




OSPAR
COMMISSION

2016 Status Report on the OSPAR Network of Marine Protected Areas



OSPAR Convention

The Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (the “OSPAR Convention”) was opened for signature at the Ministerial Meeting of the former Oslo and Paris Commissions in Paris on 22 September 1992. The Convention entered into force on 25 March 1998. It has been ratified by Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom and approved by the European Union and Spain.

Convention OSPAR

La Convention pour la protection du milieu marin de l'Atlantique du Nord-Est, dite Convention OSPAR, a été ouverte à la signature à la réunion ministérielle des anciennes Commissions d'Oslo et de Paris, à Paris le 22 septembre 1992. La Convention est entrée en vigueur le 25 mars 1998. La Convention a été ratifiée par l'Allemagne, la Belgique, le Danemark, la Finlande, la France, l'Irlande, l'Islande, le Luxembourg, la Norvège, les Pays-Bas, le Portugal, le Royaume-Uni de Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord, la Suède et la Suisse et approuvée par l'Union européenne et l'Espagne.

Acknowledgements

This report has been edited by Dr. Janos Hennicke, Secretary of OSPAR's Intersessional Correspondence Group on Marine Protected Areas (ICG-MPA), Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union (NABU), c/o German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN), Isle of Vilm, 18581 Putbus, Germany.

Chapter 1 (Current Status) was produced by Dr. Janos Hennicke. Figures were made by Mirko Hauswirth (BfN) and guidance was provided by Prof. Dr. Henning von Nordheim (Convenor of OSPAR ICG-MPA; BfN). Chapter 2 (Ecological Coherence) was produced by Benjamin Ponge, Agence Aires Marines Protégées (AAMP), France. Chapter 3 (Management) was produced by Pete Chaniotis and Jon Davies, Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC), United Kingdom. The report was finalised in collaboration with colleagues from ICG-MPA and the OSPAR Secretariat. All information presented is based on data provided by Contracting Parties.

Cover illustration

The illustration on the front page was created by Mirko Hauswirth (BfN).

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Background..... | 3 |
| 1 Status of the OSPAR Network of MPAs | 5 |
| 1.1 OSPAR MPAs under National Jurisdiction..... | 5 |
| 1.1.1 Distribution of OSPAR MPAs in the national waters of CPs | 5 |
| 1.1.2 Distribution of OSPAR MPAs across OSPAR Regions..... | 10 |
| 1.2 OSPAR MPAs in areas beyond the limits of national EEZs | 13 |
| 1.2.1 Background | 13 |
| 1.2.2 Establishment and nomination of OSPAR MPAs in areas beyond the limits of national EEZs | 14 |
| 1.2.3 Jurisdiction of OSPAR MPAs in areas beyond the limits of national EEZs..... | 15 |
| 3 Management of the OSPAR Network of MPAs | 33 |
| Annex I – List of OSPAR MPAs | 45 |
| Annex II – Evolution of the OSPAR Network of MPAs..... | 58 |
| 12 th Reporting Period of new MPAs (2 October 2015 – 1 October 2016) | 58 |
| 11 th Reporting Period of new MPAs (2 October 2014 – 1 October 2015) | 58 |
| 10 th Reporting Period of new MPAs (2 October 2013 – 1 October 2014) | 58 |
| 9 th Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 January 2013 – 1 October 2013) | 58 |
| 8 th Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 January 2012 – 31 December 2012) | 58 |
| 7 th Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 January 2011 – 31 December 2011) | 59 |
| 6 th Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 June 2010 – 31 December 2010) | 59 |
| 5 th Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 January 2009 – 31 May 2010) | 59 |
| 4 th Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 January 2008 – 31 December 2008) | 61 |
| 3 rd Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 January 2007 – 31 December 2007) | 62 |
| 2 nd Reporting Period of new MPAs (10 April 2006 – 31 December 2006) | 62 |
| 1 st Reporting Period of new MPAs (2005 - 9 April 2006) | 63 |
| Annex III – Historical process of the elaboration of proposals for OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ/in the High Seas | 64 |
| Annex IV – List of Abbreviations | 68 |

Executive Summary

OSPAR Recommendation 2003/3¹, amended by OSPAR Recommendation 2010/2, on a network of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) sets out the goal of OSPAR Contracting Parties (CPs) to continue the establishment of the OSPAR Network of MPAs in the North-East Atlantic and to ensure that:

- a. *by 2012 it is ecologically coherent, includes sites representative of all biogeographic regions in the OSPAR Maritime Area, and is consistent with the CBD target for effectively conserved marine and coastal ecological regions;*
- b. *by 2016 it is well managed (i.e. coherent management measures have been set up and are being implemented for such MPAs that have been designated up to 2010).*

This report aims to summarise the information made available by OSPAR CPs on their respective MPAs nominated to the OSPAR Commission and on this basis assess the progress towards overall status, management and ecological coherence of the OSPAR MPA network.

