



**Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD)  
Common Implementation Strategy**

**33<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Marine Strategy Coordination Group (MSCG)**

**Brussels, CCAB + WebEx**

**23 October 2023, 09:30 – 17:00**

Document:	MSCG_33-2023- Final Minutes (MSCG_33-2023-08)
Title:	Final Minutes of the 33 <sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Marine Strategy Coordination Group (MSCG)
Date prepared:	17.11.2023
Prepared by:	European Commission

## 1. Opening of the meeting

The Chair introduced the meeting and new observer, North Western Waters Advisory Council (NWWAC).

The Chair informed that Commission adopted its working programme for 2024 and highlighted some initiatives, notably the Wind Power Package, the Action plan on renewable energies, a New initiative on Water Resilience. The Commission work programme is available here – [Commission work programme 2024 \(europa.eu\)](https://europa.eu/commission/work-programme-2024)

Two Member States introduced their new MSCG representatives.

### 2a. Adoption of the agenda

The chair asked for the approval of the agenda for the current meeting (MSCG\_33-2023-01\_draft agenda\_rev1). It also informed MSCG that it wished to include an AOB point on the *Sustainable Blue Economy Partnership*. The agenda was adopted.

### 2b. Approval of the minutes of the 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting

The Chair apologised for the late transmission of the minutes. [Romania] One Member State requested to receive the invitation for the MSCG meetings well in advance to secure authorisation for travel. The Chair proposed to send the invitation even without the final agenda in advance.

The minutes of the 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting were adopted.

## 3. Implementation of the Directive & the GES Decision

### 3a. Monitoring, measures and exception

The Chair reminded Member States of their reporting obligations, with one MS still not having reported its monitoring programmes due in October 2020 and another five not having reported their programmes of measures due in March 2022.

The Chair informed that the programmes of measures not received by the cut-off date of 1/09/2023 will not be considered in the Commission assessment and the associated report. This brings the number of programmes of measures to be assessed to 17. The other 5 Member States not covered by this assessment will be assessed separately and their assessments will be eventually published on WISE-marine and the Commission website. The Commission then presented the structure of the Commission's report assessing Member States' measures.

The EU report will be linked with the Water Resilience initiative and will be structured around the triple planetary crises. The package should be published in Q2 2024 together with the River basin management plans and Flood Risk Assessments

One Member State informed that its monitoring programme was submitted in August. The Chair replied that it will check with its colleagues dealing with infringements to check about the status.

One Member State informed that its programme of measures is under public consultation and the submission is expected in March 2024. DK introduced a new MSCG representative.

One Member State questioned whether the assessment itself will be made against the planetary crises, notably in relation to climate change, as this is not a main feature of the programmes of measures. The Chair clarified that the assessment will be carried out in accordance with the assessment methodology, but the narrative of the report will contribute to the wider policy context. It reassured Member States that the Commission's intention is not to assess the programmes against the crises, but rather to show how these measures generally contribute to addressing them.

One Member State underlined the importance of linking the assessment with biodiversity and requested clarification on the assessment of climate change under D4 and D7 as these descriptors would be relevant for climate change.

One Member State asked whether they could see a draft of the assessment made by the Commission. The chair while acknowledging that this is a recurrent question, offered an open channel of communication where the Member States have doubts on their reported information, emphasising though that sharing the assessment prior to its publication is not being considered. The chair invited the Member State for a bilateral dialogue.

The Chair then briefed MSCG on the timeline for the review of the Directive, notably that the evaluation will be ready for Q2 2024. DG ENV is currently working with JRC on the modelling. The chair also raised that the issue of co-use of maritime space is becoming more relevant in the discussion and will be discussed also at the Directors' meeting in November. This needs to be investigated more closely in the revision of the MSFD and strengthening the links with the maritime spatial planning directive therefore becomes more important. The issue is also being discussed across the relevant Commission services.

The Chair informed that work is ongoing with the European Environment Agency (EEA) on how to improve data management.

