



**UNITED  
NATIONS**

**EP**

UNEP/MED WG.471/6



**UNITED NATIONS  
ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME  
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**

27 May 2019  
Original: English

---

**PAP/RAC Meeting of the Ecosystem Approach Correspondence Group on Monitoring (CORMON) on  
Coast and Hydrography**

Rome, Italy, 21-22 May 2019

**Report of the meeting**

For environmental and economic reasons, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not request additional copies.

---

UNEP/MAP  
Athens, 2019



## **Table of contents**

### **Report of the meeting**

#### **Annexes**

**Annex I** List of participants

**Annex II** Meeting timetable

**Annex III** Short questionnaire on progress with regards to implementation of IMAP for coast and hydrography indicators

**Annex IV** Conclusions and recommendations

## **Report of the meeting**

### **Introduction**

1. The PAP/RAC Meeting of the Ecosystem Approach Correspondence Group on Monitoring (CORMON) on Coast and Hydrography was held on 21 and 22 May 2019 in Rome, Italy (ISPRA premises) with the kind collaboration of the INFO/RAC. Its main objectives were to (i) discuss and agree on amendments related to indicator guidance factsheets for the EO7 and EO8 common indicators (CI 15 and CI16), as well as EO8 candidate indicator (CCI25); (ii) discuss and provide guidance on data standards and data dictionaries for IMAP Common Indicators related to coast and hydrography; (iii) exchange information on the status of implementation of the Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme (IMAP) at national level with regard to EO7 and EO8, and address the challenges identified; and (iv) discuss and provide guidance on cross-cutting issues of regional importance for the Coast and Hydrography Cluster of IMAP implementation.

### **Attendance**

2. The meeting was attended by participants from 15 Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Egypt, France, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Libya, Malta, Montenegro, Slovenia, Spain, Tunisia and Turkey.
3. The following components of the Mediterranean Action Plan (UNEP/MAP) were present at the meeting: the Priority Actions Programme Regional Activity Centre (PAP/RAC) as organiser, Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC), Information and Communication Regional Activity Centre (INFO/RAC), UN Environment MEDPOL, and the EcAp MED II project coordinator.
4. The list of participants is attached as Annex I to this report.

### **Opening of the Meeting and Organizational Matters (Agenda Item 1)**

5. The meeting was opened at 9:30 a.m. on 21 May 2019 by Mr. Marko Prem, PAP/RAC Deputy Director, who welcomed the participants and introduced the background and objectives of the meeting.

### *Rules of Procedure*

6. The meeting agreed that the rules of procedure for meetings and conferences of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention (UNEP/IG 43/6, annex XI), as amended by the Contracting Parties (UNEP(OCA)/MED IG.1/5 and UNEP(OCA)/MED IG.3/5), would apply *mutatis mutandis* to their deliberations.

*Election of Officers*

7. In accordance with the Rule 20 of the rules of procedure, the meeting unanimously elected the following Officers:

Chair: Ms. Alexia Vella (Malta)  
Vice-chairs: Ms. Tutku Gökcalp (Turkey)  
Mr. Gabriel Jordà Sánchez (Spain)  
Rapporteur: Ms. Željka Čurović (Montenegro)

*Adoption of the Agenda*

8. The meeting reviewed and adopted the provisional agenda and its timetable set out in UNEP/MED WG.471/1 and UNEP/MED WG.471/2, noting that simultaneous translation in English and French was provided during the Meeting. The final adopted timetable is presented in Annex II to this report.

