



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL  
Joint Research Centre  
Institute for Environment and Sustainability  
**Water Resources Unit**

**MINUTES OF THE 6<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE  
MSFD GES TECHNICAL SUBGROUP ON MARINE LITTER**

**HAMBURG, GERMANY**

**14-16.05.2013**

**Participants:**

*Ania Budziak, AWARE,  
Constança Belchior, EEA,  
David Fleet, Schleswig-Holstein Agency for Coastal Defence,  
François Galgani, IFREMER,  
Lex Oosterbaan, Rijkswaterstaat and OSPAR,  
Leo De Vrees, DG ENV,  
Georg Hanke, EC JRC IES,  
Jan van Franeker, IMARES,  
Jeroen Dagevos, North Sea Foundation  
Jesus Gago, IEO,  
Thomas Maes, CEFAS,  
Joana Mira Veiga, EUCC  
Sue Kinsey, MCS  
Gerd Liebezeit, Univ. Oldenburg  
Per Nilsson, Havsmijo Institute,  
Andreja Palatinus, IWRS,  
Richard Thompson, Univ. Plymouth,  
Sandy Cruickshank, DEFRA,  
Kim Detloff, NABU,  
Stefanie Werner, UBA  
Marcus Schulz, Uni. Osnabrück  
Maria Ferreira, EUCC  
Mike Van Acoleyen, ARCADIS  
Heather Leslie, IVM-VU University*

**Meeting minutes**

**1) OPENING OF THE MEETING**

F. Galgani opened the 6<sup>th</sup> TSG-ML meeting and welcomed all the participants, S. Werner provided some practical information, followed by a brief round of introductions of all attendees.

## 2) GENERAL INFORMATION, WORK SET-UP, WORK PLAN 2013 AND TIME SCHEDULE

(S. Werner, F. Galgani, G. Hanke, L. De Vrees)

Key observations:

- The MSFD common implementation strategy internal structure has been adapted: this technical subgroup on marine litter now reports to MSCG. MSCG can ask for assistance from the MSFD-GES.
- The mandate for this group is extended to the end of 2014
- The report on guidance for monitoring as outcome of the group's work in 2012 and 2013 is being prepared. Planned deadlines:
  - o Chapters to be finalised (level of consensus to be reached) before 31/05. Cross-commenting via basecamp, preparing final content;
  - o One single unified and harmonised report to be prepared by the support team on 10/06;
  - o Two weeks for final comments (preferably non-structural comments) before 21/06;
  - o Final editing including language check before end of June;
  - o Publication as final draft (not "interim guidance") on Circa, **8th of July** – open for clarification and final reality check, not for discussion but ready for use by MS authorities;
  - o Final version as PDF to be submitted formally to MSCG (12 November meeting);
- The key task for this meeting and its immediate follow up is to plan and proceed on the remaining crucial (technical) issues, and to develop strategies for the remaining topics in the group's mandate.

## 3) OUTCOME ML CONFERENCE: ISSUE PAPER, TOOLBOX, MESSAGE FROM BERLIN

(S. Werner, UBA; Leo de Vrees, DG ENV)

- Before providing an update on the state-of-affairs and outcomes of Berlin conference, Leo de Vrees, European Commission (EC), briefly introduced the consultants Maria Ferreira (Coastal & Marine Union, EUCC) and Mike van Acoleyen (ARCADIS-BE), who are contracted to provide administrative, logistical and technical support for TSG ML (and TSG Noise). M. Ferreira (EUCC) will be the main person responsible for such tasks and she will be supported by her colleague J. Veiga, who is also a member of the TSG-ML.
- Stefanie presented in PPT some highlights of the conference: 16 MS were represented and several non-EU countries. The main outcome is the *Issue Paper*, which will be provided to the Water/Marine Directors meeting (30-31 May in Dublin) (together with the *Message from Berlin*, which reflects the conclusions of the chairpersons of the conference. This message was delivered to high-level policy players attending the final session (European Commissioner for the Environment, German Federal Minister for the Member of the EU Parliament and UNEP as well as the Irish Minister of State at the Department of the Environment. This document provides a problem statement, describes current efforts, key principles and priority actions to be taken. As clarification, the Issue paper aimed to take stock on existing knowledge about sources, compositions and amounts of ML and work especially within the RCSs – it was intended to initiate action instead of pure discussion. The conference also produced an online database of existing measures and new initiatives regarding ML. During the conference there was quite some interest outside the EU like NOAA and UNEP: it might be possible that the work prepared today will have a worldwide impact.
- The Berlin conference also included two workshops (breakout sessions), one on target setting and one with a regional focus on possible measures to be implemented to pave the way for the RCSs for the further development of Regional Action Plans on Marine Litter
- UNEP communicated during the conference to be interested in the protocols provided by the TSG Marine Litter
- Leo de Vrees informed that the EU (Parliament, EC and MSs) proposed to have a common quantitative reduction target, as a *Headline Target* (non-legally binding). Next Friday (17<sup>th</sup> May), there will be a regional workshop from the Barcelona Convention on targets & measures.
- Regarding the EU waste legislation, there will be a review in 2014 (e.g. should we increase the