### 3b. Regional cooperation

The chair invited the Regional Sea Conventions representatives to provide an update on their latest work relevant for the implementation of the MSFD, notably on their quality status reports:

### **North-East Atlantic (OSPAR):**

OSPAR reported that the Quality Status Report 2023 (QSR)<sup>1</sup> was published last September. The QSR shows that measures on human activities can produce a positive impact on the environment, but the biodiversity indicators show that still much needs to be done. The QSR, which is available online, will inform future actions for more improvements. In terms of use of OSPAR products for MSFD reporting by EU Member States, he highlighted the good cooperation of all actors and especially with the EEA and EMODNET. In its QSR, OSPAR published 33 out of 35 MSFD tables and used Reportnet3 for prefilling data. OSPAR observed that there has been improvement since the previous MSFD reporting cycle in terms of assessment units used. OSPAR will also cooperate fully with the recently revived TG Data.

The report to Ministers on implementation of the OSPAR Strategy (adopted in 2021) was sent, which highlights achievements but also issues with resources for the follow-up to the strategy.

The successful workshop held in mid-October was an important milestone in the OSPAR Roadmap for the Arctic, and very useful, among other things, for the outreach to stakeholders in the Arctic.

### **Baltic Sea (HELCOM):**

The HELCOM representative announced that the HOLAS III thematic assessment was published in March 2023. The indicators are available online and a webinar will be organised to present the summary report and launch the website<sup>2</sup>. A workshop will be organised in April 2024 to improve the assessment with the feedback collected from the update of the HELCOM science agenda. As for OSPAR, HELCOM is also working with the EEA to ensure the availability of data for Member States. The Baltic Sea action plan will be reviewed using the results of the holistic assessment. The representative presented the project “Protect the Baltic”, the objective is to have by 2028 a holistic framework to protect the Baltic.

The Chair asked about the scope of this project. HELCOM replied that the project will focus on MPAs, but will use the knowledge base from the entire Baltic.

The Commission also debriefed on the outcomes of the second edition of the **Our Baltic Conference**, which was held in Palanga, Lithuania on the 29 September. The conference discussed the progress made on the implementation of the Baltic Declaration (adopted in September 2020 during the first edition of Our Baltic conference), the sustainable blue economy in the Baltic and new actions were agreed upon on dumped munitions, with commitments presented to the press. A wrap-up video is available: <https://vimeo.com/873687544/451fb915ba>

### **Mediterranean Sea (Barcelona Convention, UNEP/MAP):**

The UNEP-MAP representative informed that its assessment of the quality status of the Mediterranean Sea was done with the data available. It shows that some species are on the recovery, but others remain endangered. An improvement for some pollution types is also noticed but marine litter are a major issue.

UNEP-MAP also informed that legally binding measures on aquaculture are under discussion and moreover highlighted the support UNEP/MAP is providing to contracting party for their programme of measures.

UNEP/MAP informed that the Barcelona Convention will hold its 23<sup>rd</sup> Conference of the parties on the 4-8 December in Slovenia and the exchange sit is having with the Presidency of the Council to prepare

---

<sup>1</sup> [Quality Status Report 2023 - OSPAR-OAP \(Prod\)](#)

<sup>2</sup> [State of the Baltic Sea 2023 – HELCOM](#)

this ministerial meeting. Finally, UNEP-MAP outlined some of the ongoing work on the implementation of the ecosystem approach.

#### **Black Sea:**

The representative from one Member State in the region announced that they invited the neighbouring EU Member State for an MSFD coordination meeting before the end of the year. It informed that the Advisory Groups of the Bucharest Convention no longer meet, but regional experts nevertheless continue the technical work on the implementation of the Black Sea integrated monitoring and assessment pollution, which is in line with MSFD. A meeting of the Black Sea Commission is planned for the 1st of November. The collaboration of Black Sea Commission with UNEP/MAP on marine litter was taken up again.

The Chair announced that the JRC will be invited for the next MSCG to present their work on mapping/modelling the war impact on the Black Sea environment, with a view to effectively assist restoration and green reconstruction (“build back better”).

### 3c. Seabed integrity: development of threshold values through the Common implementation strategy

The co-chair of TG Seabed provided a summary of recent developments in the group. First she informed that in relation to the proposal by TG Seabed experts for a **D6C5 threshold value for areas of seabed without pressures**, further work has taken place since the previous MSCG meeting in May. On 21 September, a workshop was organised to allow MSCG/WG GES members to ask technical questions to TG Seabed experts about the proposal.