**EO7 Hydrography Common Indicator 15 “*Location and extent of the habitats impacted directly by hydrographic alterations*” (Agenda item 2)**

9. Mr. Atef Ouerghi (SPA/RAC) presented the Reference list of benthic habitats that has to be taken into account when monitoring impacts of hydrographic alterations, in order to be harmonised with the habitats that are monitored under EO1, as well as the consultation process with the SPA/RAC FPs and CORMON on Biodiversity that elaborated the list. The meeting took note of the Reference list of habitats relevant for EO7. Some minor adjustments will be provided by SPA/RAC and will be communicated to PAP/RAC.
10. Mr. Alessandro Lotti (INFO/RAC) presented the final draft of the Data Standards for the Common Indicator 15 and the Meeting took note of its contents.
11. Mr. Olivier Brivois (representative of France, and PAP/RAC consultant during the EcAp MED II Project) presented the simplified version of the indicator guidance factsheet for Common Indicator 15. The preparation of such a factsheet was asked by several CPs on several occasions (such as at the PAP/RAC FPs meeting, at Sub-regional meeting on Coast and Hydrography in December 2017, in comments on QSR assessment factsheets and in particular at 6<sup>th</sup> EcAp Coordination Group meeting in September 2017), since these CPs believe that this indicator is too complex and not mature enough/feasible to be implemented. For that reason PAP/RAC has prepared the draft ‘alternative’ indicator guidance factsheet in collaboration with Mr. Brivois.
12. The meeting expressed strong concerns related to the implementation of the CI15 due to its complexity, needing considerable financial and human capacities, as well as facing scientific gaps. The meeting endorsed the alternative version of the guidance fact sheet and as presented in the Working document that will allow for step-by-step approach to its implementation.

13. The Meeting therefore proposed to the EcAp Coordination Group to replace the current Guidance Fact sheet with the alternative one for the CI15 with the following title: „Location and extent of the habitats potentially impacted by hydrographic alterations” so as to reflect the precautionary principle and risk assessment approach. European Countries are obliged to monitor this indicator within the Descriptor 7 when implementing the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, so the experiences from these countries could be taken into account once (other) countries are ready to implement this indicator
14. The Common Indicator 15 should be based on the assessment of physical loss including the footprint of the structures, permanent changes of seafloor and, in addition, permanent hydrographic changes of the surrounding area with a view to determining areas of potentially impacted habitats. The physical loss can “offer” a first-level information, since it is more straight-forward. Consequently, the related DS and DD will be adjusted.
15. During further discussion it was stressed by the participants that certain details of obtaining the data could still be discussed: resolution of models, also temporal resolution, i.e. frequency (for example, for velocity the frequency could be higher). Extreme events could also be considered.
16. Many countries also monitor parameters relevant for this indicator as part of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) but this is done on a case-to-case basis. The EIAs are often carried out by private companies, and there can be questions by public regarding the quality of performance of those companies. The level of control by the public institutions needs to be transparent, with potential protocols that need to be agreed on. For that matter, the Barcelona Convention can be a guiding platform for international agreement on minimal requirements on how to perform the EIA in this case.
17. The problem of assessing the impact of hydrographic changes on habitats was also raised. It is particularly challenging to determine what exactly is considered as “change” – if we do not consider the impact on habitats but only the intersection, then for some infrastructures the EIA will not be carried out properly.
18. At the first glance it may seem that some parameters such as temperature and salinity have been omitted in the fact-sheet, but actually these parameters are very structure-related. For that reason, when assessing the impact of structures, a type of structure needs to be carefully taken into account and consequently define the parameters to be monitored.
19. As for the Reference list of benthic habitats, the participants wanted to know its relevance for the alternative factsheet on Hydrography. PAP/RAC explained that the list of habitats was relevant for both, the adopted factsheet and the alternative one. SPA/RAC added that the list included all habitats – it is up to countries to take from the list what is relevant to their country. There was a question on the locations/extent of certain habitats at the Mediterranean level. SPA/RAC answered that most countries had information mostly on coralligenous habitats and *Posidonia* meadows.
20. During the discussion it was pointed out by the participants that certain details of obtaining the data can still be discussed, such as the resolution of models, also temporal resolution, i.e. frequency (for example, for velocity the frequency could be higher). Extreme events could also be considered
21. The Copernicus model was mentioned as a combination of in-situ modelling and satellite verification. Some participants said that the Copernicus worked well on a large-scale; however, its operability when considering the impact of structures was

questioned. We can focus on data being compatible with the Copernicus format, not necessarily to be “nested” in the Copernicus.

