

EPUNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.22/Inf.7



14 January 2016 Original: English

19th Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean and its Protocols

Athens, Greece, 9-12 February 2016

Agenda item 3: Thematic decisions

Draft Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Guidance

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 to request additional copies.

Note from the Secretariat

In line with Decision IG.21.3, as agreed at the 18th Meeting of the Contracting Parties, the Secretariat was requested to "prepare in cooperation with MAP components and competent partner organizations, through a participatory process involving Contracting Parties and the scientific community, a Monitoring and Assessment Methodological Guidance for consideration during the first meeting of EcAp CG in 2014 and a draft Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme to be presented at the 19th Meeting of the Contracting Parties for adoption".

In order to meet the timeline set out in Decision IG.21/3, an Integrated Correspondence Group (Integrated EcAp CorGest) Meeting was held in February 2014, that gave specific recommendations for the future Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme, agreed on a list of common indicators, which would form the basis of the Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme (UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.390/4).

Following this key step, the Correspondence Groups on Monitoring (CORMONs) started their work, with the aim to further specify the common indicators, discuss methodologies and parameters related to them and as such form the core of the Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme.

Three CORMON Meetings took place in between May-July 2014, on Pollution and Litter; on Coastal Ecosystems and Landscapes and Hydrographical conditions; and, on Biodiversity and Fisheries. These meetings provided important guidance on and input to the draft Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Guidance of the Secretariat.

The 4th EcAp Coordination Group took place following these specific monitoring and assessment related meetings, in October 2014 and it provided further comments, suggestions, political guidance on the Draft Monitoring and Assessment Methodological Guidance (UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.401/3) and mandated informal online expert groups, with the leadership of volunteering Contracting Parties, to address the outstanding monitoring and assessment questions, with the overall aim to be able to meet the timelime of the COP 18 EcAp Decision and agree on an Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme by COP 19.

Based on the outcomes of the above meetings and of further input of these informal online working groups, the Secretariat has prepared the "Main elements of a Draft Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme", which was discussed in an Integrated CORMON Meeting in April 2015.

This Integrated CORMON Meeting provided further useful input into the development of the draft Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme and mandated the informal online working groups to continue their work on montiroign and assessment specifics, while the draft to be further addressed also in the upcoming Focal Points Meetings (MED POL, PAP/RAC, REMPEC and SPA/RAC Focal Points Meetings, which took place in between May-July 2015).

This draft Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Guidance is building on all the above expert level work, input and aims to set out the monitoring and assessment specifics of the agreed common indicators (including assessment criteria, when available).

As such, together with the draft Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme of the Mediterranean Coast and Sea and Related Assessment Criteria (UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.420/3, the draft IMAP) it aims to lay down the principles for the update of the existing national monitoring and assessment programmes, following the agreed common indicators.

It provides to Contracting Parties guidance on methodologies, monitoring and assessment techniques, specifics, for each common indicator and analyses key outstanding issues also in an intergrated manner.

While it will be a common basis for the development of the national integrated monitoring and assessment programmes, during the initial phase of IMAP, it will also be further developed in the

upcoming CORMON groups, in order to address still outstanding issues, in light of future scientific and methodological developments, best practices of Contracting Parties.			

Table of contents

1.	Setting the context	1
2.	The common indicators	2
3.	IMAP Cross- cutting issues.	4
	3.1. The integrated approach of IMAP	4
	3.2. Good Environmental Status as the underlying aim of IMAP	7
	3.3. Assessment Criteria	10
4.	Key Principles of the Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme	17
5.	Aiming to cost efficiency in relation to socio-economic benefits of monitoring	19
6.	Data and information sharing	20
	6.1. The Shared Environmental Information System (SEIS)	20
	6.2. The Group on Earth Observations (GEO), which has defined the following Data Sharing Principles	20
	6.3. The Global Monitoring for Environment and Security (GMES), which establishes a full, open and free data policy	
7.	Quality Assurance and Quality Control	21
II. N	IONITORING AND ASSESSMENT OF EO1: BIODIVERSITY	23
1.	The application of the risk based approach to biodiversity monitoring	23
2.	Monitoring and assessment of biodiversity related common indicators	25
	2.1. Specific considerations on assessing biodiversity common indicators	26
3.	Methodology and standardization	27
4.	Quality control/ quality assurance	27
5.	Monitoring for the biodiversity common indicators	28
	5.1. Elaborating habitat distributional range (Common Indicator 1: Habitat distributional range).	28
	5.1.1 Locating and assessing benthic habitats	28
	5.1.2 Evaluating the status of habitat areal extent through the indicator on area of habitat loss (in line with the operational objective that key coastal and marine habitats are not being lost)	•
	5.1.3 Assessment – specific considerations	
	5.1.4 Cost-effectiveness	
	5.1.5 Further work	
	5.2. Elaborating the condition of habitat defining species and communities (Common indicator 2: Condition of the habitat's typical species and communities)	
	=	