recycling targets, in order to stimulate the recycling market?...) and therefore the EC has published a Green Paper in order to foster discussion and receive online feedback from stakeholders until 6<sup>th</sup> June.

- A note of caution regarding the proper use of scientific references and the interpretation of research has been noted. The section on micro-plastics in the Commission's Green Paper on plastic in the environment was a recent example of concern. The Group agreed that it was important for influential sources to take responsibility for ensuring discussion papers accurately reflect science and research references and provide impartial advice. Action: UK to circulate comments provided as part of response to Green Paper consultation. Action completed via Basecamp.
- The Port Reception Facilities legislation is to be reviewed before end of June.
- Proposal on possibilities to ban single-use carrier plastic bags by the end on 2013 (average use phase in the lifecycle of plastic bag is 10 minutes!)

#### **4) MSFD DESCRIPTOR 10 – DEVELOPMENTS AND NEEDS – TIME SCHEDULE-**

*Leo de Vrees, DG ENV*

- The main task of this present meeting is to finalise the report on the ML protocols. An executive summary of this report should be ready later in November (<12 pages) and there may be the possibility to have it translated in the main EU languages.
- There are good developments in monitoring of riverine inputs litter. The possibilities to include monitoring programme of riverine litter in their scope of work, as land-based sources, will be discussed in the MD/WFD upcoming meeting. Since many sources of ML are land-based/upstream, there is on-going discussion about monitoring at this level. It is therefore important to get river basin managers involved in monitoring but also in terms of raising awareness, towards the possibility to take more measures in the future;

#### **5) UPDATE FROM RSCS: OSPAR, HELCOM, MEDPOL, BLACK SEA COMMISSION**

**OSPAR** (*Lex Oosterbaan*):

- In terms of monitoring, OSPAR had a workshop on indicators in February and 3 indicators have been singled out to be used by contracting parties: beach litter monitoring, the fulmar stomach content monitoring (some use as floating others biota) and the seabed IBTS monitoring. Microplastics monitoring was not selected. Not all countries will be using but some will take a combination of these indicators. For example, Fulmars do not exist in the entire OSPAR region. On the 6<sup>th</sup> June there will be a workshop dealing with all the descriptors to agree on the final list of indicators. A dedicated workshop for the further development of a RAP on ML by 2014 will be organized in November this year but the final format and audience to be invited still needs to be discussed.
- The common indicators might become more sub-regional. It is difficult to agree on common indicators for all the countries. This choice must be done carefully.

**HELCOM** (*Stefanie Werner*):

- Stefanie Werner explained that, together with Samuli K. (Germany and Project Manager of HELCOM CORESET), they've prepared a paper about monitoring and assessment of ML: progress of work in the HELCOM region for GEAR 2/2012. The HELCOM background on ML, availability of data on the Baltic Sea, criteria and methodological standards, the work of the TSG ML including information on the tool sheets, further projects and actions as well as suggested action in the Baltic Sea is included.
- Indicators for ML will be developed within the next phase of CORESET project, ML monitoring needs to be considered within the HELCOM MORE project.
- A ministerial declaration is under preparation, in which the development and adoption of a RAP on ML is proposed.
- In the upcoming HELCOM work HELCOM LAND will deal with ML coming from land-based sources and HELCOM MARITIME with litter from at-sea sources.