**EO8 Coastal ecosystems and landscapes Common Indicator 16 “Length of coastline subject to physical disturbance due to the influence of manmade structures” (Agenda item 3)**

22. Mr. Prem presented the proposed amendments to the indicator guidance factsheet for Common Indicator 16.
23. The first amendment was related to the determination of the Good Environmental Status (GES) for this indicator. It is not possible to establish a unique target and GES for all countries due to strong socio-economic, historic and cultural dimensions, in addition to specific geomorphological and geographical conditions. Additional criteria should be taken into account for the definition of the GES, targets, measures and interpretation of results (especially where the trends are high). These elements should be defined by the countries themselves, taking the legal obligations of the Barcelona Convention into account, in particular the ICZM Protocol.
24. The second amendment was the removal of *impervious surface in the coastal fringe (100m from the coastline)* from the list of criteria for calculation of the CI16.
25. The final amendment was to replace the term ‘manmade structures’ with the term ‘human made structures’ to respect the gender-neutral terminology.
26. The countries agreed on all proposed amendments and further highlighted two important issues. First one was the proposal to remove the *land claim, i.e. the surface area reclaimed from the 1980’s onward (ha)* from the list of criteria for the calculation of this indicator for several reasons (e.g. some countries did not have reference images from the 1980s, tombolos can be land-reclaimed structures but are not necessarily artificial, etc.). Most importantly, the removal of “land claim” would not change the final outcome, i.e. the length/percent of artificialized coastline, and will at the same time facilitate the calculation of the indicator. The second was related to the erosion. Erosion exists as an indicator still to be developed (not yet as a candidate common indicator) but the countries feel that the CPs should report on it, especially those in which erosion represents serious problem.

**EO8 Coastal ecosystems and landscapes Candidate Common Indicator 25: “Land-use change” (Agenda item 4)**

27. Mr. Prem presented the proposed amendments related to the Candidate Common Indicator 25. He highlighted that at several meetings (such as the CORMON 2017 in Madrid, PAP/RAC NFPs meetings 2015 and 2017) CPs concluded that the Land-use change indicator was a very useful and appropriate tool to detect changes in coastal areas. Thus, it would bring more objectivity into reporting on the state and evolution of their coastal zones (as requested by the ICZM Protocol), i.e. *Land-use change* indicator should be discussed here to be promoted as a common indicator.
28. With regard to *setting the GES* (threshold values) and interpretation of the results it is necessary to build-in flexibility to reflect the countries’ local socio-economic, historic and cultural specificities in addition to the specific geomorphological and geographical conditions for the management purposes.
29. Other important amendments are related to a possible change of the indicator title to *Land cover change*, and the potential addition of a layer on protected areas.

30. The countries welcomed the proposal to promote the Land-use change indicator to a common indicator. Also, the *Land cover change* title was welcomed as a more appropriate since “land use” is more of a planning category. *The terminology* in the factsheet should follow this change as well, after the new term has been officially adopted. The “*protected area*” layer was also welcomed by the countries as it would show a more direct link to the ecosystem approach. It would include all types of protection (e.g. Natura 2000 sites, IUCN or national-specific categories with the objectives to protect biodiversity, habitats, species, landscapes and alike in the coastal zone), and would ideally contain the information on the level of protection, but it is up to each country to decide whether to provide this information.
31. Mr. Ivan Sekovski (PAP/RAC) presented the “Evolution of built-up area in coastal zones of Mediterranean countries between 1975 and 2015” report. This report was prepared for the purpose of assessing and testing the Candidate Common Indicator 25 at the Mediterranean level. This assessment, carried out by UNEP GRID in collaboration with PAP/RAC, provides a good insight in the evolution of built-up areas in coastal zones, since urbanization, or land-take, is the most dramatic change of coastal zones given the (almost) irreversibility of the process.
32. One CP commented that the classification of categories needed to be very clear. For example, the term “built-up” (also land take) may vary between experts – some can consider open paved spaces as built-up, some consider only residential infrastructure, etc. For that reason we should have very precise definitions.