Since 2005, all 12 CPs bordering the North-East Atlantic have nominated sites to the OSPAR Network of MPAs in their national waters as well as collectively in Areas Beyond National jurisdiction (ABNJ). The contributions by CPs differ substantially regarding distribution of sites across coastal and offshore waters as well regarding overall coverage of their national waters by OSPAR MPAs.

By 1 October 2016, the OSPAR Network of MPAs comprised 448 MPAs, including 7 MPAs situated in ABNJ. Collectively, these sites have a total surface area of 806,472 km² covering 5.9 % of the OSPAR Maritime Area.

Since the last Status Report in 2014, 35 MPAs with a surface area of more than 18,000 km² were added to the OSPAR Network of MPAs. The new MPAs were nominated by the United Kingdom (25 MPAs), Spain (2 MPAs), Portugal (5 MPAs) and Norway (3 MPAs) – increasing the overall percentage covered by OSPAR MPAs from 5.8 % to 5.9 %. No additional MPAs were nominated in ABNJ.

The vast majority of OSPAR MPAs have been designated in territorial waters, which show a good overall coverage with 16.7 %. The area beyond the limits of national Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZ), i.e. the High Seas, the Area and the Extended Continental Shelf (ECS) areas, is covered by 8.9 % and the lowest coverage is found in EEZs where only 2.3 % are protected by OSPAR MPAs.

OSPAR Region II, the Greater North Sea, has an MPA coverage of 14.7 %. The Wider Atlantic (Region V) and the Celtic Seas (Region III) are represented with 8.3 % and 7.6 % coverage by OSPAR MPAs, respectively. While coverage of the Bay of Biscay and Iberian Coast (Region IV) is at 5.9 %, the Arctic Waters show the lowest coverage with only 1.9 % of the area being protected by OSPAR MPAs.

With respect to the assessment of the ecological coherence of the OSPAR Network of MPAs, it is important to bear in mind that the Madrid criteria were derived from the “three initial spatial tests” defined at the early stage of the development of the OSPAR MPA network. If the MPA network fails one of these tests then it cannot be considered as ecologically coherent.

Application of the Madrid Criteria to the OSPAR MPA network as it stood at the end of 2016 illustrates that whilst significant progress has been made in developing the network, it cannot yet be considered to be ecologically coherent across the OSPAR Area and further work is required to develop the way in which to the OSPAR MPA network is assessed for ecological coherence in time for the QSR 2021.

The assessment against Madrid Criterion A (a proximity analysis of MPAs as a surrogate for the OSPAR MPA network principle of connectivity) suggests that the OSPAR MPA network is nearing a well distributed network in OSPAR Regions II (North Sea) and III (Celtic Seas), but there remain significant gaps in OSPAR Regions I (Arctic) and V (Wider

¹ [OSPAR Recommendation 2003/3](#) (OSPAR 03/17/1, Annex 9), amended by [OSPAR Recommendation 2010/2](#) (OSPAR 10/23/1, Annex 7)

Atlantic) and a small gap further offshore in OSPAR Region IV (Bay of Biscay and The Iberian Coast). Future work should focus on addressing these geographical gaps where possible

The assessment against Madrid Criterion B (percentage coverage of MPAs across the Dinter biogeographic provinces) suggests that the target has been exceeded for three of the 19 provinces; all within the continental shelf and slope of the OSPAR Maritime Area and all within the Eastern Atlantic Temperate sub-region. A further five exceed 5 % total surface coverage (four within the Eastern Atlantic Temperate sub-region and one in the Atlantic deep-sea Region) and of these three exceed 9 % (all within the Eastern Atlantic sub-region). Four of provinces have no OSPAR MPAs and a further five have less than 1% surface coverage. These provinces are predominantly to the north of the OSPAR Maritime Area.