**MEDPOL** (*François Galgani*):

- Apologies from MEDPOL for not attending this meeting but they are very interested in the TSG work

- on protocols and will follow the developments;
- AS mentioned before, there will be a meeting soon, with quite ambitious goals in terms of actions and measures but in terms of monitoring the Convention has a more limited role. Non-EU countries must be engaged, to reduce inputs of litter from southern Mediterranean.
- A. Palatinus informed that there is a proposal being prepared for the EPA Adriatic Region (including EU and non EU-countries). The 2nd phase proposal is under preparation and if successful it will include monitoring of beach litter and microplastics, while relate them to derelict fishing gear. Final decision on project proposal will be known later in October.
- France uses OSPAR beach methodology also in their Mediterranean coast.

**Black Sea Commission** (*no delegate from BSC present, G. Hanke reported*):

- There are new contacts being made and following the TSG. It is quite important to have the BS countries to adopt the protocols. It was suggested that the translation of the protocol or key parts of the chapters might promote their adoption in the region. Furthermore, there are contacts being established with Poland and UNEP.

**Brief update on new research-related initiatives:**

- *HORIZON 2020*: It is timely to propose and provide a strong message on what are the research needs regarding ML. First, take stock of existing projects – project coordination group has been set-up: to assess what are the research needs. No budget has been allocated yet.
- *STAGES* (FP7 project): project and implement policy-research platform. F. Galgani attended the last meeting and provided update from the TSG ML.

It was commented that not all on-going projects are always aware of each other: posting of initiatives on basecamp remains crucial.

## 6) THEMATIC REPORTS – PROGRESS REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

Discussion on each thematic topic, considered the state of the report, next steps, discussion needs and needs for input. Following plenary discussion, the groups would breakout for discussions on selected issues. *(Note from TSG-supporting team: though the chronological sequence was different, for the sake of clarity the conclusions from the break-out sessions has been placed under each of the chapters below)*

### CHAPTER 1 Monitoring – General, Strategies and Costs (*L.Oosterbaan and P.Nilsson plenary and break-out group discussions*)

The thematic report about monitoring strategies and cost is a central part of the group's work. It was agreed that discussion will focus on the contents and needs for this section, as this chapter is the backbone of the report. The latest version (#6), which has been updated just prior to the meeting, is now online. A reshuffling might be needed between this chapter and the introductory parts of the specific chapters;

**Main discussion items:**

- Include the theory about what makes a good monitoring as an introduction for the various chapters/protocols in the report. Overarching principles valid for all descriptors need to be included in this chapter;
- Include reference to which monitoring could be preferable or alternative, and include that if a monitoring is set-up, the prescribed protocols are best to be used;
- A good balance should be found between the scope of TSG work and the MS responsibilities; Clear distinction between monitoring and genuine scientific research questions;
- Include details about how to promote cooperation between countries and regions;

**Results from Break-out Session:**

- Chapter will include the principles that the Guidance MSFD document has put forward (5"Cs).
- The group agreed that is important that each thematic report (protocols) highlights the costs and the possibility to be coupled with monitoring of other descriptors, which will then be summarised in this

1<sup>st</sup> chapter – protocol leaders need to provide detailed info on costs – Joana will keep track and make pressure.

- The chapter will also include an overview table with a series of criteria for all the protocols, that may help MS to decide which ones to adopt and their value;
- This chapter will also include a paragraph on the use of volunteers (e.g. beach monitoring and diving observations), which has the added value of cost-effectiveness and awareness.

## **CHAPTER 2: Monitoring protocols - Beach litter** (*D. Fleet, plenary and group discussions*)

Current status of topics that have been included so far in this chapter: Review of monitoring methods, Requirements for beach monitoring, OSPAR methodology, UNEP guidelines, Proposal multi-sampling beach, for extremely polluted beaches other methods are proposed, Selection and characterisation of sites, Proposal for frequency of surveys and quantification of litter and Proposal lower size and quality assurance.