#### **Status of the implementation of IMAP for coast and hydrography at national level (Agenda item 5)**

33. Representatives of several Contracting Parties presented the progress in the implementation of IMAP with regard to the Coast and Hydrography indicators in their respective countries. During the meeting a short questionnaire on progress with regard to implementation of IMAP for coast and hydrography indicators was distributed to the participants. The questionnaire is attached as Annex III to this report.
34. **Italy** is implementing the Common Indicator 15 in coherence with Descriptor 7 of the MSFD. The focus is on the planned structures from 2012 that are subject to national Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Some specific areas such as new Port of Fumicino and the Re-gasification and distribution LNG terminal in the Port of Monfalcone were in the focus of the 2012-2018 implementation. The hydrographic modelling was combined with in-situ monitoring data (temperature, salinity, nutrients, turbidity, currents, river flow, sediment deposition, etc.). For the 2018-2024 there is an ongoing inclusion of new structures covering all three sub-regions surrounding Italy: Adriatic Sea, Western Mediterranean Sea and the Ionian-Central Mediterranean Sea.
35. The Common Indicator 16 was implemented for the whole country with the identification of human-made structures by aerial photographs for the 2006-2012 period (reference coastline: 2006). The analysis shows slight increase of the human-made structures for the whole country (+0.36%) with considerable differences between continental Italy (+0.51%) and for example Sardinia (+0.06%).
36. The presentation of **Croatia** was more focused on Common Indicator 16 and land take, than on Common Indicator 15, due to different institutions in jurisdiction of implementation of these indicators. In Croatia the spatial layers of the building areas within and outside settlements are published within the Physical Planning Information



System (PPIS) as the result of processing the data from spatial plans. There is a publicly available geo-portal and all spatial plans are available there. The overlapping of the layers of building areas from PPIS with the High Resolution Layer Imperviousness (built-up areas) in the 2011 State Geodetic Administration background map showed some differences. In other words, the main issue of implementing the CI16 and CCI25 could be the difference between cadastral parcels referring to spatial plans, and the actual built-up areas. There can be a significant distinction between the orthophoto and cadastre, especially when it comes to slope areas.

37. **Israel** developed the National IMAP for Coast and Hydrography in 2017 within the frame of the EcAp MED II Project. Israel highlighted that regarding the CI15 the extent and spectrum of all possible "hydrographic alterations" on the one hand and the "habitats impacted" on the other make it impractical to try and have a solid indicator to follow and monitor. This was demonstrated by presenting the case of desalination Hadera plant. It concerns one parameter - salinity, which is well defined and easy to measure at any depth, but the "Direct impact" on habitats is impractical to measure as opposed to "subjected". The CI16 on the other hand is very straightforward with some issues to resolve: the "land reclamation" layer and the inclusion of erosion. However, there are annual orthophotos of high-resolution available which should facilitate the implementation of this indicator. For CCI25 there were some uncertainties how to refer to "agriculture", i.e. do constructions related to agriculture count as "Agriculture" or "Built-up"?
38. In **Spain**, the "Physical loss" (due to permanent change of seabed substrate or morphology and to extraction of seabed substrate), a pressure relevant for CI15 has been analysed in the context of the MSFD. The exact modality of how to model the baseline and altered hydrographical conditions is still under discussion. As for the habitats relevant for CI15, Spain is currently developing a seabed habitat map, comprised of special habitats included in Regional Conventions and predominant habitats (EUNIS 3 equivalent). Overlapping the hydrographical alterations map with the habitat map is ready, but there are issues to consider: overlapping of these maps will give information about "potentially impacted areas", and not on the actual impacts. As for the CI16, in Spain the implementation of this indicator is under development.
39. In **France** the CI15 is assessed, not exactly as proposed in the factsheet, but hydrographical changes induced by existing structures are included in the assessment of Criteria 1 of the MSFD's Descriptor 7 (D7C1), and their impacts on benthic habitats are included in the Descriptor's 7 Criteria 2 (D7C2). The CI16 is assessed for the coastal water bodies within the frame of Water Framework Directive (WFD) using the MEDAM (Mediterranean French Coast: Inventory of the constructions reclaimed from the sea) database.
40. **Turkey** presented the Integrated Coastal zone Plan of Turkey, a strategic plan prepared with an integrated approach to all development/zoning plan decisions and guiding spatial plans by providing inputs for spatial strategy plans and territorial development plans. From the land side there are data on coastal structures, transport connections, urbanization, administrative borders and land-use, while at the sea side there are data, among others, on biodiversity, ecological aspects, special status areas, oceanographic and bathymetric measurements. These datasets are used to estimate the coastal structures suitability at resolution of 500m.
41. **Malta** is monitoring the aspects of CI15 through the Environmental Assessment Procedures and the LIFE River Basin Management Plan (RBMP). As for the CI16, there are already calculated artificial coastlines for 1994 and 2004 as part of the