- Questions were raised in relation to the **legality of the threshold**. The Commission confirmed that it had consulted its legal services on this issue. Based on this discussion, the Commission can answer that the proposed threshold is in line with the definition of GES for D6 in Annex I of the Directive and that it can also be construed as being part of a package of threshold values to limit adverse effects on seabed habitats as required under D6C5 of the COM Decision.
- Discussions also took place on the **links between the threshold of 10% of each habitat type to be without pressures on the seabed and existing or upcoming MPAs**, including ‘strictly protected’ ones. It was clarified that there is no conflict between the two frameworks, so that areas may (at least partially) overlap.
- **The concept of ‘manageable pressures’** raises concerns among certain Member States. The document provides a high-level definition of what should be considered ‘manageable’ and ‘unmanageable’, but it leaves it in the hands of the Member State to make the determination on a case-by-case basis. Following the workshop, TG Seabed experts revisited the text of the proposal related to ‘manageable pressures’ to try to clarify even more its meaning.

The co-chair informed that the outcomes of the workshop were presented at WG GES. A number of questions were raised again in relation to the concept of ‘manageable pressures’ and the choice of instrument (threshold value vs target) for this environmental objective. In addition to the discussion at the meeting, further written answers were provided to WG GES through TG Seabed the previous week.

Secondly, on 12 and 13 October, TG Seabed organised its 18<sup>th</sup> meeting which focused on the question

of determining **indicators and threshold values for the assessment of adverse effects** on seabed habitats, as part of the work of TG Seabed on criterion D6C5. The meeting was the first step of a roadmap set up by TG Seabed towards the adoption of D6C5 threshold values over the coming months. It served to clarify a number of key issues and get a better understanding of the current state of play when it comes to the use of different indicators for the assessment of D6C5 by different Member States/Regional Sea Conventions and the ability of existing indicators to fully address D6C5 requirements. A number of actions were identified by participants for the next steps in this process. In addition to regular TG Seabed experts, the meeting was attended by RSC experts and additional national experts and observers working on other pressures that affect the seabed beyond physical disturbance.

The Chair of MSCG thanked the TG Seabed experts for their work on these different work strands. In relation to the proposed threshold value for areas of the seabed without pressure, she recalled that the objective of the discussion was not to take decisions but to listen to the different views with the aim of preparing the ground for an adoption of the threshold values at the next MSCG in 2024. She also mentioned that the Commission is working on a Commission notice to clarify the status of (all) threshold values, which should be published by the end of the year or beginning of next, well before next MSCG.

The floor was opened for comments and Member States made a number of remarks on both the proposed threshold value and the work on the 'quality' thresholds.

- In relation to the work of TG Seabed on the development of 'quality' thresholds, one Member State expressed support for TG Seabed's suggestion to create a drafting group to focus on Mediterranean and Black Sea issues on 'quality' threshold values (TVs) only, in order to address certain gaps and see how indicators and methods developed elsewhere could be of use in these two regions.
- In relation to the proposed threshold value for areas of seabed without manageable pressures:
  - o One Member State expressed that the discussion on manageable and non-manageable pressures goes beyond seabed and would need to be seen in the context of other descriptors. As such there is a risk of creating a precedent by qualifying certain pressures as 'manageable' and others as 'non-manageable'.
  - o One Member State expressed its reservation regarding the proposal for 10% protection due to unmanageable anthropogenic pressures such as eutrophication, non-indigenous species, diffuse pollution, illegal fishing and input from Danube, Niper, Dniester, Bug Rivers. On the other hand, it is necessary to take into consideration that only 20% of the Black Sea is covered by EU Member States. It also pointed out that anoxic areas should not be considered as examples of unmanageable pressures as they are the result of natural conditions.
  - o Three Member States also expressed some reservations or lack of clarity with regard to the concept of 'manageable pressures'. One Member State stated that the proposal is more a matter of spatial management and measures than a GES TV.
  - o Two Member States mentioned that there is a risk that adding a TV under D6 would bring uncertainty to the negotiation process of the Nature Restoration Law. Other Member States on the contrary expressed their views that the proposed TV will help increase coherence with the future NRL as well as with the Biodiversity Strategy.
  - o One Member State called for the rapid adoption of the TV considering that TVs should be in place already since 2018 according to the COM Decision. It also mentioned that the way the proposed TV is expressed is fully in line with the Directive and the need to set a framework for the sustainable use of the marine environment.
  - o In summary, 6 Member States expressed their support for the proposed TV, three

Member States their opposition and three Member States stated that they still have reservations, some for procedural reasons, others because they are carrying out socio-economic assessments of the proposal.