What still needs to be included: Reference to UNEP guidelines (text used), review of text, review level of detail (e.g. equipment needed?), fill in text and appendixes and include cost assessments.

### **Main discussion items:**

- How to improve the protocol: suggest some changes in the OSPAR, e.g. leave out the 1000 meter survey and perhaps suggest replicates of the 100 meter survey;
- How to cope with heavily polluted sites, where the OSPAR 100m method is not adequate? (BO) leave out the quadrant method, use OSPAR but on smaller tracks: 50m, 25 m depending on the amount of items)
- Reference that the monitoring authorities can/should encourage the support by charities and voluntaries, as it is currently done in the UK;
- The category list of items should not exclude currently surveyed items for the sake of simplification. Better to gather too much information than too little.
- Which approach (es) for type of beaches (remote, hot-spots of accumulation, hot-spots of activities)?

### **Results from Break-out Session:**

- Should we select beaches at random or focussing on hotspots? **Conclusion of this point should be checked by Task Leader.**
- Identification of gaps and sites should be addressed as well. There is recommendation about site selection but not answer to how many sites are needed per region and how they should be distributed. Statistical advice is to be included in the general chapter 1. Discussion was based on this definition being dependent on statistical variability but also the targets and goal of the surveys. D. Fleet mentioned that there is huge variability among beaches, regarding nr of items. Heather will upload a document on basecamp with general principles to design monitoring programmes, including nr of surveys needed.
- Agreement was reached on a minimum frequency of 4 times/year; once in each season, not on fixed days but preferable before beach clean-up takes place.
- The lower size limit is 2.5 cm, unless smaller parts are still easily identifiable (e.g. cigarette butts...)
- The protocols will provide technical description of the methodology/record of items on a beach but not the strategy to design a monitoring programme. Health and safety warnings should anyhow be included in the chapter.

## **CHAPTER 3: Monitoring protocols - Floating/water column litter** (*G.Hanke, plenary and group discussion*)

The proposed approach regarding visual observations was presented on PPT (uploaded to basecamp) to have advice and agreement from the group.

### **Main discussion items:**

- Definition of limit size range categories: options to be agreed (e.g. regarding the size range from 2.5 to 50 cm)

- Contributing external experts that will review the protocol proposed by TSG as they are monitoring and surveying floating litter.
- How should people observe, which width of observation, apply the technique of distance sampling

**Results from Break-out Session:**

The group agreed that the protocol will be simplified but that the observation width ranges should be identified according to observation conditions, with a table as guidance. The draft protocol could benefit from a reality check. Sizes to be monitored: according to the beach monitoring sizes.

**CHAPTER 4: Monitoring protocols – Seafloor litter (*F. Galgani; plenary and group discussion*):**

This chapter protocol is well under development but discussions needed about categories consistency. Regarding IBTS data this is hold by ICES. One item to consider regards the need for a basic protocol with flexibility for local specifications.

**Results from Break-out Session:**

- The group agreed that a section will be included on interpretation of data, e.g. nr of surveys needed to recognise trends and some examples.

**CHAPTER 5: Monitoring protocols - Litter in biota**

**Main discussion items:**

- Protocol for turtles (ingestion) is included, as comparable as possible to the fulmar. However, while in birds only for stomachs, in turtles stomachs and gut;
- Another protocol for fish stomachs is now included
- Should invertebrates be included? In the chapter biota? In the chapter of microplastics? There is already a handling for invertebrates monitoring included in the microplastics chapter.
- Plastics as nesting material with associated entanglement mortality rates will be specified in a dedicated protocol
- Marine mammals and food chain transfer are considered in short paragraphs, but no protocols will be developed
- Discussion about uncertainty regarding entanglement – it may be difficult to distinguish between entanglement from an active fishing gear (not ML) from a lost/discarded one. Entanglement rates are to be covered by a paragraph in this chapter but no protocol recommended at this stage, but maybe in a next step.

**Results from Break-out session:**

Chapter will include protocols on ingestion of litter by birds, turtles and fish and plastics as nesting material with associated entanglement rates of seabirds . Monitoring entanglement of marine mammals was once again discussed. Some paragraphs making reference to ingestion/entanglement of marine mammals, explaining the pro and cons of their use for monitoring.