5.2.2 Cost efficiency	33
5.2.3 Further work	34
5.2.4 Special considerations for elaborating Benthic Biotic Indices	34
5.2.5 Special considerations in relation to elaborating the changes in plankton fun types	
5.2.6 Special considerations in relation to assessing the changes in plankton function types	
5.2.7 Further work needs in relation to assessing the changes in plankton function	al types 41
5.3. Elaborating species distributional range (Common indicator 3: Species distributional range)	ange)41
5.3.1 Introduction	41
5.3.2 Monitoring strategy and framework	41
5.3.3 Assessing species distributional range	47
5.4. Determining population abundance (Common indicator 4: Population abundance of se species)	
5.4.1 Introduction	
5.4.2 Monitoring strategy and framework	48
5.4.3 (Distribution) for information on this technique	50
5.4.4 Summary and Evaluation	50
5.4.5 Assessing the population abundance of selected species	51
5.5. Elaborating population demographic characteristics (Common Indicator 5 on populati demographic characteristics(e.g. body size or age class structure, sex ratio, fecundity survival/'mortality rates related to marine mammals, seabirds, marine reptiles)	on rates,
5.5.1 Introduction	52
5.5.2 Monitoring strategy and framework	52
5.5.3 Summary of further work for Common Indicators 5.3-5.5 in relation to sea t marine mammals and marine birds	urtles,
III. MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT METHODLOGICAL GUIDANCE ON EO2:	NON-
INDIGENOUS SPECIES	55
1. Introduction	55
1.1. Definition of key terms	
1.2. Invasive species in the Mediterranean	
1.2.1 Pathways of introduction of non-indigenous species in the Mediterranean Se	
1.2.2 Climate change effects on the spread of NIS in the Mediterranean	
2. Monitoring Strategy	
2.1. Selection of monitoring locations	
2.2. Deciding what to monitor	60
2.2.1 Creation and regular updating of a national database of invasive species	60

	2.2.2 Collection of socioeconomic information	60
	2.3. NIS, IAS data collection method	60
	2.3.1 Rapid Assessment Surveys (RAS)	62
	2.3.2 Citizen Science support to monitoring NIS	62
3.	Monitoring to address Common Indicator 6:"Trends in abundance, temporal occurrence and spatidistribution of non- indigenous species, particularly invasive non indigenous species, notably in rareas in relation to the main vectors and pathways of spreading of such species"	isk
	3.1. Status of development	63
	3.2. Selection of parameter/metric	63
	3.2.1 Abundance of non-indigenous species	63
	3.2.2 Temporal occurrence and spatial distribution of non-indigenous species	64
	3.3. Assessing common indicator 6	65
	3.4. Concluding remarks	65
	IV. MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT METHODLOGICAL GUIDANCE ON EO5:	
E	UTROPHICATION	66
1.	Introduction	66
2.	The choice of indicators for monitoring and assessing eutrophication	66
	2.1. The choice of eutrophication indicators to be monitored under the LBS Protocol and the draft Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme (Common indicators 13 and 14, Concentration of key nutrients in the water column and Chlorophyll-a concentration in the water column)	
3.	Monitoring strategy	68
	3.1. Considerations regarding eutrophication monitoring methods	68
	3.2. The frequency of eutrophication monitoring and location of sampling sites	70
	3.3. Characterization of Ecological Quality Status of coastal marine waters with regard to eutrophication	71
4.	Development of assessment thresholds and identifying reference conditions for eutrophication in order to be able to monitor the achievement of GES	
	V. MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT METHODLOGICAL GUIDANCE ON EO9:	
C	ONTAMINANTS	77
1.	Introduction	77
	Monitoring Strategy for contaminants and effects (Applicable to all contaminants related indicatorie Common Indicators 17-21	rs,
	2.1. The risk approach and precautionary principle	78
	2.2. Selecting locations for environmental monitoring of contaminants and biological effects	
	2.3. Geographic scale of monitoring and assessment	79
	2.4. Monitoring frequency	80