DEDUCE Project. For 2012 there is a possibility to calculate the artificialized coastline as well as for 2016, but with some difficulties (there are discrepancies between the base map and the ortho-photos). Malta is working on a new base map which is expected to improve calculations for the length of artificial coastline.

42. In **Montenegro** there are few sources of data relevant for CIs 15 and 16 such as Coastal Zone Management Programme (CAMP) Montenegro (2011-2014) - implemented in parallel with the development of the Spatial Plan for the Coastal Area of Montenegro; and the project “Defining the methodological framework for marine spatial planning in the Boka Kotorska Bay” (2015-2017). The basis for the Montenegrin monitoring programme based on CI 16 was established within the activities of the CAMP Montenegro (it does not fully resemble the implementation of CI16, since it pre-dates IMAP implementation, although the methodology for delineating built-up coastline is quite similar to IMAP’s monitoring guidelines). In Montenegro, the assessment of 2013 showed around 32% of built-up coastline at the national level with notable differences between coastal municipalities (e.g. 11.6% in Ulcinj County and 40.4% in the Tivat County). The GEF Adriatic Project will further support the establishing of the national monitoring programmes for CI 15 and CI 16 in Montenegro. The first drafts of these have already been prepared. There is an ongoing work for the establishment of systematic monitoring, along with the provision of sustainable financing and trained staff. Only a fully-functional inter-sectoral cooperation will ensure good implementation of a national monitoring program based on CIs 15 and 16. Capacities need to be strengthened at administrative, technical and institutional levels (training and capacity building of national experts).
43. In **Slovenia** the hydrographic data relevant for the CI 15 are being collected. The habitat mapping was done last year. Some uncertainties regarding the implementation of CI15 are present, e.g. what threshold of change in hydrographical conditions (for example, change in the velocity of the currents) can be considered as having significant impact. The CI16 has not yet been implemented in Slovenia. However, there were some similar studies on the calculation of the Coastal Changes Index (MISO-M index) for the purpose of the development of the Water Management Plan for the Danube and Adriatic waters for the period 2015 – 2021.

#### **Cross-Cutting issues and common challenges (Agenda Item 6)**

44. Ms Jelena Knežević (UN Environment MEDPOL) presented the inter-linkages among activities/pressure/impacts and integration and aggregation among different relevant Ecological Objectives towards integrated marine and coastal assessments. She presented also the main process and the milestones of the roadmap to Quality Status Report (QSR2023). In addition, different approaches to ensure the better interaction of pressures, impacts and state in assessing GES, such as GRID table, Risk-Based Approach, NEAT approach, were presented. The matrix of interactions between EcAp EOs and elements of the ICZM Protocol was also presented. The proposed matrix is based on the principle of ecosystem-based management to reach GES, as well as on the principles of integration and cumulative impact. The matrix consists of cross-check elements of the ICZM Protocol with the EOs organised in four clusters: 1. Biodiversity, 2. Fisheries, 3. Coast and Hydrography, 4. Pollution and Litter. The matrix should be directly utilized as an assessment tool supporting decision-making mechanisms at different levels (regional, sub-regional, national, sub-national). The identification of the spatial and temporal (short, medium and long-term) scales is

therefore an essential initial step of the overall analysis, including the elaboration of the matrix of interactions.

