

MINUTES of Meeting

J.no. SN 2001-403-0142

9 September 2005

Project: BALANCE
Subject: Kick-off Meeting
Date: 31st August and 1st September 2005
Place: GEUS, Copenhagen

Participants: See Annex 1
Distribution: Participants + website
Minutes by: JYR + JHA

Agenda:

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Presentation of participants
3. Information from the BALANCE Secretariat (PC and PM)
4. Presentation of WP 1-5
5. Food for thoughts
6. WP seminars
7. Presentation of the BALANCE web site
8. Reporting and payment procedures
9. Meeting summary and future meetings
10. Any other business

Minutes:

Action/deadline

1 The meeting was opened by Mr. Jesper H. Andersen who welcomed the participants to the BALANCE kick-off Meeting in Copenhagen. It was emphasised that this meeting is strategically important and that it is essential that all partners have a common understanding of respective roles and duties.

The meeting was co-chaired by Mr. Johnny Reker and Mr. Jesper H. Andersen.

A revised agenda was presented and adopted. All participants were encouraged to be open and contribute and to contribute to a hopefully successful lapse of the BALANCE project in general and the meeting in particular.

The goals for the meeting were introduced:

- Official start of BALANCE.
- Presentation of partners and participants.
- Presentation and discussion of WP activities and products.
- Presentation of structure and principles for coordination and management of BALANCE, including BALANCE working rules.
- Presentation of the BALANCE web page.
- Presentation of INTERREG IIIB Maritime Safety Umbrella Operation (MSUO).

2 All participants gave a brief presentation of themselves. A List of Participants is enclosed as Annex 1.

3

The BALANCE project coordinator, Mr. Johnny Reker outlined the project with the intention of setting the scene for the kick-off meeting. It was pointed out that:

- The project runs for 2½ year from 1/7 2005.
- The project covers the entire Baltic Sea.
- The budget is €4,3 mio. + €0,4 mio. in non-eligible funding.
- There are 19 partners + 7 consultants
- 10 countries incl. Norway & U.S.A (but excl. Russia) are involved.
- BALANCE is the largest project funded by the BSR INTERREG IIIB Programme.
- All conditions have been met.

The PowerPoint presentation (KO2 PC Setting the scene) can be found at the BALANCE web site (<http://www.balance-eu.org>).

The BALANCE project coordinator, Mr. Jesper Andersen presented the proposed set up for the daily operation and coordination of BALANCE. Four basic working rules were introduced (Do a good job – keep deadlines – have fun – keep your bosses happy). The Lead Partner principle was described and it was emphasised that the BALANCE Secretariat is responsible for communication with the BSR INTERREG Joint Secretariat. The reporting procedures per milestone and internal in-between progress reporting were briefly outlined. The PowerPoint presentation (KO3 PM Info) can be found at the BALANCE web site (<http://www.balance-eu.org>).

The BALANCE communication principles and guidelines were presented by Mr. Johnny Reker. It was emphasised that the BALANCE web site will be the backbone in the communication within the project together with e-mails. It was also emphasised that external communication and stakeholder involvement is important – and that the EU flag and the BSR INTERREG logo should be clearly visible whenever a BALANCE product is made available to the public. The PowerPoint presentation can be found at <http://www.balance-eu.org>.

The Meeting briefly discussed the presentations by the project coordinator and project manager and endorsed the working rules and communication guidelines. The Meeting also took note of the message in relation to logos.

Mr. Johnny Reker introduced the INTERREG Maritime Safety Umbrella Operation (MSUO), which is an instrument aimed at improving trans-national cooperation and to create, maintain and implement a

4

WP4: Spatial planning and management

Mr. Jan Ekebom (Metsähallitus), responsible partner for WP4, introduced the partners involved in WP4 as well as the goals and objectives of WP4. The overall goal is development of guidelines for Baltic Sea marine management framework. The activities are:

- Activity 1: To synthesise a framework on how to apply marine zoning in management of marine areas.
- Activity 2 (detailed part of Act.1): To produce GIS based methods (protocols, mostly GIS based) for management of marine areas with emphasis on the development of indices that quantify management efficiency
- Activity 3 (detailed part of Act. 1): To present a template and methods for stakeholder involvement

Mr. Thomas K. Sørensen (DIFRES) presented an example of marine zoning from the Great Barrier Reef in Australia with special focus on operating principles. Zoning is considered to be a key management tool and the development of a Baltic approach to marine zoning a primary goal of BALANCE. Zones separate conflicting uses and range from e.g.: i) General (= sustainable) use, ii) national park ('no-take'), and iii) preservation ('no-go'). Each zone type has a specific written objective.