The Commission moreover clarified that the text submitted to MSCG for this meeting incorporated changes made by TG Seabed, not just by the chairs. On the specific technical issues that were raised, the Commission pointed out that these need to be discussed in the TG Seabed.

The Chair concluded that, given the discussions at the meeting and the need for a stable text on the Nature Restoration Law, the paper will be submitted for adoption in the next MSCG after final review by TG Seabed, but going through WG GES before. In the meanwhile, a Commission notice on TVs is expected to be published.

### 3d. Marine litter: development of threshold values developed through the Common implementation strategy

The Commission presented the work being done on seafloor litter by TG Litter and stressed that the document being submitted for endorsement today is on the methodology to set TVs for seafloor litter, not on the values themselves. Notably the methodology focuses on the ‘combined approach’.

One Member State could endorse this approach in general and emphasised that the final threshold value should contribute to a reduction of seafloor litter. It felt that use of imaging techniques is promising but not yet practicable. This was supported by another 3 other Member States. The first Member State, joined by another, insisted that there should be no obligation for using video monitoring.

Another Member State could also support the approach. It would look into start using imaging techniques. It also informed that it has applied a non-increase trend in assessing the amount of seafloor litter using data from bottom trawling, but there are problems (e.g. variability, statistical analysis) with the use of such data.

One Member State could also endorse this approach, but could foresee challenges setting TVs for areas without data (from bottom trawling); as it might take years before sufficient data from imaging/observation techniques are available.

One Member State thanked the Commission and TG Litter for the changes made to the document and can provide its support, while reminding that there are still technical issues open.

The two methods proposed have their limitations according to one Member State, and the document requires more methodological guidance to be apply the methodology.

One Member State agreed on the non-increase TV. On the combined approach, it expressed its wish to be part of the project to develop this approach.

Another Member State did not oppose the document, on the condition that the hybrid approach did not create a precedent on the threshold value itself; the technical and financial challenges must be considered before setting an absolute TV for non-trawled areas, from which then seafloor litter would probably have to be removed; removing existing litter from the seabed is very difficult and deviates from the prevention principle, which requires reducing litter at source.

Another Member State supported the approach and took note of the issues raised by other MSCG members.

Another Member State agreed with the hybrid approach but also raised concerns on areas where data is not available.

Two Member States supported the approach subject to further scrutiny.

Two Member States supported the approach but pointed out that in the Baltic the bottom trawling approach is not entirely practical, since the aim is to reduce this activity in the sea. In reaction to this another MS considered that it has run some pilots and that it seems to be yielding good results, applying the technique in the Baltic should therefore not be discarded.

The Commission replied that the proposal is not encouraging bottom trawling for obtaining seafloor litter data, but any baseline/TV setting for seafloor litter must use available data, and these until now came almost exclusively from bottom trawling; implementation of the hybrid approach will trigger supply of data from other (observation/imaging) sources. On the non-increase threshold value, it is meant to inform on trends, not to create an obligation for clean-up activities.

The Chair concluded that MSCG supports the combined approach and asks TG Litter to develop it, to resolve the methodological issues and to submit it for further scrutiny to WG GES.

### 3e. Biodiversity (D1): pelagic habitats

The Commission presented the chapter on D1 – pelagic habitats, to be included in the Article 8 assessment guidance. It underlined that in the current version of Article 8 assessment guidance document ('the guidance'), the chapter dedicated to D1 – pelagic habitats was very coarse (1 page) and therefore not sufficient for guiding the Member States in their reporting. A fully-fledged chapter was developed since the adoption of the guidance in May 2022, and it is fully in line with the guidance's presentation and standards. WG GES 29 (5 October 2023) endorsed the chapter, pending minor corrections and clarifications. The chapter presented to the MSCG meeting, incorporates those updates. MSCG was requested to adopt the chapter and tasked WG GES to incorporate it into an updated Article 8 assessment guidance document. The Commission stressed that the guidance was a living document and agreed that it would be understandably difficult for the Member States to use it for their upcoming Article 8 report. A note will be added before the chapter to explain when the chapter was added to the guidance.