**Conclusions and recommendations of the meeting (Agenda Item 7)**

45. Following presentations and discussions of all agenda items, the Meeting agreed on the conclusions and recommendations as given in Annex IV to this report.

**Closure of the meeting (Agenda Item 8)**

46. The Chairperson closed the Meeting at 16:00 on Wednesday, 22 May 2019.

### Annex I List of participants

<b>ALBANIA</b>	<b>Mr Perparim Mancellari</b>  Inspector in the Natural Resources Sector, Directorate of Environmental Inspectorate, State Inspectorate of Environment, Forestry, Water and Tourism, Ministry of Tourism and Environment, Albania
<b>BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA</b>	<b>Ms Bojana Nedić</b>  Researcher at Hydro-Engineering Institute, Sarajevo
<b>CROATIA</b>	<b>Ms Vesna Marohnić Kuzmanović</b>  Researcher at Ministry of Construction and Physical Planning of Croatia  <b>Ms Sanja Šaban</b>  Assistant of the Minister at Ministry of Construction and Physical Planning of Croatia
<b>EGYPT</b>	<b>Mr Ahmed Kassem Sheta</b>  Head of Coastal Areas Central Department Egypt
<b>FRANCE</b>	<b>Mr Olivier Brivois</b>  Researcher at the BRGM (French Geological Survey)
<b>ISRAEL</b>	<b>Ms Maayan Haim</b>  Coastal Environment Engineer, Marine Environment Protection Division Israel Ministry of Environmental Protection
<b>ITALY</b>	<b>Mr Giordano Giorgi</b>  Researcher at the Italian Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (ISPRA)

<b>LEBANON</b>	<b>Mr Bassem Ali</b> Researcher at the Ministry of Environment, Lebanon
<b>LIBYA</b>	<b>Mr Almunji Al-Samh</b> Director of the Environmental Impact Assessment Office, Environment General Authority
<b>MALTA</b>	<b>Ms Alexia Vella</b> Assistant Planning Officer, Planning Authority, Floriana, Malta
<b>MONTENEGRO</b>	<b>Ms Željka Ćurović</b> Department for Spatial Planning, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism, Podgorica, Montenegro
<b>SLOVENIA</b>	<b>Ms Helena Caserman</b> Researcher at the Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenia
<b>SPAIN</b>	<b>Mr Gabriel Jorda Sanchez</b> Spanish Institute of Oceanography, Oceanographic Centre of Balearic Islands.
<b>TUNISIA</b>	<b>Mr Bassem Sghir</b> International Cooperation Officer of the Protection Agency and Coastal Planning
<b>TURKEY</b>	<b>Ms Tutku Gökcalp</b> Urban Planner, General Directorate of Spatial Planning Turkey Ministry of Environment and Urbanization

**SECRETARIAT TO THE BARCELONA CONVENTION  
AND COMPONENTS OF THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**

<b>UN ENVIRONMENT MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN (MAP)</b>	<b>Ms Julie Ann Auerbach</b> Ecosystem Approach Project Manager
<b>REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTER FOR THE PRIORITY ACTIONS PROGRAMME (PAP/RAC)</b>	<b>Mr Marko Prem</b> Deputy Director  <b>Mr Ivan Sekovski</b> Project Officer  <b>Ms Dina Šilović</b> Admin/Fund officer
<b>REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTER FOR SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS (SPA/RAC)</b>	<b>Mr. Atef Ouerghi</b> Ecosystems Conservation Programme officer
<b>UN ENVIRONMENT MEDPOL</b>	<b>Ms Jelena Knežević</b> Programme Officer
<b>INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE (INFO/RAC)</b>	<b>Mr Alessandro Lotti</b> Project Officer  <b>Mr Arthur Pasquale</b> Coordinator/Senior Officer