Mr. Ole Vestergaard (DIFRES) presented the WP4 understanding of the BALANCE working process with special focus on (1) data requirement, (2) mapping requirements, (3) representativity analysis, and (4) guidelines for management planning. A sketch illustrating the linkages between these activities in a management context can be found in the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Jan Ekebom continued to present for evaluation of management effectiveness. At present, a lack of quantitative indications has been identified. Within BALANCE, there will be a special focus on:

- Quantitative indicators for evaluation of how marine nature conservation goals have been achieved
 - Use of focal species (position, cover, depth range)
- Quantitative indicators for evaluation of how the socio-economic goals have been achieved and if there is indication of negative impact of potential threats
 - Gain to local communities from a managed marine area with a zoning plan
 - Impact of urban sprawl and development (buildings, construction activities)

- 5** Food for thoughts was presented by Jon Davies, coordinator of the MESH project. MESH is an acronym for “Development of a framework for **M**apping **E**uropean **S**eabed **H**abitats”.

MESH activities include:

- Collate and harmonise existing habitat maps.
- Develop standards and protocols.
- Test protocols and standards.
- Develop predictive mapping tools.
- Case studies on uses for maps.
- Communication and dissemination.

MESH will establish the ways and means to produce consistent marine habitat maps for NW Europe, and show how they might be used.

Within MESH, the terminology used have been discussed in order to avoid misunderstanding and incorrect use:

- Marine landscape: A suite of habitat types which occur together, often in a specific pattern, to form a topographically distinct feature.
- Habitat: A recognizable space which can be distinguished by its abiotic characteristics and associated biological assemblage, operating at particular spatial and temporal scales.
- Classification: A structured system of habitat or landscape types, often in a hierarchy, in which the types are clearly.

The PowerPoint presentation can be found at the BALANCE web site (<http://www.balance-eu.org>).

- 6** A summary of the WP4 seminar is included in Annex 3.
A summary of the WP3 seminar is included in Annex 4.
A summary of the WP1 seminar is included in Annex 5.

Summaries of WP2 and WP4 seminars have unfortunately not been received, nor have detailed information on activities per milestone. Annex 6 includes an overview of WP4 mapping requirements for development of zoning plans and management framework.

- 7** Due to technical problem, the planned presentation of the BALANCE web site was cancelled. The Meeting was informed that the official web site www.balance-eu.org is expected to be launched within 1-2 weeks.

8

Mr. Jesper Andersen informed the meeting on matters in relation to reporting, auditing and payment procedures.

A Progress Reporting is required and submitted after every milestone and covers the periods: 01.01. – 30.06. and 01.07. – 31.12. JS provides each project a prefilled activity (AR) and financial report (FR) generated from its database. Deadlines for reports: 1st of August and 1st of February (LP to JS) – and we (BS) need time to compile contributions from partners etc. LP collects and submits the progress reports to the JS.

The Financial Report (FR) has to provide information about:

- allocated costs per work package (FR I),
- used financial sources and the confirmation by an independent auditor (FR II),
- other costs, equipment and in kind contribution (FR IIIa),
- small scale investments carried out in the reporting period (FR IIIb), and
- division of eligible expenditures by PP and reporting period/MS.

To avoid irregularities, the reported expenditures:

- have to be paid within the reporting period concerned,
- have to be in accordance with the approved application,
- have to be eligible (according to BSR INTERREG III B rules, EU rules and national rules),
- have to be assigned to the correct BL and WP (according to BSR INTERREG III B rules),
- have to be documented (in particular personnel costs: time sheets and overhead costs: calculation scheme), and
- have to be audited by an independent external/internal auditor.

The general procedures in relation to payment are:

- No advance payment will be made to the projects.
- Payment requests must be based on reported expenditures and will be calculated automatically (Financial Report form).
- Project costs will be reimbursed only.
- Payment requests will be managed by the JS together with the 6-months Progress Reports.

The PowerPoint presentation can be found at the BALANCE web site (<http://www.balance-eu.org>)

9 The Meeting was briefly summarised. It was the view of the co-chairs that to goals for the kick-off meeting had been fulfilled:

- All partners and participants have been presented.
- All WP activities and products have been presented and discussed.
- The structure and principles for coordination and management of BALANCE have been presented.
- The INTERREG IIB Maritime Safety Umbrella Operation (MSUO).

The BALANCE Secretariat informed the meeting that draft minutes would be produced within a week and circulated for comments. The WP leaders were kindly requested to submit summaries of the WP seminars within a week. The WP leads were also requested to outline a suite of annexes with information on WP budget (per budget line per partner per milestone).