Four Member States supported the adoption of the chapter without further comments. One Member State supported the adoption and underlined that methodological issues were still pending and that closing these gaps required financial support and joint scientific projects.

A further Member State also supported the adoption and the comments made by the previous Member State. A last Member State took the floor to support the adoption and underlined that the next guidance should be submitted timely to MSCG to ensure full use in the Member States 2030 report on Article 8.

One Member State supported the adoption of the chapter "pelagic habitats" and thanked for considering the request to clarify the terms: "transitional waters" and "water with variable salinity". This will avoid that the terms are misunderstood during reporting process.

Building on the Member States' comments, the Chair concluded that MSCG adopted the chapter and

tasked WG GES with inserting it into an updated Article 8 assessment guidance.

### 3f. NEA-PANACEA

The project coordinator thanked the Commission for the EU funding under the EMFF (Call MSFD 2020) and presented the outcomes of the project, which are directly related to needs of Member States for MSFD reporting and implementation; the project also delivered several biodiversity-related assessments for OSPAR's Quality Status Report 2023.

The Chair highlighted the relevance of the project for MSFD implementation and expressed her satisfaction for the good use of EU funding to increase knowledge and support MSFD assessments and the OSPAR QSR report, while underlining the need for the Member States to capitalise on the outcomes of the project for establishing regional threshold values also for other GES criteria.

The NEA PANACEA built on two previous projects (ECAP RHA and JMP Eunosat) and comprised five activities: Pelagic habitats; Eutrophication & physical conditions; Benthic habitats; Marine birds; Coordination; 4 workshops were organised to bring experts together. All the information and details about the project outcomes can be obtained through the weblinks inserted in the powerpoint presentation, which will be included in the MSCG documents uploaded on CIRCABC.

The Executive Secretary of OSPAR highlighted the role of NEA PANACEA in delivering the OSPAR QSR and thanked the EU for its support and the project consortium for delivering such good work.

A Member State requested to have similar support for the Black Sea.

The Chair replied that the Commission is perfectly aware of the challenges in the Black Sea and provides support through a number of instruments (regional/neighbourhood funding); the Commission is ready to discuss further bilaterally, but the MSFD support must be seen in the broader context of EU assistance to Ukraine and the Black Sea, as illustrated by the PHOENIX project.

### 4. Other Commission initiatives (Marine action plan)

The Chair debriefed MSCG on the first meeting of the joint Member States' special group set up under the Marine action plan, which took place on 6 October 2023. She underlined the fact that the group uniquely gathered the 'blue' and 'green' community (all Member States attended, with experts from the environment and fisheries ministries, stakeholders from the fisheries advisory councils and e-NGOs). She further underlined that the objective of the special group was to start a dialogue to enhance mutual understanding, get an overview of the various work strands and agree on a common approach. The first meeting focussed on the short term, namely discussing working methods, presenting draft rules of procedures, presenting the actions suggested under the action plan, roadmap for 2030, in particular as regards the protection of species and the measures. The Chair reported that there was a good representation and openness to engage constructively provided that the administrative burden would be minimised and would not duplicate work taking place in the working and expert groups under the CFP, MSFD, BHD.

The Chair also reported on the main takeaways from the meeting: i) the socio-economic impact was identified as a challenge (but its assessment is provided for under the CFP rules for fisheries measures), ii) access to funding and iii) smart planning and co-use of the maritime space. In its final intervention, the Chair reported that online workshops on funding and eel were planned and that the next meeting will take place in June 2024.

A Member State noted that a 2016 Directors' meeting already called for such a joint meeting and fully acknowledged the fact that this structure was an opportunity for new ways of working.

An observer considered the special group a useful initiative to break silos between the members and the stakeholders. He suggested the need for a deeper exploration of how fisheries can be made more sustainable with a gradual transition to low-impact fishing that benefits coastal communities and informed the group that his organisation was about to release a study on this subject.

Two further Member States expressed their support to the Action plan and its ambition, underlining that a robust scientific basis was necessary as well as a close cooperation between the environment and the fisheries worlds, and noted that it was important for the environment constituents to understand the fisheries perspective.

The Chair concluded stated that the rules of procedure will be shared this week with a deadline for comments. She also confirmed that MS were welcome to provide input both on possible workshops and suggestions for agenda items for the next special group's meeting.