**Annex II Meeting timetable**

<b>Tuesday, 21 May 2019</b>		Relevant documents
9.00 – 9.30	Registration of participants	
9.30 – 10.00	<b>Agenda item 1 Opening of the Meeting and Organizational Matters</b>	UNEP/MED WG.471/1 UNEP/MED WG. 471/2 UNEP/MED WG. 471/Inf.1 UNEP/MED WG. 471/Inf.2
10.00 – 11.30	<b>Agenda item 2 EO7 Hydrography Common Indicator 15 “<i>Location and extent of the habitats impacted directly by hydrographic alterations</i>” 2.1 and 2.2</b>	UNEP/MED WG.471/3
11.50 – 13.30	<b>Common Indicator 15 “<i>Location and extent of the habitats impacted directly by hydrographic alterations</i>” 2.3 and 2.4</b>	UNEP/MED WG.471/3
14.45 – 16.00	<b>Agenda item 3 EO8 Coastal ecosystems and landscapes Common Indicator 16 “<i>Length of coastline subject to physical disturbance due to the influence of manmade structures</i>”</b>	UNEP/MED WG.471/4
16.20 - 17.30	<b>Agenda item 4 Candidate Common Indicator 25: “<i>Land-use change</i>”</b>	UNEP/MED WG. 471/5 UNEP/MED WG.471/Inf.3
<b>Wednesday, 22 May 2019</b>		
9.30 – 11.30	<b>Agenda item 5 Status of implementation of the IMAP for coast and hydrography at national level</b>	
11.50 – 13.30	<b>Agenda item 6 Cross-Cutting issues and common challenges</b>	UNEP/MED WG. 471/Inf.4 UNEP/MED WG. 471/Inf.5 UNEP/MED WG. 471/Inf.6
14.45 – 16.30	<b>Agenda item 7 Conclusions and recommendations of the meeting</b>	
16.30	<b>Agenda item 8 Closure of the meeting</b>	

**Annex III Short questionnaire on progress with regards to implementation of IMAP for coast and hydrography indicators**



### Short questionnaire on progress with regard to implementation of IMAP for coast and hydrography indicators

Indicator	CI15 Location and extend of the habitats impacted directly by hydrographic alterations	CI16 Length of coastline subject to physical disturbance due to the influence of manmade structures	CCI25 Land use change
Country	Is indicator included in the national IMAP? Yes/No	Are there examples of monitoring available? Yes/No If No, indicate when expected	Is info on land use available? Yes/No
Albania	No	Yes	No
Bosnia and Herzegovina			
Croatia			
Egypt			
France	Partially in MSFD, Df NO	Yes in the Ground Monitoring Program partially	Yes NO - SOON
Israel			
Italy			
Lebanon	NO	-	-
Libya	NOT implemented	NO	-
Malta		Not implemented	-
Montenegro	<del>NO</del> YES	NO N/A	NO N/A
Slovenia	Partially	Partially	YES
Spain	Partially in MSFD, Df	YES, in EIA	<del>NO</del> YES
Tunisia	No	No	No
Turkey	NO	NO	In Progress
			In Progress
			Partially (Yes)