The partners were reminded that all partners shall allocate 17% for project management (9.6%), travel and accommodation.

10 The BALANCE partners were encouraged to contact national INTERREG auditors and announce the forthcoming auditing in relation to the reporting.

11 The co-chairs thanked the participants for a very constructive and active dialogue. The co-chairs were of the opinion that BALANCE now has been launched successfully.

The meeting was closed.

Attachments:

Annex 1: List of Participants

Annex 2: Agenda for the kick-off meeting

Annex 3: Summary of WP4 seminar

Annex 4: Summary of WP3 seminar

Annex 5: Summary of WP1 seminar

Annex 6: WP4 mapping requirements for development of zoning plans and management framework

Annex 1: List of participants

Denmark

Zyad Al-Hamdani
Geological Survey of Denmark and
Greenland
azk@geus.dk

Jesper H. Andersen (Project Manager)
DHI Water & Environment
jha@dhi.dk

Maj-Brit Bunch
The Danish Forest and Nature Agency
mbb@sns.dk

Karsten Dahl
National Environmental Research Institute
kda@dmu.dk

Grete Dinesen
The Danish Forest and Nature Agency
grd@sns.dk

Jørgen Hansen
National Environmental Research Institute
joh@dmu.dk

Stig Helmig
The Danish Forest and Nature Agency
sah@sns.dk

Jørgen Jørgensen
Geological Survey of Denmark and
Greenland
jtj@geus.dk

Jørgen Leth
Geological Survey of Denmark and
Greenland
jol@geus.dk

Johnny Reker (Project Coordinator)
The Danish Forest and Nature Agency
jyr@sns.dk

Anne-Marie Rolev
Danish Institute for Fisheries Research
amr@dfu.mim.dk

Peter Sandbæk
Danish Institute for Fisheries Research
pes@dfu.mim.dk

Steen Silberg
Danish Institute for Fisheries Research

sts@dfu.mim.dk

Claus Sparrevohn
Danish Institute for Fisheries Research
crs@dfu.mim.dk

Thomas Kirk Sørensen
Danish Institute for Fisheries Research
tk@dfu.min.dk

Ole Vestergaard
Danish Institute for Fisheries Research
osv@dfu.mim.dk

Henrik Wichmann
The Danish Forest and Nature Agency
hew@sns.dk

Germany

Christiana Feucht
WWF Germany
feucht@wwf.de

Jochen Lamp
WWF Germany
lamp@wwf.de

Latvia

Juris Aigars
Institute of Aquatic Ecology, University of
Latvia
juris@monit.lu.lv

Estonia

Kristjan Herkül
Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu
(kristjan.herkyl@sea.ee)

Lithuania

Darius Daunys
CORPI, Klaipeda University
darius@corpi.ku.lt

Sergei Olenin
CORPI, Klaipeda University
serg@corpj.ku.lt

Finland

Ulla Alanen
Geological Survey of Finland
ulla.alnen@gtk.fi
Henne Biekkrinen
The Finnish Environment Institute
henne.bierkrinen@ymparisto.fi

Jan Ekebom
Metsähallitus
jan.ekebom@metsa.fi

Aarno Kotilainen
Geological Survey of Finland
aarno.kotilainen@gsf.fi

Anita Makinen
WWF Finland
anita.makinen@wwf.fi

Tanja Pirinen
WWF Finland
tanja.pirinen@wwf.fi

Madeleine Nyman
The Finnish Environment Institute
madeleine.nyman@ymparisto.fi

Anna-Leena Nöjd
The Finnish Environment Institute
anna-leena.nojd@ymparisto.fi

Anu Reijonen
Geological Survey of Finland
anu.reijonen@gtk.fi

Sweden

Åsa Andersson
WWF Sweden
asa.andersson@wwf.se

Ulf Bergström
National Board of Fisheries (NBF-DRD)
ulf.bergstrom@fiskeriverket.se

Anna Sarah Liman
WWF Sweden
annasaraliman@fast-mail.org

Cecila Lindblad
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
(cecila.lindblad@naturvardsverket.se)

Greger Lindeberg
Geological Survey of Sweden
greger.lindeberg@sgu.se

Annelie Mattisson
County Administrative Board of Stockholm
annelie.mattisson@ab.lst.se

Alfred Sandström
National Board of Fisheries (NBF-DRD)
alfred.sandstrom@fiskeriverket.se

Göran Sundblad
National Board of Fisheries (NBF-DRD)
goran.sundblad@fiskeriverket.se