The assessment against Madrid Criterion C (protection of OSPAR Threatened and/or Declining species and habitats within OSPAR MPAs) suggests that 19 of the 54 OSPAR Threatened and/or Declining habitats and species whose recommendations include considering protection using MPAs are considered to be protected within more than one MPA in the OSPAR Region(s) they are considered to be under threat/subject to decline in. All OSPAR Threatened and/or Declining invertebrates, three of the seven birds, one of the two reptiles, one of the three marine mammals, five of the 22 fish and four of the 15 habitats are considered adequately protected within the MPA network.

Approximately two-thirds (61 %) of the OSPAR MPA network has full management information in place which is publicly documented, with a further 16 % of OSPAR MPAs having partial management information in place. The partial response is largely due to CPs updating conservation objectives or because work is ongoing to identify the management actions that may be required to address the known pressures and threats to the protected features of OSPAR MPAs. However, whilst there is progress on taking management action and implementing measures to achieve conservation objectives, such actions are only partially completed across the OSPAR Maritime Area; a similar picture emerged for the implementation of monitoring the ecological quality of the OSPAR MPAs. Consequently, the predominant response to whether OSPAR MPAs are moving towards their conservation objectives is 'unknown' and only 11 % are moving towards or have achieved their conservation objectives. This is largely because site-specific data on the ecological status of the protected features of OSPAR MPAs are not available. The overall conclusion from this chapter therefore is that the OSPAR MPA network cannot be considered to be 'well-managed' at the end of 2016.

It is important to note that in many cases there remain institutional barriers and resourcing issues to the implementation and evaluation of effective management measures for MPAs across the OSPAR Maritime Area; this was cited as a primary reason for limited progress by many Contracting Parties, as well as the infancy of many of the OSPAR MPAs.

Future work should focus on implementing the management measures considered necessary to achieve the conservation objectives of the protected features of OSPAR MPAs. In parallel, there is a need for long-term monitoring programs to be established that evaluate the effectiveness of such management measures to conclude with greater confidence whether the conservation objectives of the protected features of OSPAR MPAs are being achieved. In addition, work should progress on improving methods of evaluating the degree to which the OSPAR MPA network is well-managed to support a more sophisticated assessment as to whether or not the OSPAR MPA network is delivering a genuine conservation benefit to targeted habitats, species and ecological processes.

For OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ, there should be continued effort to further the collective arrangements and Memorandums of Understanding with relevant competent management authorities so that they can consider appropriate management actions to help deliver the conservation objectives for OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ. Contracting Parties should continue to raise awareness of OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ with relevant stakeholders and interest groups and look to further our scientific understanding of these sites.

Background

The Sintra Ministerial Statement, adopted at the meeting of the OSPAR Commission in Sintra, Portugal (22-23 July 1998), included the commitment that the OSPAR Commission will promote the establishment of a network of MPAs to ensure the sustainable use, protection and conservation of marine biological diversity and its ecosystems.

This process has been enhanced by the Bremen Ministerial Statement, adopted at the first Joint Ministerial Meeting of the Helsinki and OSPAR Commissions in Bremen, Germany (25-26 June 2003), as it established the commitment to complete by 2010 a joint network of well-managed MPAs that, together with the Natura 2000 network, is ecologically coherent.

The aims of the OSPAR Network of MPAs have been set out as:

- *to protect, conserve and restore species, habitats and ecological processes which have been adversely affected by human activities;*
- *to prevent degradation of, and damage to, species, habitats and ecological processes, following the precautionary principle; and*
- *to protect and conserve areas that best represent the range of species, habitats and ecological processes in the maritime area.*

OSPAR Recommendation 2003/3 sets out that in the years subsequent to 2005, OSPAR CPs should report by 31 December to the OSPAR Commission on any OSPAR MPAs that they have selected (or deselected) and on any corresponding management plans that they have adopted or substantially amended in that year. In 2006, the OSPAR Biodiversity Committee (BDC) agreed that annual reports on the status of the OSPAR Network of MPAs should be prepared in the period up to 2010.

As the target had not been reached in 2010, the OSPAR Ministerial Meeting in Bergen, Norway (20-24 September 2010) adopted a consolidated version of Recommendation 2003/3 (amended by OSPAR Recommendation 2010/2) including renewed targets, *i.e. to continue the establishment of the OSPAR Network of Marine Protected Areas in the North-East Atlantic and to ensure that:*

- a. by 2012 it is ecologically coherent, includes sites representative of all biogeographic regions in the OSPAR Maritime Area, and is consistent with the CBD target for effectively conserved marine and coastal ecological regions;*
- b. by 2016 it is well managed (i.e. coherent management measures have been set up and are being implemented for such MPAs that have been designated up to 2010).*

OSPAR CPs therefore agreed to continue with the preparation of annual reports with a view to track progress as well as any shortcomings with regards to the targets that have been set by the OSPAR Commission for the OSPAR Network of MPAs.