## 5. Commission implementation strategy

### 5a. CIS work programmes

DG ENV highlighted that the level of maturity differs from the different groups and a consolidated version should be provided for the next MSCG meeting. The objective of the presentation is to present a state of play of the proposal made by the different groups and have an exchange of views. The Commission presented the draft working programmes of the various groups under the CIS process in the form of a ppt presentation, available on CIRCABC. Acknowledging that MSCG may require more time to comment on the document, the Chair announced that it would welcome written observations by 1 December.

Some Member States nevertheless made some preliminary comments:

Four Member States underlined that the work programme is going into the right direction. Replying to a prompt by the Commission, one Member State, supported the idea that MSCG outcomes and deliverables are be defined. One of these Member State saw no need for a substantial reshuffle of the current work programme, but rather for an update. This Member State went on suggesting clear task-sharing between the RSCs and the EU processes (CIS, JRC, EEA). It suggested that MSCG's steering of the CIS process and implementation would be made easier if a simplified overview regularly submitted to MSCG. This would both help make the right decisions and prioritise work. One of these Member States also noted that it was good to have an ambitious work programme.

As a general reflection one Member State noted that after 15 years focusing on the implementation of the MSFD there are still many open issues and it struggles with driving EU policies more widely. The MSFD review could provide this opportunity, with a need to consider better links with other legal instruments. The Member State also raised the issue of more funding and projects for MSFD implementation. The Member State also pointed out on the need to look at other initiatives, such as in the Arctic, but also noted gaps between MSFD and CBD implementation, mostly due to them being dealt by different persons. The Member State therefore said it would be good to better highlight nature conservation, pollution, biodiversity (triple planetary crisis), perhaps with workshops (funding, coherence) and how this can be done in practice. Having a dedicated Working Group can be good but not necessary for the success and workshops are very meaningful to come together and figure specific issues out.

As to WG GES, one Member State said that predominant and new pressures on the marine environment could also be considered in the work programme for WG GES, such as climate change. Another Member States expressed the need to develop some thematic work, for example WG GES could work on D4. A further Member States also called for WG GES to engage in coordination meetings with other groups covering initiatives. One observer pointed out that changes in acidity, temperature and salinity are also on the WFD WG ECOSTAT agenda and suggested collaborating with the WFD if work on climate change and acidification were to be taken forward.

For WG DIKE, one Member State said that communication is needed to make to work useful for other initiatives as Nature Restoration Law and ensure data harmonisation. Another Member State [DK] considered the timeline for reporting guidelines for article 11, too late for Member States to use it in the process for developing their monitoring programme.

Regarding WG POMESA, one Member State expressed its reluctance to add additional requirements for the work on social analysis, saying that it is for the individual Member States to decide on the indicators and methods to be used in doing this analysis. A Member State requested guidance for socio-economic analyses in WG POMESA, it also mentioned that the determination of targets should not only be linked to measures but also to the determination of GES.

For TG litter, while understanding the emphasis on TV setting, two Member States, enquired about the proposed work of TG Litter on measures and asked whether there is a link with regional implementation of TVs; the aim of this work and how it will be used by Member States should be clarified. In this respect one Member State expressed the need to link monitoring with measures and with assessing the effectiveness of reduction measures, such as the SUP directive, and the EU measures for reduction of microplastics (under REACH and for pellets). A coherent approach on monitoring is necessary to make sure that we focus on the abovementioned measures and can show their effects on the marine environment. Another Member State notes a strong emphasis on the development of TVs but called for a balance between the work dedicated to developing of measures to achieve those TVs.

As to TG Noise, one Member State pointed out that cooperation with WG GES is important to facilitate work of technical group.

For both TG Noise and TG Litter, one Member State concluded by noting that the specific objectives of their work should be discussed to avoid overstressing limited resources.

As to TG Seabed, one Member State considered that the work programme was possibly too ambitious.

The Commission informed that these comments will be passed on to the different Working and technical Groups. For the written replies, the Commission clarified that:

- deadline for comments to be sent by 1 December 2023, to be included in revised document to be discussed by the subgroups for their spring meetings.
- While the focus on implementation remains due to the mandate of CIS, the Commission will ensure strong links with MSFD review and scope to look at certain points mentioned in that context.