#### Annex IV Conclusions and Recommendations

- I. The Meeting welcomed the coordination between the EO1 and EO7 in order to harmonise the Reference list of habitats to be monitored under CI15 (EO7) and took note of the proposed draft Reference list of habitats previously agreed also by the CORMON on Biodiversity. The latest amendments will be inserted accordingly.
- II. The Meeting reviewed the proposed Data Standards (DS) and Data Dictionaries (DD) for CI15 based on the Guidance Factsheet adopted by COP 19 (February 2016, Athens; Decision IG. 22/7) and took note of its contents.
- III. The meeting expressed strong concerns related to the implementation of the CI15 due to its complexity, needing considerable financial and human capacities, as well as facing scientific gaps. Following several requests by the CPs, already expressed at some previous meetings, PAP/RAC has developed a simplified version of the Guidance factsheet and the Meeting endorsed the alternative version as presented in the Working document that will allow for step-by-step approach to its implementation.
- IV. Reconfirming the importance of this indicator and recognising the difficulties in its implementation, the Meeting proposes to the EcAp Coordination Group to replace the current Guidance Factsheet with the alternative one for the CI15 with the following title: „Location and extent of the habitats potentially impacted by hydrographic alterations” so as to reflect the precautionary principle and risk assessment approach. The indicator should be based on the assessment of physical loss including the footprint of the structures, permanent changes of seafloor and in addition permanent hydrographic changes of the surrounding area with a view to determining areas of potentially impacted habitats. Other parameters to be monitored (such as salinity and temperature) should be structure-specific. Consequently, the related DS and DD will be adjusted.
- V. The Meeting expressed the importance of the definition of GES with regard to CI16 but emphasised that due to national circumstances such as socio-economic, historic, cultural and alike, a unique target and GES cannot be specified quantitatively (as a threshold value). The definition of GES and related targets and measures should be left to the CPs taking legal obligations of the Barcelona Convention into account, in particular the ICZM Protocol.
- VI. The Meeting agreed on the removal of *impervious surface in the coastal fringe (100m from the coastline)* and *the land claim, i.e. the surface area reclaimed from the 1980's onward (ha)* from the list of criteria for calculation of this indicator. Minor adjustments to the Guidance Factsheet namely, replacement of the term ‘manmade structures’ with the term ‘human made structures’ to respect the gender-neutrality was endorsed by the Meeting.
- VII. Human induced coastal erosion was recognised as an important process affecting coastline, so the Meeting suggested to develop a relevant indicator under this EO.
- VIII. The Meeting welcomed the work done on DS and DD and endorsed the document as presented with the exception of the variables “border on the sea side of coastal artificial structures” to be reported as non-mandatory but to be replaced by aerial photographs as appropriate.
- IX. The Meeting welcomed the work done on the preparation of the Guidance Factsheet for the CCI25 and acknowledged its usefulness for the EcAp process, as well as for the implementation of the ICZM Protocol, in particular for reporting on the state and evolution of coastal zones. The Meeting agreed to add a layer on protected areas and to change the title of the indicator to read “Land cover change“.

- X. Similar to the CI16, the Meeting agreed that the GES, targets and measures cannot be expressed quantitatively but, due to country specific circumstances (socio-economic, cultural, historical), should be defined by the countries themselves. In doing so the CPs should take their spatial development and planning policies into account, as well as the legal obligations of the Barcelona Convention, in particular the ICZM Protocol.
- XI. The Meeting took note of the presentation of the report “Evolution of built-up area in coastal zones of Mediterranean countries between 1975 to 2015” as being useful for the EcAp process.
- XII. The Meeting endorsed the Guidance Factsheet presented and proposed to the EcAp Coordination Group to put the CCI 25 on the IMAP List of Common Indicators. Also, it requested to prepare the related DS and DD for this indicator to accompany the Factsheet and facilitate its monitoring. The Meeting encouraged the Contracting Parties to implement this indicator for national and regional assessment purposes.
- XIII. A number of CPs presented their status with regard to the implementation of IMAP for coast and hydrography indicators. The meeting emphasised the importance of IMAP implementation in its initial phase as its results will be important inputs for the preparation of the Mediterranean Quality Status Report in 2023 (MED QSR 2023) which will be based on national monitoring, shared through the IMAP Info system. The Meeting encouraged the CPs to mobilise their efforts to implement their national monitoring programmes and invited the Secretariat to provide assistance if required.
- XIV. The Meeting acknowledged the methodologies proposed for GES-integrated assessment based on DPSIR approach. Furthermore, the Meeting recommended their testing by the Contracting Parties with the view to present the related main findings in the next meeting of CORMON on Coast and Hydrography. The importance of monitoring data modelling is noticed in order to complement the proposed methodologies and ensure a more reliable quantification of the magnitude of impacts (i.e. scientifically-based scoring).
- XV. The Meeting acknowledged the importance of the common data management policy for the Barcelona Convention system, and took note of the draft MAP Data Management policy presented by Info/RAC as an information document. The Meeting invited at least two CPs to participate in the testing phase of the IMAP Pilot info system for coast and hydrography.
- XVI. The Meeting agreed to re-activate the on-line working group to discuss and finalise DD and DS.