At the 2013 OSPAR Commission meeting in Gothenburg, Sweden (24-28 June 2013) OSPAR CPs agreed that the Status Report of the OSPAR Network of MPAs will be produced every two years. The deadline for new nominations and for reporting was set to 1 October.

This document presents the 10th Status Report on the OSPAR Network of MPAs taking into account all MPAs that have either been nominated by CPs within their respective national waters or established collectively by the OSPAR Commission in ABNJ/in the High Seas until 1 October 2016.

Sources of data and information on OSPAR MPAs

The analysis of the OSPAR Network of MPAs is based upon information that has been provided by the Contracting Parties in the process of nominating MPAs to the OSPAR Commission. Data for analyses were gathered from the OSPAR Database of MPAs which is co-administered by the French Agence des Aires Marines Protégées (AAMP) and the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN). Data for reporting on the management of OSPAR MPAs were collected through a separate exercise coordinated by the UK. All calculations were made with reference only to the OSPAR Maritime Area as defined in the OSPAR Convention, excluding overseas territories and territories of Contracting Parties in the Baltic and Mediterranean Seas. All figures, tables and maps in this report provide information on the OSPAR Network of MPAs as of 1 October 2016.

1 Status of the OSPAR Network of MPAs

By 1 October 2016, the OSPAR Network of MPAs comprises 448 MPAs (Fig. 1.1) including 438 MPAs situated within national waters of CPs and 10 MPAs situated in areas beyond the limits of national EEZs with different jurisdictional regimes². In total, OSPAR MPAs cover an area of 806,472 km², which equals 5.9 % of the OSPAR Maritime Area. This represents an increase by 18,095 km², or 0.1 %, compared to 2014.




Figure 1.1. OSPAR Network of MPAs (as of 1 October 2016)³.

1.1 OSPAR MPAs under National Jurisdiction

1.1.1 Distribution of OSPAR MPAs in the national waters of CPs

From 2005 until 2016, OSPAR CPs have nominated a total of 438 OSPAR MPAs within their respective national waters⁴, i.e. territorial waters and EEZs (Fig. 1.2).

² For further information on the jurisdictional regime of OSPAR MPAs situated in areas beyond the limits of national EEZs of CPs please see section 1.2.3 “Jurisdiction of OSPAR MPAs in areas beyond the limits of national EEZs”.

³ The boundaries of CPs’ EEZs have been obtained from the [open source VLIZ Maritime Boundaries Geodatabase](#). It is noted, that not all of these boundaries as shown in the map have been officially declared by CPs.




Figure 1.2. OSPAR MPAs and boundaries of the Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) of OSPAR CPs (as of 1 October 2016)⁵.

The contributions by CPs regarding the number of MPAs, their coverage and distribution in their national waters differ substantially. Table 1.1 shows the number of MPAs per CP and the area coverage.

Table 1.1. Number and coverage of OSPAR MPAs in Territorial Waters (TW), the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) and in areas beyond the limits of national EEZs (beyond EEZ), i.e. the High Seas, the Area, and ECS areas (as of 1 October 2016)⁶.

| OSPAR | No. of | MPA coverage [km ²] |
|-------|--------|---------------------------------|
|-------|--------|---------------------------------|

⁴ Refer to Annex I for a list of all OSPAR MPAs nominated until 1 October 2016 and Annex II presenting the evolution of the OSPAR Network of MPAs in the period of 2005-2016.

⁵ The boundaries of CPs' EEZs have been obtained from the [open source VLIZ Maritime Boundaries Geodatabase](#). It is noted, that not all of these boundaries as shown in the map have been officially declared by CPs.

