HELCOM experiences on granting exemptions under the BWM Convention

Webinar on the implementation of the BWMC in the Mediterranean region
23 September 2020
Cooperation on clean and safe shipping in the Baltic

- Helsinki Commission (HELCOM) work since 1970s
- Work on effective and harmonized implementation of IMO rules (Convention Annex 4, Reg. 1)
- Addresses also emerging issues
- All nine Coastal Countries and the EU
- Industry and NGOs participate as Observers
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HELCOM MARITIME Group

- 1-2 Annual Meetings
- Ca. 50 participants/meeting from all the BS country and the EU administrations and ministries, Observers
- Sub groups:
  - HELCOM/OSPAR TG BALLAST (Ballast Water)
  - SAFE NAV (Safety of Navigation)
  - GREEN TEAM (Green Technology and Alternative Fuels Platform for Sustainable Shipping)
  - AIS EWG (developing and maintaining the regional AIS network since 2003)
Non-indigenous species

What is the status?

~140 non-indigenous species or species with unknown means of arrival have so far been recorded in the Baltic Sea.

12 new non-indigenous species were introduced to the Baltic Sea between 2011 and 2016.

0 primary introductions of non-indigenous species due to human activities is the agreed threshold value for good status.
HELCOM Ballast Water Road Map 2007

- 12 action points adopted as part of the 2007 HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan
- Focus on challenges specific for the Baltic Sea (shallow waters, relatively small sea area)
- To facilitate ratification and harmonized regional implementation of the BWMC (Unified A-4 implementation)
- Concluded that Ballast water exchange not a management option for intra Baltic shipping
- Cooperation with the North Sea (OSPAR)
HELCOM Ballast Water Road Map
2007 – 2016

– 9 action points adopted by HODs
– Relevance of HELCOM/OSPAR Cooperation (TG BALLAST):
  
  • Continuing working on the Joint HELCOM/OSPAR Harmonised Procedure for the Contracting Parties of OSPAR and HELCOM on the granting of exemptions under BWM Convention (JHP) and further developing the online decision support tool
  
  • Further studying the new concept of the “same risk area” - which is currently being discussed at IMO - in relation to the JHP, avoiding pre-empting any decisions at IMO MEPC or PPR.
  
  • Examining if the database on port survey results can be coupled with or linked to the data obtained from the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) monitoring for Descriptor 2 in order to improve the current limitation of data availability on non-indigenous species (NIS).
Voluntary guidance on BWE (2008-):

- Joint HELCOM/OSPAR guidance on voluntary BWE in specified areas:
  - North-East Atlantic – OSPAR area and the Baltic Sea, IMO circular BWM.2/Circ.14., 1 April 2008
  - Baltic Sea - OSPAR area, IMO circular BWM.2/Circ.22., 1 January 2010

- Joint HELCOM/OSPAR/REMPEC guidance on voluntary BWE in specified areas:
  - Mediterranean - the North Atlantic/the Baltic Sea, IMO in circular BWM.2/Circ.39, 1 October 2012
2010 HELCOM A-4 Guidance

- Agreed in Moscow Ministerial Meeting 2010
- Baltic Sea guidance on A-4 exemptions
- General principles and starting point
- Little data on ports available
- Somewhat difficult to apply directly

*Image: Andrzej Krauze*

By Marta Ruiz, HELCOM
Wednesday, September 23, 2020
HELCOM projects (2010-)

- Further development of 2010 Guidance
- Biological survey protocols
- Testing protocols in ports (sampling)
- Target species selection
- Online decision support tool for A-4 risk assessments
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HELCOM-OSPAR cooperation

- Joint Baltic and North Atlantic approaches to BWM implementation for benefit of the sea and shipping
- BWE guidance was a good start (2007-)
- Joint HELCOM-OSPAR task group on risk assessments established in 2012:
  - Joint HELCOM-OSPAR guidelines for BWM A-4 exemptions
  - Other issues to ensure good implementation
HELCOM-OSPAR Joint Harmonised Procedure for BWM Convention A-4 exemptions

– A regionally harmonized method
– A comprehensive system:
  • Port surveys
  • Target species & selection
  • Risk assessment model
  • Database and web-tool
  • Administrative issues
– Adopted by HELCOM and OSPAR in 2013
– Under continuous review
1. Port surveys of NIS following port survey protocol
2. ...or access to the results of such surveys done by others.
3. Run online risk assessment:
   - Step 1: Risk Assessment Algorithm (basis for DST): based on 2 criteria: difference in **water salinity** between ports/locations being visited and the presence of **target species** in either port/location being visited by the vessel.
   - Step 2: Final detailed risk assessment, including additional aspects
4. Attach the results to applications to port states
5. National detailed considerations and consultations
6. (Clarifications)
7. Decisions
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Note on port surveys

- Practical methodology with sampling from land
- Comparable results
- Minimal costs (per port: ca. 50 men hrs sampling + analyze ca. 50 biological samples)
- Results valid for re-use (maximum of five years).
The almost ready updated HELCOM/OSPAR BWE Decision Support Tool

Check the potential risk on available routes

You can do this by selecting in the drop-down menus (below) a donor port and recipient port for a route among those ports where there is comparable data.