Per Nilsson
Göteborg Universitet (TMBL)
per.nilsson@tmbl.gu.se

Sandra Wennberg
Kartverket, Miljöanalys
sandra.wennberg@lm.se

Norge

Ole Christensen
Geological Survey of Norway
ole.christensen@ngu.no

Martin Isaeus
Norwegian Institute of Water Research
martin.isaeus@niva.no

Others

Jon Davies
JNCC, MESH Coordinator
jon.davies@jncc.gov.uk

Annex 2: Agenda for the kick-off meeting

Agenda

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Presentation of participants
3. Information from the BALANCE Secretariat and others
4. Presentation of WP 1-5 (WP leads)
5. Food for thoughts ...
6. WP Seminars
7. Presentation of the BALANCE web site
8. Reporting and payment procedures
9. Meeting summary and future meetings
10. Any other business

Timetable

31st of August 2005

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| 10:30 – 10:40 | Opening of the Meeting (<i>Jesper Andersen, BALANCE Secretariat</i>) |
| 10:10 – 10:50 | Presentation of participants (<i>tour-de-table</i>) |
| 10:50 – 11:20 | “Setting the Scene” (<i>Johnny Reker, BALANCE Secretariat</i>) |
| 11:20 – 11:50 | Information from the Project Manager (<i>Jesper H. Andersen, BALANCE Secretariat</i>) |
| 11:50 – 12:10 | Discussion (<i>all</i>) |
|
 | |
| 12:10 – 13:00 | Lunch |
|
 | |
| 13:00 – 13:40 | WP4: Participants, strategic focus, planned results and milestones (<i>Jan Ekebom, Metsa</i>) |
| 13:40 – 14:10 | WP3: Participants, strategic focus, planned results and milestones (<i>Åsa Andersson, WWF S</i>) |
| 14:10 – 14:50 | WP2: Participants, strategic focus, planned results and milestones (<i>Jørgen Leth, GEUS</i>) |
| 14:50 – 15:20 | WP1: Participants, strategic focus, planned results and milestones (<i>Greger Lindeberg, SGU</i>) |
| 15:20 – 15:30 | WP5: Participants, strategic focus, planned results and milestones (<i>Johnny Reker, SNS</i>) |
|
 | |
| 15:30 – 16:00 | <i>Break (tea/coffee)</i> |
|
 | |
| 16:00 – 16:30 | Discussion: WP coordination and communication (<i>Johnny Reker, BALANCE Secretariat</i>) |
| 16:30 – 17:00 | Maritime Safety Umbrella Operation (<i>Johnny Reker, BALANCE Secretariat</i>) |
|
 | |
| 19:30 – ... | Dinner (Restaurant Philippe, Gråbrødre Torv 2, 1154 København K) |

1st of September 2005

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 09:00 – 09:45 | Food for thoughts (<i>Jon Davies, MESH Project Manager, Joint Nature Conservation Committee</i>) |
| 09:45 – 12:00 | WP seminars (<i>1-4, Chaired by WP Leads</i>) |
|
 | |
| 12:00 – 13:00 | Lunch |

13:00 – 13:40	Summary of discussions at WP seminars (1-4, Chaired by WP Leads)
13:40 – 14:00	Presentation of the BALANCE web site (<i>Johnny Reker, BALANCE Secretariat</i>)
14:00 – 14:15	<i>Break (tea/coffee)</i>
14:15 – 14:45	Reporting and payment procedures (<i>Jesper H. Andersen, BALANCE Secretariat</i>)
14:45 – 15:15	Meeting Summary and future meetings
15:15 – 15:30	Closing of the Meeting

Annex 3: WP4 summary

Participants: Jan Ekebom, Cecilia Lindström, Anneli Mattisson, Christiane Feucht, Jesper Andersen, Ole Vestergard, Thomas Kirk Sörensen, Jochen Lamp, Johnny Reker, Henrik Wichmann

The session was based on the presentations in the whole group earlier and the preliminary description of WP activities prepared by Ole, Thomas and Jan. The main discussions concerned the activities in the WP 4, especially in the starting phase, the choice of activities in the pilot areas and the main objectives to be met in the WP.

TOUR-DE-TABLE

In a tour de table the WP members presented their main activities in WP4:

SEPA: Cecilia will feed in material and background data from her agency. She will be in the WP only with little time capacity.

CABS: Annelie works in the Stockholm county and her main focus will be on shoreline exploitation in the Archipelago, applying GIS. From this experience she will be able to contribute with skills and data to do similar mappings for management purposes in the Area 3. She will co-operate on these issues with the new person from Metsähallitus.