⁶ n.a. = not applicable

| Contracting Party | OSPAR MPAs | TW | EEZ | beyond EEZ | Total |
|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Belgium | 2 | 749 | 490 | n.a. | 1,239 |
| Denmark | 34 | 6,954 | 5,536 | n.a. | 12,490 |
| France | 39 | 15,821 | 6,283 | n.a. | 22,104 |
| Germany | 6 | 8,963 | 7,911 | n.a. | 16,875 |
| Iceland | 14 | 90 | 476 | n.a. | 566 |
| Ireland | 19 | 1,594 | 2,542 | n.a. | 4,135 |
| Netherlands | 5 | 2,434 | 5,922 | n.a. | 8,356 |
| Norway | 15 | 83,120 | 2,408 | n.a. | 85,528 |
| Portugal | 13 ⁷ | 1,556 | 4,656 | 22 | 6,234 |
| Spain | 15 | 8,311 | 19,076 | n.a. | 27,387 |
| Sweden | 10 | 1,114 | 1,364 | n.a. | 2,478 |
| United Kingdom | 269 ⁸ | 30,607 | 106,179 | 17,158 | 153,944 |
| All Contracting Parties | 7 ⁹ | n.a. | n.a. | 465,165 | 465,165 |
| | | | | | |
| Total | 448 | 161,312 | 162,815 | 482,345 | 806,472 |

⁷ Portugal (PT) has nominated a total of 17 MPAs to OSPAR. Four of these MPAs, namely *Altair Seamount HS MPA*, *Antialtair Seamount HS MPA*, *Josephine Seamount HS MPA* and *Mid Atlantic Ridge North of the Azores HS MPA*, occur in an area subject to a submission by PT to the UN CLCS for an ECS. These 4 MPAs have been assigned to all Contracting Parties in terms of number and area coverage (category “beyond EEZ”). One of the 17 MPAs, namely *Rainbow Hydrothermal Vent Field*, occurs on the ECS of PT. This MPA has been assigned to Portugal in terms of number and area coverage (category “beyond EEZ”). The MPA that occurs beyond the EEZ of PT covers 22 km².

⁸ The United Kingdom (UK) has nominated a total of 269 MPAs to OSPAR. Two of these MPAs, namely *Hatton Bank SAC* and *Hatton-Rockall Basin*, occur on the ECS of the UK. These 2 MPAs have been assigned to the UK in terms of number and area coverage (category “beyond EEZ”). One of the MPAs, namely *North West Rockall Bank SAC*, occurs partly within the EEZ and partly within the ECS of the UK. This MPA has been assigned to the UK in terms of number and area coverage (partly category “EEZ” and partly category “beyond EEZ”). MPAs that occur beyond the EEZ of the UK cover 17,158 km².

⁹ Three OSPAR MPAs, namely *Hatton Bank SAC* (UK), *Hatton-Rockall Basin* (UK) and *Rainbow Hydrothermal Vent Field* (PT), occur on the ECS of a CP. These 3 MPAs have been assigned to the respective CP in terms of number and area coverage.

Figure 1.3 provides an illustration of the distribution of OSPAR MPAs (in % and km²) across territorial waters and the EEZ of CPs. Norway (> 95 %), France (> 70 %) and Belgium (> 60 %) designated most of their OSPAR MPAs in territorial waters, i.e. within 12 nautical miles from the shoreline. In contrast, Iceland (> 80 %), Portugal (75 %), the United Kingdom (> 75 %), the Netherlands (> 70 %), Spain (> 65 %) and Ireland (> 60 %) designated their OSPAR MPAs mainly in their EEZs. Sweden, Germany and Denmark show a relatively balanced distribution of the areas covered by their MPAs in TW and the EEZ (between 40 – 60 %).




Figure 1.3. Distribution of OSPAR MPAs across the Territorial Waters (TW) and Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZ)¹⁰ of CPs (as of 1 October 2016).

Further aspects regarding the distribution of OSPAR MPAs across the national waters of CPs are highlighted in Figure 1.4¹¹. For each CP¹², the distribution and total area coverage (in km²) of MPAs nominated to OSPAR in its territorial waters and its EEZ, respectively, is shown (brown/blue colour of vertical bars). Furthermore, horizontal bars indicate the relative coverage (in %) of OSPAR MPAs in its territorial waters, the EEZ and overall in its national waters (yellow/light blue/red, respectively).

¹⁰ Note that results are based on the boundaries of the EEZ according to the [open source VLIZ Maritime Boundaries Geodatabase](#).

¹¹ The area calculations have been made with regards to the OSPAR Maritime Area only, i.e. without consideration of the overseas territories of CPs and marine territories of CPs in the Baltic (Denmark, Germany and Sweden) or the Mediterranean (France and Spain).