Select donor port
- Select a port

Select recipient port
- Select a port

Run Risk Analysis
## Target species for BWE

### Information

- **By HELCOM staff**
- **Wednesday, September 23, 2020**
- **“Target species” for BWE**

### Ballast Water Exemptions Decision Support Tool

#### Image of the Decision Support Tool

### Table of Target Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Salinity min</th>
<th>Salinity max</th>
<th>Health Impact</th>
<th>Health Impact Source</th>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Environmental Impact Source</th>
<th>Economic Impact</th>
<th>Economic Impact Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandrium minutum</td>
<td>Target Joint</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Responsible for creating 'red tide'. It is a known paralytic shellfish poisoning (PSP) toxin-producing species. Toxin can affect humans</td>
<td>Hallencreutz, E.M. 1998: <a href="https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1502457/">https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1502457/</a></td>
<td>The PSP toxins can affect and be found in molluscs and zooplankton.</td>
<td>Katsanevakis et al. 2014: <a href="https://dx.doi.org/10.3354/edm-00704">https://dx.doi.org/10.3354/edm-00704</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandrium coffeaeforme</td>
<td>Target HELCOM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Responsible for creating 'red tide'. It is a known paralytic shellfish poisoning (PSP) toxin-producing species. Toxin can affect humans</td>
<td>Algebase: <a href="http://www.algabase.org/search/species?species_id=29912">www.algabase.org/search/species?species_id=29912</a></td>
<td>The PSP toxins can affect and be found in molluscs and zooplankton.</td>
<td><a href="https://dx.doi.org/10.3354/edm-00704">Katsanevakis et al. 1996</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acutaria anaxioides</td>
<td>Target Joint</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Marked habitat alteration through the construction of byssal mats on the surface of soft sediments and these mats alter dramatically resident macrobenthal assemblages</td>
<td>Katsanevakis et al. 2014: <a href="https://dx.doi.org/10.3354/edm-00704">https://dx.doi.org/10.3354/edm-00704</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing a route

Check the potential risk on available routes

You can do this by selecting in the drop down menus (below) a donor port and recipient port for a route among those ports where there is comparable data.

Select donor port
- Gdańsk (GBA)

Select recipient port
- Kokkola (KOK)

Get PDF report

Risk assessment calculation for route from HELCOM area, port Gdańsk (GBA) to HELCOM area, port Kokkola (KOK).

High risk

Route details:
1) Donor port Gdańsk (GBA) minimum salinity = 2.64 PSU, maximum salinity = 7.22 PSU. Recipient port Kokkola (KOK) minimum salinity = 3.8 PSU, maximum salinity = 3.9 PSU.
2) Target species for region HELCOM in donor port not present in recipient port:
- Cossapogon asperis
- Eupsophus alleni
- Diastoma gregaria
- Paleomon macropodulus
- Synoplosis harpae
- Nephropsis mackrellarum
- Oligothyrsus affinis

Donor port salinity < 0.5 psu and recipient port salinity > 30 psu or donor port salinity > 30 psu and recipient port salinity < 0.5 psu

Is one or more Target Species present in the donor port but not in the recipient port?
Testing a route

Ballast Water Exemptions Decision Support Tool
A joint regional tool to identify low risk routes for
IMO Ballast Water Convention exemptions (A-4)

Risk assessment calculation

Donor port
Gdańsk (GDA) - HELCOM

Recipient port
Kokkola (KOK) - HELCOM

High risk
Route details

1) Salinity range in ports:
Gdańsk (GDA): 2.64 - 7.22 PSU
Kokkola (KOK): 2.3 - 3.9 PSU

2) Target species for region HELCOM in donor port not present in recipient port:
Cercopagis pengoi
Palaemon elegans
Dreissena polymorpha
Palaemon macrodactylus
Rhithropanopeus harrisi
Neogobius melanostomus
Dikerogammarus villosus

Risk Assessment Decision (23.09.2020 09:34): High risk
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Thank you!