WWF-D: Christiane will work with Jochen on stakeholder participation issues. The literature review will be a first activity. Best practice examples shall be screened. The set-up of a stakeholder database both in the pilot areas and for the whole BSR will be also started in the first milestone.

DIFRES: Ole and Thomas will focus work on activity 1 and facilitate that all relevant activities, experiences and outputs of WP1, WP2, WP3, 3 and WP4 will feed into the marine zoning framework. This includes guidance on marine habitat mapping, application of the 'blue corridor'-concept and habitat representativity analyses in marine zoning. In this process, Ole and Thomas will liaise closely with WP1, 2 and 3 regarding specific information requirements, as well as formulating criteria for marine management. Ole and Thomas will also assist the WP4 Coordinator in developing the overall WP4 Management Guidelines for marine zoning.

In addition, Ole and Thomas is closely involved with EU FP6 PROTECT ('MPA's as a tool for ecosystem conservation and Fisheries Management' coordinated by DIFRES, other PROTECT participants include Per Nilsson and Ulf Bergström in BALANCE WP3). They both work on the EU FP6 PROTECT ('MPA's as a tool for ecosystem conservation and Fisheries Management', other PROTECT participants include Per Nilsson and Ulf Bergström), which has a case study in the Baltic Sea with relevance for BALANCE pilot Area 2. Relevant PROTECT experiences, contacts and activities will be coordinated with BALANCE to maximise synergies, including stakeholder aspects. Also, PROTECT (jointly with the Mediterranean MPA project 'EMPAFISH') is organising a European MPA symposium 24-28 September 2007 in Murcia, Spain, which might offer opportunities for BALANCE synergies and dissemination.

METSÄHALLITUS: Jan will lead WP4 and take care of the duties concerning this. He will also contribute with some months in the activity 1 (and the reporting in WP5) along with Minna

Boström. Both will supply guidance and strategy for the WP4 and JE will also supervise personally the work of N.N. in activity 2 (management efficiency indicators).

Michael Haldin will bring in Metsas field and stakeholder experiences into the WP.

N.N is a new person which will be employed from Oct. 1st. He will focus on GIS esp. in the pilot Area 3 from the Finnish side and be a counterpart for Anneli.

EMI: Georg Martin (or someone at EMI, e.g. Jonne Kotta) will feed in data and criteria from the Area 4.

UNIVERSITY OF LATVIA: Although not present at this WP4 session, will Juris Aigars (or someone at his institute) participate in WP4 work in a similar way to EMI. This was discussed right before the meeting ended on Thursday.

The table with work-months in BALANCE WP4 was checked (JE, JL, OV Comment: "However, the contribution (workmonths) in WP5 was overlooked. The work/expenses in WP5 will be dealt in detail shortly with Johnny Reker and Jesper Andersen").

Jan, Ole and Jochen will also closely co-operate and take responsibilities for the proper development of the 3 activities and the exchange with the other WPs.

Jesper pointed out his concern that the need for socio-economic data is not sufficiently taken into account yet and that the WP should compile and use this type of data. A special attention should be given to economically related data since the cost of impacts/actions/decisions (price-Tags) will be very important. This is true and it was agreed that this aspect will be dealt with appropriately.

Jesper also pointed out that he feels that the Marine strategy, risk assessments as addressed in the Water Framework Directive and new methods for the implementation of the coming EU marine directive should play an important role for the WP4. Again, this was a good suggestion and we will take this into consideration (build it in) when planning the zoning framework and when developing tools and methods. It is very important that this is streamlined and well coordinated, since it affects all activities. Monitoring and success criteria should focus very much on tailoring tools and methods to fit the types of objectives used in e.g. EU WFD.

STUDY AREA FOR THE DRAFT ZONING PLAN

The discussion about size and exact focus in the pilot area 2 was started but needs some more discussion under the light of data availability and decision of final focus.

At the end of the session, Jan presented the excel sheet where the need for data, their use for the WP, sources and demands for the other WPs should be listed. This brainstorming could unfortunately just start and will have to be completed within the next two weeks. **See Annex 6 Summary table of data required).**

Annex 4: WP3 seminar

The WP3-seminar agreed to focus the discussion on preparing a detailed work plan for WP3 and to specify the contribution of each partner.