**CHAPTER 6: Monitoring Protocols- Microlitter (*R. Thompson, plenary and group discussions*)**

Brief overview was presented about the latest version of the chapter. In particular the blue box: about Standard protocols for sampling intertidal beach sediments (page 12).

**Main discussion items:**

- Regarding sampling, there is no costs information but is it needed?
- And what is the particle level for routine monitoring?
- Suggestion that an indicator with simple methods: practical side, cost effective, and another level for research purposes. The Pros & Cons about the two approaches must be considered.

Discussion on mesh size and retained particles (e.g. a filament that is only retained depending on the position it crosses the mesh) and on how to count microlitter with a size smaller than the mesh rate; use techniques as

standard for (micro)benthos research. The idea is raised to bring the input from external experts. L de Vrees alerted that the group is already quite large but naturally we can invite expertise to input in specific issues when needed.

**Results from Break-out Session:**

- The group agreed on size ranges: 0-100, 100-200, 200-300 micron. All below 5 mm will be divided in size ranges.
- All that is retained in the filters is counted. Heather alerted to the need to establish clear size records and possibly shape, otherwise only the count can undermine the results (increase fragmentation = higher number of items = higher nr of litter).
- Per asked for the micro group to check the references made in the 1st chapter. Some discussions on fragmentation rates and factors that can affect the variation of microlitter.
- No MS have reported baselines for microlitter, except Greece and Latvia but not based on national data.
- In order to cope with the “Adriatic Sea”- problem on algae, it is proposed to monitor outside the plankton season

**CHAPTER 7: Monitoring Data availability (updating and continuation of existing table) (plenary discussion).**

There hasn't been much update made since the 2011 report. The group decided to leave this chapter out of the draft version, to continue the collection of information of available datasets and to update any new additions in the final version, later in the year.

C. Belchior suggested that, in terms of data reporting and management, linkages could be made in relation to the ongoing work EEA / WISE Marine paper under preparation regarding datasets.

**CHAPTER 8: Standardization of litter categories across indicators (David Fleet, plenary and group discussions):**

**Main discussion items:**

- The master list should help: to validate the results of the surveys, to identify sources, to identify impacts.
- The master list ≠ a recording sheet.
- The master list is divided in four levels starting with the material
  - o E.g. plastic –bottle – drinking bottle - packaging
- A procedure for new items should be developed, because the list might need periodical review.

**Results from Break-out session:**

- It was suggested and agreed that since the master list of categories includes parameters that somehow link to sources, which should be developed in line with the sources chapters (next year), in this first report only the categories and level 2 parameter will be included.
- Joana V. brought attention that in the pilot study “4 Seas” the authors developed parameters (e.g type of packaging and duration of use of items) that the group should consider to adopt and recommend in the 2<sup>nd</sup> report but we should make reference to it in this 1<sup>st</sup> report. The group accepted to use the system developed by the service contract of Arcadis and EUCC, which can be adopted to support the identification of sources and other important aspects that can be considered in strategies/measures regarding items. The group asked if the Arcadis/EUCC “Access”-application could be used to analyse all available OSPAR data.
- New categories (mainly sub-categories) were added, as some of the initial ones included items that can originate from very different sources. Attribution of material to “Sewage-related” items.

The discussion about the chapter of the Protocols report has been concluded and tasks leaders agreed to coordinate the needed revisions towards the deadline.

**7) PRESENTATION OF STATISTICAL ANALYSES OF OSPAR BEACH LITTER MONITORING TIME SERIES**

Marcus Schulz, University of Osnabrück

M. Schulz presented the work done on the statistical analysis of OSPAR data in order to see if there are spatial and temporal differences. The method starts by selecting a sub-set of items (input variables) for analysis, as some of them the abundance was close to 0. Cluster analysis (ward) was used. Some beaches showed significant decrease in some of the items, others increase (e.g. Denmark and Spain) but others no significant changes. Correlation between sea-floor and floating litter (2006-2008) in the North Sea is poor. Typical Atlantic (Celtic Seas, Biscay bay) show a low during spring, while in NS the peak is during spring (for strapping bands). François G. corroborated this trend/profile for the Biscay. Monitoring minimum of 3 years, for generation of 12 surveys.

