belgium  EIHA, NORA network
32	Develop relevant measures for preventing and reducing oil pollution within OSPAR Region IV;	Iberian guillemot	IV	Spain	
33	Improve coordination of research to improve understanding of life history, distribution, track trends in populations and address specific issues identified in the recommendations	<i>Sturgeon</i> , <i>Allis shad</i> , <i>European eel</i> , <i>cod</i> , <i>orange roughy</i> , <i>sea lamprey</i> , <i>Atlantic salmon</i> , common skate, white skate, Angel shark, basking shark, spurdog, gulper shark, leafscale gulper shark, Portugese dogfish, porbeagle, spotted ray,	All		Lead Contracting Party(ies), supported by Norway  ICG-POSH, ICG-

		thornback ray			COBAM, Science Needs Agenda
34	Coordinate with fisheries research and funding agencies to consider the establishment of a collaborative fisheries-independent research programme to evaluate the status of the species, monitor stock recovery and track movements, and identify any networks of critical habitats;	Common skate, white skate, angel shark, basking shark, spurdog, gulper shark, leafscale gulper shark, Portugese dogfish, porbeagle, spotted ray, thornback ray	All		No lead  ICG-POSH, ICG-COBAM, ICG-MPA, BDC
35	Maintain cooperation with ICES and fisheries organisations to get regular advice and to coordinate monitoring and research programs. Link with IUCN and wider academic research networks for non-commercial species.	<i>Sturgeon, Allis shad, European eel, cod, orange roughy, sea lamprey, Atlantic salmon, leatherback turtle, loggerhead turtles</i>	All		No Lead, Supported by France and Norway  ICG-POSH, ICG-COBAM
36	Establish collaboration with ICES WG Bird on data collection, storage and analysis	<i>Black backed gull, Little shearwater; Balearic shearwater; black-legged kittiwake; Roseate tern; Iberian guillemot; thick-billed murre</i>	All	Germany and United kingdom	
37	Bring to the attention of relevant competent authorities the status of and threats, and the need for further research and data collection	Lesser black-backed gull; Ivory gull; little shearwater; Balearic shearwater; black-legged kittiwake; Roseate tern; thick-billed murre	All		No Lead, supported by Norway  ICG-POSH, ICG-COBAM. JWG Bird
38	Further research on source populations, status and distribution and other causes for decline. This means to develop a research agenda on this topic/ species in national waters and ABNJ	<i>Leatherback turtle, loggerhead turtle</i>	All		No Lead, supported by France  ICG-POSH, ICG-COBAM, BDC

39	Undertake further research the causes of decline in the Steller's Eider, in particular through the Norwegian-Russian Environmental Commission	Steller's eider	I	Norway	
40	Seek advice on the latest knowledge of species and habitats supported by seamounts located within the OSPAR maritime area, then evaluate possible inclusion of these biological communities in the OSPAR List of Threatened and/or Declining Species and Habitats	Seamounts	I, IV, V	Norway and UK	
41	Enhance knowledge exchange between researchers, and between researchers, management authorities and OSPAR	<i>Roseate tern</i>	II, III, IV and V		No lead ICG-POSH
42	Compile and promote a list of useful future research areas that would inform the protection and conservation of <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reefs to relevant scientific funding bodies and existing national monitoring programmes	<i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reefs <sup>[1]</sup> <sub>SEP</sub>	II and III	Netherlands	
43	Promote implementation of the European Commission Species Action Plan for the species	Balearic shearwater, roseate tern	II, III, IV and V	Spain	
44	Promote the updating and implementation of the Arctic Council CAFF Action Plan (1996)	Thick-billed murre	I		No Lead, supported by Norway, ICG-POSH
45	Develop and implement an OSPAR action plan for Lesser black-backed gull	Lesser black-backed gull	I		No Lead, Supported by Norway, ICG-POSH
46	Request the international Council for the Exploration	European eel	I, II, III	Secretariat	(action not initiated)

	of the Seas (ICES) to continue to improve its assessment of the effectiveness of European and national management plans		and IV		
--	---	--	--------	--	--