Blue corridors:

It was agreed that blue corridors need to be defined:

- It was proposed to come up with a list of issues that should be covered by the literature review on blue corridors, e.g. habitat forming species, species that are limited by dispersal, and to focus the literature review on these identified issues.
- It was proposed to include information on the functionality of the blue corridor concept – e.g. to find data and examples on the need for different habitats to be represented close to each other to support species (complexity of habitats).
- The meeting decided to divide the work on the literature review and assign different issues of blue corridors to different partners.
- It was decided that Per Nilsson will send a first list of such issues to all partners by the end of the week. Everyone will have the possibility to comment on the proposal during the following week (5-9th of September). Based on the comments Per and George will divide the work into different “subject areas” and make sure that all partners contribute and all relevant issues are covered.
- It was emphasised that data about currents is needed for the work on connectivity.

Representativity:

- The meeting discussed the criteria for selection of a representative network of MPAs (e.g. what should be represented?). It was agreed that:
 - it is important to consider the different bioregions.
 - biodiversity aspects should be included in the assessment on “pilot area level”, and whenever possible on “Baltic Sea level” (depending on available data).
 - the project should be in contact with the European Topic Center to get information about the existing Natura 2000 sites.
- It was proposed that the report on representativity should include a comparison between MARXAN and other methods for selection of representative MPA networks. The comparison should also motivate our choice.
- It was agreed that Åsa will send out a proposal on how to divide the work on representativity among the involved partners. The proposal will be sent out to everyone for comments and input as soon as possible after the meeting.
- It was emphasised that it is important that all partners are actively involved in the work to identify the “criteria for selecting a representative MPA-network”. This is a necessity in order to secure that

the needs from all relevant end-users are met. It is also important that all partners contribute with data needed for the analysis.

Coherence:

- The seminar discussed the need to start the work on coherence (e.g. the definition of coherence) earlier than proposed in the project application. According to the application it will start only in milestone 3 which makes it difficult to influence the data needed from WP1-2.
- It was agreed that Åsa will ask Johnny if there are any possibilities to move money/time/activities to an earlier date. If not possible an informal e-mail exchange will be organised (by Anita Mäkinen) to secure input to WP1-2.

The meeting also discussed how to combine the reports from the three different parts into one final report.

Åsa provided information about the MARXAN workshop that will be organised in Stockholm on the 15-16th of September. Experts from the Nature Conservancy (TNC) will facilitate the workshop and the relevant BALANCE-partners will be invited to participate. It was decided that Åsa will send information on where the MARXAN-software can be downloaded to all involved partners. The focus of the workshop is to develop the methodology for selection of a representative MPA-network including criteria for site selection and to identify needed data.

Attached is a draft list of data needed from other WPs. This list needs to be further developed.

Data needed from WP1 & WP2

	Entire Baltic	Pilot areas
Salinity	x	x
Depth	x	x
Sediment	(x)	x
Currents	x	x
Exposure	x	x
Ice coverage	x	x
(Temperature?)	x	x
Flora		x
Fauna		x
Essential habitats (e.g. for fish)	(x)	x
Other characters	?	x
Marine landscapes	x	x
EUNIS habitats	x	x
Natura 2000 habitats	(x)	x

Data needed from WP4

Socioeconomic data	(x)	x
--------------------	-----	---

Annex 5: Minutes from WP1 seminar at BALANCE Kick-off meeting 2005-09-01

Chair: Greger Lindeberg greger.lindeberg@sgu.se
 Göran Sundblad goran.sundblad@fiskeriverket.se
 Ulla Alanen ulla.alanen@gtk.fi
 Jörgen Jörgensen JTJ@geus.dk
 Madeleine Nyman madeleinenyman@ymparisto.fi
 Anne-Marie Rolev amr@dfu.min.dk

Decision on using ESRI standard formats for raster and vector data and the datum WGS84. There will be a continued discussion to decide on which projection to use. The alternatives are UTM and/or Lamberts equal area.

In October there will be a meeting at SGU where a prototype for the BALANCE internet portal will be presented and tested. Date will be set later.

Greger L will in collaboration with the Balance secretariat produce a common legal document regarding request for access to data sets to the portal from all partners.

Greger L will send an email on data hosting capabilities and what kind of GIS-software partners use.

Discussion on metadata; The ESRI standard mandatory fields will be used plus possibly some Balance specific fields. Inputs from the MESH project will be used in deciding possible extra fields.

In WP1 there will, for a start, be 3 workgroups – Biological, Oceanographic and Geological. Greger L will send a request to all partners to deliver names of participants in each workgroup. These workgroups should produce a template, using a draft from Greger L, for data requirement needs and the template will be sent out to the other WPs. Also draft guidelines for data harmonization should be produced in these workgroups. They should then be compiled by the end of milestone 1. Further draft guidelines for sampling will be done in these workgroups.