## 5b. Upcoming Water & Marine Director meetings

Two points were presented: first the presentation of the agenda of the Meeting of Marine and Water Directors that will take place on 13-15 November in Madrid. The ES Presidency presented its

programme around the directors' meeting. the agenda of the meeting, notably for the joint water and marine session, as well as the marine session which will be held on the 15th.

Second, the forthcoming Water and Marine Directors meeting (under the BE Presidency) will be held in Ghent on the 13-14<sup>th</sup> June 2024.

The Chair thanked both presidencies for their work.

## 5c. CIS meetings

A document debriefing on the last CIS meetings was circulated last week, following the last DIKE meeting.

## 6. AOB

One Member State announced a change of the representative in MSCG.

As requested by a Member States during the last meeting of WG GES, DG ENV presented the Sustainable Blue Economy Partnership. A Member State asked for clarification on the budget. The Chair replied that the speaking points and the clarification will be distributed after the meeting.

## 7. Action Points

Action points per agenda item	Who	By when
<b>5.a CIS Work programmes</b>		
Send comments in writing on the proposal of Work Programmes for TGs and WGs (2024-2027)	Member States	1 <sup>st</sup> December 2023
<b>AOB - Sustainable blue Economy Partnership</b>		
Send link and information on the programme	Commission	

## Annex I

### List of Documents and Presentations

#### Presentations:

- 3a(i)\_State of Play of the second-cycle PoM reporting Art13-14\_.pdf
- 3c\_TGSeabed\_ThresholdValue\_AreasWithoutPressures.pdf
- 4\_IA. review MSFD. Environmental target setting.pdf
- 5a\_MSCG 11052023 - Marine Action Plan.pdf
- 6(i) MWD Stockholm.pdf
- 7a MSCG art 8, 9, 10 reporting guidance.pdf

#### Documents:

- MSFD\_D3Lists\_data\_product.xlsx
- MSCG\_32-2023-07\_D3 ref list.pdf
- C (2023) \_2203\_final.html
- JRC\_Review\_and\_analysis\_of\_EU\_Member\_States'\_2020\_reports\_on\_monitoring\_programmes\_\_M

SFD\_Article\_11.html  
 COM (2023) 101.html  
 COM (2023) 100.html  
 SWD (2023) 103.html  
 COM (2023) 103.html  
 COM (2023) 102.html  
 MSCG\_32-2023-08\_CIS updates.pdfAnnex II

List of participants

Member State		Organisation / Ministry
BE	Belgium	Belgian Federal Public Service Agency
CY	Cyprus	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment
DK	Denmark	Ministry of Environment
EE	Estonia	Ministry of Environment
FI	Finland	Ministry of Environment
FR	France	Ministère de la Transition écologique
HR	Croatia	Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development
DE	Germany	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety
EL	Greece	Ministry of Environment and Energy (YPEN)
FR	France	Ministère de la transition écologique
IE	Ireland	Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage (DHLGH)
IT	Italy	Italian Ministry of Environment and Energy Security
LT	Lithuania	Ministry of Environment
LV	Latvia	Latvian Institute of Aquatic Ecology
		Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development
MT	Malta	Environment & Resources Authority
NL	Netherlands	Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Waterstaat
PL	Poland	Ministry of Infrastructure (MI)
PT	Portugal	Direcção-Geral de Recursos Naturais, Segurança e Serviços Marítimos (DGRM)
RO	Romania	Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests
ES	Spain	Ministry for the Ecological Transition and the Demographic Challenge
SI	Slovenia	Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning
SE	Sweden	Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SwAM)
NO	Norway	Norwegian Environment Agency
Observers		Entity
-	OSPAR	OSPAR Convention Secretariat
-	Barcelona Convention	(UNEP/MAP) Secretariat
	HELCOM	Helsinki Convention (HELCOM) Secretariat
-	NWWAC	North Western Waters Advisory Council
-	NAVI	Marine Strategy Navigation Group representative (Central Dredging Association - CEDA)
-	SAR	Seas At Risk
-	EMB	European Marine Board
-	EAP0	European Association of fish Producers Organisations
-	MedPAN	Mediterranean Protected Area Network

European Commission and European agencies		
-	ENV.C.2	European Commission, DG Environment, Unit C.2 "Marine Environment and Clean Water Services"
-	JRC	Joint Research Centre
-	MARE D.3	European Commission, DG Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, unit D.3 "CFP and Structural Support - Policy Development and Coordination"
	EEA	European Environment Agency