3.	Development of assessment criteria for the definition of threshold limit values for chemical environmental status monitoring of contaminants in order to be able to determine the achievement of GES
	3.1. Forward procedure for monitoring the achievement of GES for contaminants in the
	Mediterranean marine environment. 82
4.	Monitoring Biological Effects
	4.1. Assessing Biological Effects
5.	Monitoring acute pollution events for the quantification of acute chemical spills, specifically of oil and its products, but not excluding others (Common Indicator 19Occurrence, origin and where possible extent of acute pollution events)
6.	Monitoring of contaminants in fish and other seafood used for human consumption (Common Indicator 20 Actual levels of contaminants that have been detected and number of contaminants which have exceeded maximum regulatory levels in commonly consumed seafood)
7.	Monitoring microbiological pollution (Common Indicator 21: Percentage of intestinal enterococci concentration measurements within established standards)
8.	Quality Assurance and Quality Control of contaminants monitoring
9.	Reference methods and guidelines for marine pollution monitoring under UNEP/MAP- UNEP/MAP MED POL
/I.	MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT METHODLOGICAL GUIDANCE ON EO10: MARINE
L	TTER93
1.	Introduction93
2.	Establishing a monitoring framework for marine litter in the Mediterranean
	2.1. Some general considerations on spatial distribution of survey sites: site selection strategies 95
	2.2. Some general considerations regarding Quality Assessment/Quality Control approaches and requirements
3.	Monitoring of litter washed ashore and/or deposited on coastlines (Common indicator 22, Trends in
	the amount of litter washed ashore and/or deposited on coastlines, ie Beach Litter)
	3.1. Introduction to Beach Litter
	3.2. Categories of marine litter on the beaches
	3.3. Requirements of a harmonised protocol
	3.3.1 Amounts, composition, distribution and sources of Beach Litter
	3.3.2 Strategy for monitoring beach litter
	3.4. Quality Assessment /Quality Control for beach litter
	3.5. Conclusion
4.	Monitoring of litter at the sea (Common Indicator 23 Trends in the amount of litter in the water column including microplastics and on the seafloor)
	4.1. Introduction to floating litter
	4.2. Scope and key questions to be addressed
	4.3. Existing approaches for visual ship-based observation of floating litter

	4.3.1 Discussion of observation protocol elements	103
	4.4. Strategy for monitoring of floating litter	104
	4.4.1 Source attribution of floating marine litter	104
	4.4.2 Spatial distribution of monitoring	104
	4.4.3 Timing of floating marine litter monitoring	104
	4.5. Visual monitoring of floating litter	104
	4.6. Visual monitoring of floating litter	105
	4.6.1 Observation	106
	4.6.2 Reporting of monitoring results	106
	4.6.3 Quality assessment/Quality control	107
	4.6.4 Equipment	107
	4.6.5 Implementation of the TSG-ML Protocol	107
	4.7. Other methodologies	107
	4.8. Conclusions	108
5.	Seafloor Litter (Common Indicator 23, Trends in the amount of litter in the water column including microplastics and on the seafloor)	_
	5.1. Introduction to seafloor litter	108
	5.2. Scope and key questions to be addressed	109
	5.3. Monitoring the shallow sea-floor (<20m)	109
	5.3.1 Technical requirements	109
	5.3.2 Use of volunteers in shallow waters surveys	110
	5.4. Monitoring the Sea-floor (20-800m)	110
	5.5. Litter categories for Sea-floor	112
	5.6. Complementary sea-floor monitoring – Video camera	112
	5.7. Quality Assessment /Quality Control for sea-floor litter	112
		112
	5.8. Conclusions	

预览已结束, 完整报告链接和二维码如下:

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_15865