There was also a discussion on the Nordgis programme. More information is available from Grete Dinesen SNS and will be looked into by Greger L.

Also Neil Golding, JNCC, from the MESH project could have input on possible obstacles in the mapping, collating and modelling work we have in front of us.

There was a suggestion that the portal should contain a request form for additional data so that data not yet uploaded can be “searched”. This requires that all partners regularly visit the portal to see if they have any of the requested data.

We need to decide on data exchange – how will it be done?

We might need a template/guideline showing how to produce .mxd-files.

Regarding case study delineation, input is needed and should come from WP2.

Annex 6: WP4 MAPPING REQUIREMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF ZONING PLANS and MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

DATA NEEDS RELEVANT TO MANAGEMENT, SOCIO-ECONOMICS, ZONING etc.							
Borders of existing/planned protected areas (Natura 2000 etc.)	Reserves with marine components, Natura 2000 sites, BSPA etc., including seal sanctuaries.	Not yet defined					
Borders of military areas and type of use	Closed areas, ammunitions dumps, etc.	Not yet defined					
Borders of areas with other forms of restricted use	For instance safety zones surrounding windfarms, cables, etc.	Not yet defined					
Ship-lanes and boat-lanes	Identifying areas with potential disturbance by traffic	Not yet defined					
Harbours, marinas, piers and jetties	Identifying the positions for shoreline use	Not yet defined					
Shoreline buildings, including detailed attribute data	Identifying the positions for shoreline use	Not yet defined					
Categorised data on local enterprises (companies) including attribute data (please contact WP4 for details)		Not yet defined					
Demographic data (please contact WP4 for details)	By analysing georeferenced population abundance & structure data can several pressure indicators be defined, related to urban & settlement sprawl	Not yet defined					
Abundance of leisure boats	Identifying areas with potential disturbance by traffic	Not yet defined					
Communication network data	Identifying areas with potential locations for companies using IT	Not yet defined					
Fishing grounds INCL. real trawl lines where possible.	Mapped for zoning purposes.	Not yet defined					
Designated areas for standing fishing gear		Not yet defined					
Designated areas for mariculture (fishfarms, mussel-cultivation)		Not yet defined					
AIS / VMS data with area/temporal distribution	identify ship traffic and rarely frequented zones Identifying areas with potential disturbance by traffic	Not yet defined					
Sand & Gravel extraction		Not yet defined					
Existing AND PLANNED Oil and gas pipelines		Not yet defined					
Seabed uses and plans (cables, dredging, dumping, drilling/exploration licences)	Identify threats and status quo	Not yet defined					

existing and proposed windfarm sites	zoning, use of data from EIAs	Not yet defined						
Research activities	Data collection and further development of database	Not yet defined						
Areas prone and/or sensitive to oil spills		Not yet defined						
Existing management regulations		Not yet defined						
Pollution sources (major industry, sewage etc.)		Not yet defined						
SUGGESTED WP2 & WP3 DATA NEEDS FOR MAPPING	These are but suggestions that have come up during several WP4 discussions to be used as supplemental or inspirational purposes. See among others also: Day & Roff 2000. Planning for representative mpas: a framework for Canadas oceans. WWF report. AND Roff, Taylor & Laughren 2003. Geophysical approaches to the classification, delineation and monitoring of marine habitats and their communities. Aquatic Coserv.: Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst. 13: 77-90.							
Data must indicate relevant information on original data sources/producer, year of production, data used for generating the data (where appropriate), etc.(to be defined)								
Data requests must include all relevant attribute data that normally support the GIS data (to be defined)								
TYPE OF DATA	WHAT IS IT USED FOR?	AREA?						
BASIC DATA SETS	MAPS							
Shoreline data (>1:25000 vector)	Basic data, includes islands and mainland - linking other data sources	Not yet defined						
Bathymetric data (>1:25000 vector data)	Basic data - linking other data sources	Not yet defined						
Topographic data (vector elevation curves or DEM)	Basic data, make it possible to identify habitats	Not yet defined						
nautical charts (1:30.000)	Most traffic, rock structures and lots of info are included	Not yet defined						
ABIOTIC DATA								
Bottom substrate (sediment type)	Regional and area specific maps of bottom substrate with categories developed by wp1 and 2.	Not yet defined						
Substrate particle size (if hard bottom)	Perhaps only possible for pilot areas. However, this data is important for extrapolating benthic community info.	Not yet defined						
types of landscapes/areas with similar conservation/management characteristics	identifying and grouping specific management approaches.	Not yet defined						
Boulders (point data)	Maps	Not yet defined						