## **8) CLEANSEA PROJECT PRESENTATION Heather Leslie, IVM**

H. Leslie presented the CleanSea Project. F. Galgani congratulated the project and welcomed Heather Leslie to the TSG. Comment regarding the timing of the project (1 Jan 2013-31 Dec 2015) as the TSG was “waiting” for info to be produced by the project that could feed into the group. H. Leslie explained that the Consortium is aware of the MSFD timing and TSG progress and will make deliverables available whenever possible and will keep the TSG updated. The overlap between the current TSG work and the CleanSea Project research is not that extensive. The negotiation phase with EC took quite some time but the outcomes of the project (in terms of monitoring, research, measures) will also feed into the MSFD 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle. Finally it was explained that F4L and riverine input litter data are part of the project activities.

## **9) EYE ON EARTH, MARINE LITTER WATCH PROJECT Constança Belchior, EEA**

C. Belchior presented the Eye on Earth – Marine Litter Watch initiative from EEA, which is about the development of an APP (for phones and tablets) to conduct beach surveys and directly upload information in database. The APP will be tested this summer and will be officially launched in 2014.

**All PPTs are uploaded in basecamp.**

At conclusion of day 1, F. Galgani briefly presented a system ([www.Liquid.com/news...testimonies](http://www.Liquid.com/news...testimonies)) – autonomous floating device developed by a millionaire to record sound of whales - “wave gliding”. The system has coupled a photo or video camera to this device, which can record litter.

## **10) WORK PROGRAM 2013/2014 PRIORITIES**

Topics for the next phase, to be realised within the mandate period until end of 2014:

10. Sources – General
11. Sources - Land based input
18. Sources - Riverine Litter – monitoring, WFD link
12. Sources - Sea based input
13. Harm caused by Marine Litter
17. Research

Another TASK that may be added will be Data Management – Dyke working group/ EMODNET/ bottom-up approach the TSG should suggest what data needs to be collected.

Regarding the task and reporting of TSG ML the working process remains voluntary, except for the support team. Next to this process, the EC framework contracts could order work on e.g. detailed protocols, research items. Finally PCG will decide on how the funding will be allocated.

### **10. Sources - General**

The group discussed openly about main questions to be addressed. There is not yet a Task leader appointed – so first the group will identify what needs to be done. In conclusion of the discussion a shortlist of questions, accepted by the group, has been summed up by P. Nilsson and uploaded in Basecamp, which include: which are the sources (generally known), which are the users leading to sources, which are the main pathways, which



are the most important in terms of quantity and harm and how to assess it at regional, national and European level, how to link this knowledge to measures and how to prioritise them.

### **18. Sources - Riverine Litter – monitoring, WFD link**

G. Hanke presented basic assumptions for riverine litter monitoring. Some data is available from UK, DE and NL. It should be taken into consideration to open basecamp for third parties that can be invited as riverine litter experts.

### **13. Harm caused by Marine Litter**

This chapter will be part of the 2nd part of the final report. Nevertheless the following items have been discussed for consideration later:

P. Nilsson : there is a need to clarify what we mean by “harm” and possibly approach it from a Risk Assessment perspective – what is the potential impact when you expose, how likely it is to be exposed (the severity when it happens and how likely it is to happen). The precautionary principle could be applied, to avoid –as with cigarettes – six decades of population research.

J. van Franeker: sub-lethal effects, even if not with impact at the population level should be of concern.

P. Nilsson: where do we lack knowledge on impacts? The answer to this question will pinpoint the research needs.

G. Hanke: Example on chemical pollutants: establishing of concentrations that cause effect and monitoring if the concentrations in the environment are above or below these thresholds.

P. Nilsson: we can perhaps use the risk (as in toxicology) to ML.

S. Werner: in the TSG-UN we have large discussions on this matter and we are trying to include the precautionary principle. We should try and see how we can use the same approach here. The concept of harm should also be extended to economic and social harm.

François G.: the extension should be related to the MSFD, how MS are considering harm. In France, harm includes also the economic impact.