Boulder shores (vector data)	Maps	Not yet defined				
Sandy shores (vector data)	Maps	Not yet defined				
Cliffs, etc. (vector data)	Cliffs as one of many habitat categories within maps. Other categories identified and developed as WP1 & 2 go along.	Not yet defined				
Submerged or partly submerged rocks	Maps	Not yet defined				
Temperature (incl. gradients, etc.)	Average temperatures at selected depths. Temperature is positively related to growth. In the pelagic realm temperatures often dictate what occurs. In benthic or demersal realms temperatures often contribute to what occurs.	Not yet defined				
Upwellings	If possible, but probably difficult. Upwellings important for production, mixing etc.	Not yet defined				
P, N, heavy metals, Toxics concentrations	identification of frequent anoxic zones / zoning	Not yet defined				
waves, currents, water inflows, tidal amplitudes	blue corridors, area planning of living resources	Not yet defined				
Stratification, mixing and nutrients	Important for biological communities, recruitment, larval dispersal, production etc..	Not yet defined				
Light penetration and turbidity	Important for biological communities, recruitment, larval dispersal, production etc..	Not yet defined				
Oxygen content (sediment & water column)	Very Important parameter for biological communities	Not yet defined				
Salinity data	Averages of salinity at selected depths, Important factor in estuarine areas.	Not yet defined				
Ice cover data	On a broad scale ice cover influences marine productivity.	Not yet defined				
Shipwrecks	Potential fish "hotspots"	Not yet defined				
erosion/sedimentation, land-upheaval-areas	forecast of coming processes for management/zonng	Not yet defined				
		Not yet defined				
BIOTIC DATA		Not yet defined				
Spatial use	The distribution of key organisms such as commercial fish species, including the ways in which they use different areas at different times in their life cycles.	Not yet defined				
Life-history patterns	Difficult to capture in a data set!! Spatial use is better if we mean the spatial use of e.g. cod or other organisms.	Not yet defined				
Recruitment mechanisms	Difficult to capture in a data set unless we ask for specific species data for species. Here, commercial fish species will be important and data exists for many.	Not yet defined				

Faunal larval dispersal	Difficult to capture in a data set unless we ask for specific species data for species. Here, commercial fish species will be important and data exists for many. However, as pointed out by J Hansen (NERI), this is important also to identify sources and sinks for fauna (and flora).	Not yet defined				
Predation	These parameters may be very difficult to define and provide in a form that will be useful to WP4.	Not yet defined				
Competition	These parameters may be very difficult to define and provide in a form that will be useful to WP4.	Not yet defined				
Migrant species	Important for fisheries management aspects in MPA establishment (e.g. cod) as well as marine mammals.	Not yet defined				
Seasonal cycles		Not yet defined				
Nutrients and food		Not yet defined				
Spawning areas for fish (species specific, preferably)	Identification of areas of high importance for the biodiversity	Not yet defined				
Nursery areas for fish (species specific, preferably)	Identification of areas of high importance for the biodiversity	Not yet defined				
Marine habitat data (with defined classification system)	Identification of areas of high importance for the biodiversity	Not yet defined				
Marine landscape data (with defined classification system)	Identification of areas of high importance for the biodiversity	Not yet defined				
Biological communities	If certain specific biological communities are defined in groups for BALANCE purposes we may assume (?) that we will have these mapped.	Not yet defined				
Marine sessile plant data (algae, vascular plants)	Identification of important species (keystone species)	Not yet defined				
Marine sessile animal data / benthos	Identification of important species (keystone species)	Not yet defined				
Genetically specific data on plants and animals (if exists)	Identification of "rare" populations	Not yet defined				
non commercial fish like e.g. gobies,...	identify important areas in the food-chain	Not yet defined				
areas with expanding alien species	identifying disturbed areas - management demands	Not yet defined				
harbour porpoise distribution / marine mammals	Identification of areas of high importance for the biodiversity	Not yet defined				
wintering , migrating and breeding areas for selected birds	Identification of areas of high importance for the biodiversity	Not yet defined				
DATASETS PRODUCED BY BALANCE THROUGH ANALYSIS OF DATA						

Topographically distinct areas that may suffer of anoxia		Not yet defined				
Topographically distinct areas with accumulated sediments		Not yet defined				
Topographically distinct areas of erosion		Not yet defined				
Areas of potential disturbance by ships and boats (analytical study performed jointly by WP1, WP2 and WP4)		Not yet defined				
Wave exposure data (M. Isaeus data?)		Not yet defined				
areas of high importance for specific species		Not yet defined				