J. Veiga: MARLISCO (University of Plymouth) is conducting a survey on public perceptions regarding ML, which includes perceptions on harm and risk, results of this survey may be included in the final report.

As follow-up to this brainstorm, additional data and ideas need to be collected from the TSG ML group through basecamp discussions.

### **17. Research needs/priorities and availability of data**

G. Hanke referred that often MS have used scientific work in their initial assessments. There is a grey area in terms of what is monitoring and what research is. In terms of research the problem will be the funding but with the Horizon 2020 there may be opportunities. L. de Vrees stated that in the Initial Assessments it has been asked what the knowledge gaps are and how these can be addressed. By the end of the year, it is expected to be known what the common gaps are and which can be addressed by monitoring and which ones by research. Then the research needs identified in the previous report should be revise again to single out which ones are the short-term needs. S. Werner suggested that perhaps info on the contents of national research & development projects can be collected by this group. L. Oosterbaan mentioned that within OSPAR there is a list of initiatives and programmes on-going in the area and perhaps we can extend it to other parts of Europe through the TSG members. L. Oosterbaan will upload it and members will update it to other countries.

For this 1<sup>st</sup> report it will be mentioning some questions/needs in relation to monitoring and the topics that will

be addressed in the next part.

It has been agreed that the chairs will prepare a list of topics and sub-topics (table of contents) – work until 2014, to be discussed on basecamp.

## **11) OPEN DISCUSSION ON GROUP PRIORITIES**

- G. Hanke alerted to taking care and consistency in where info is being uploaded in Basecamp, info for specific topics should be put in the adequate section.
- Deadlines will be posted on Basecamp and a call for Task-leaders to coordinate the feedback on time from participants.
- M. Ferreira requested the Task-leaders to maintain as much as possible the format of the templates and that the final report should have a limit of ~80 pages, which currently is much longer. G. Hanke emphasizes that first we should collect all the needed info and then check if there are redundant parts and if some of them can go into annexes.
- There is not final agreement on title of the report however it should contain “monitoring” and “ML” and “guidance” rather than “guidelines”.
- In terms of costs, they should be provided as person-hours and not €. L. Oosterbaan will send a targeted email to contributors which still need to supply information on costs related to the protocols. In the 1<sup>st</sup> chapter there will be a summary from all protocols and in each protocol a special section related to its costs.
- G. Hanke asked the protocol leaders to post just the title of the protocols, so we have a list of all of them and to be able to give them a formal identification number.
- References should be cited in the format of the previous TSG report.
- If there the authors of the protocols are keen or having key messages, issues (e.g. this methodology relies on the supply of fulmars found/turtles found by rescue centres, etc. please mentioned them. Based on general key messages from authors, we can attempt to make a general conclusions chapter.
- A general introductory part to the report will be compiled and all chapter introductory parts will be harmonised.
- The CIRCA-BC version, would it be officially as a draft version to be submitted **8<sup>th</sup> July** and the FINAL version is to be submitted to the MSCG in November.

Sources; Harm; Data availability & data management; research needs will be addressed and discussed on Basecamp. For this a new groups and contributors will be appointed. Basecamp will be adjusted to reflect these topics and sections and ask contributors to upload material. The chairs will work on template and subchapters.

The group supports to continue work as done previously and the task leaders will take up specific topics. In addition will be supported by:

- A better definition of subchapters (e.g. sources), for practical reasons
- A request for volunteer task leaders
- The chair will take initiative, once the priorities on part 1 have been adopted.

## **12) WRAP UP, NEXT STEPS, NEXT MEETING**

### **Next meeting of MSFD GES TSG Marine Litter:**

Next meeting towards the end of the year (2<sup>nd</sup> week December 11-13, Wednesday-Friday) has been proposed to be held in Lisbon, Portugal. It is a strategic location, to allow involvement by less participating countries. The Chairs will first approach the representatives in the TSG and the secretariat, M. Ferreira and with support of C. Belchior (EEA) will follow-up.

The group thanked Stefanie W. and colleagues warmly for the great organisation and hosting of this meeting in Hamburg. The meeting was closed by Francois Galgani.