¹² The area calculations for Denmark have been made for the mainland only, i.e. without consideration of the territories of Greenland and the Faroes Islands.




Figure 1.4. MPA coverage in the national waters of CPs, i.e. territorial waters and EEZ¹³ (as of 1 October 2016).

For interpreting Fig. 1.4, it needs to be taken into account that the total areas of CPs' national waters differ substantially (see **Error! Reference source not found.** above for an illustration of CPs' marine areas under national jurisdiction.) The United Kingdom, for example, that have nominated by far the most OSPAR MPAs of all CPs, has the largest area of national waters protected by those MPAs (136,786 km²). However, due to the extensive size of its national waters, the overall relative coverage of OSPAR MPAs is only about 20.1 %¹⁴. In Germany, in contrast, due to the comparatively smaller marine area under its jurisdiction, OSPAR MPAs represent about 41.4 % of its national waters. Belgium has about 35.7 % of its national waters covered by OSPAR MPAs. Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands show a relative MPA coverage of approximately 19.6 %, 17.2 %¹⁵ and 13.2 %, respectively, in their national waters. Coverage of national waters by OSPAR MPAs remains under 10 % in Spain (9.3 %), France (9.0 %), Norway (4.1 %), Ireland (1.0 %), Portugal (0.6 %¹⁶) and Iceland (0.1 %).

¹³ Note that results are based on the boundaries of the EEZ according to the [open source VLIZ Maritime Boundaries Geodatabase](#).

¹⁴ Area calculations are based on national waters only, i.e. *Hatton Bank SCA*, *Hatton-Rockall Basin* and the area of *North West Rockall Bank SCA* extending beyond the EEZ of the United Kingdom are not included.

¹⁵ Area calculations only consider national waters adjacent to mainland Denmark, excluding the marine areas of Greenland and the Faeroe Islands.

¹⁶ Area calculations only consider the marine areas adjacent to mainland Portugal and around the Azores archipelago in the OSPAR Maritime Area.

Overall there is a good coverage of coastal waters with about 16.7 %¹⁷ (161,312 km²) of the territorial waters of OSPAR CPs being protected by OSPAR MPAs. This is mainly a result of extensive MPAs designated in OSPAR Regions II (Greater North Sea) and III (Celtic Seas) and around the Svalbard archipelago in Region I (Arctic Waters). In addition, 8.9 % (482,345 km²) of the area beyond the limits of national EEZs, i.e. the High Seas, the Area and the ECS areas, are currently covered by OSPAR MPAs.

However, as illustrated above, there continues to be differences with respect to the overall distribution of OSPAR MPAs across the OSPAR Maritime Area, with a bias towards near-shore sites. Compared to territorial waters and areas beyond the limits of EEZs, far less MPAs have been designated in the Exclusive Economic Zones, covering only 2.3 % (162,815 km²) of all EEZs in the OSPAR Maritime Area.

1.1.2 Distribution of OSPAR MPAs across OSPAR Regions

The distribution of OSPAR MPAs across the five OSPAR Regions, i.e. Arctic Waters (Region I), Greater North Sea (Region II), Celtic Seas (Region III), Bay of Biscay and Iberian Coast (Region IV) and Wider Atlantic (Region V), is shown in figure 1.5.

¹⁷ For the calculation of the surface of TW and EEZ areas, the whole marine area of Portugal including Madeira and Azores as well as the Channel Island (UK) were included. Thus, the percentages are not directly comparable to previous Status Reports.




Figure 1.5. Distribution of OSPAR MPAs across OSPAR Regions (as of 1 October 2016).

The spatial coverage by OSPAR MPAs differs substantially between the OSPAR Regions (Tab. 1.2).

The Greater North Sea (OSPAR Region II) has the most coastal states of all OSPAR Regions and all have contributed MPAs to the network. The MPAs nominated by Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom, cover 14.7 % (112,968 km²) of the Greater North Sea. Thus, Region II is the first, and so far the only, OSPAR Region where MPA coverage is in excess of CBD Aichi Target 11¹⁸, i.e. to protect at least 10 % of the coastal and marine areas by 2020.

In the Wider Atlantic (OSPAR Region V) 8.3 %, covering 526,525 km², are protected by the OSPAR Network of MPAs. This region comprises MPAs nominated by Portugal and a number of sites designated by Ireland and the UK. No MPAs have yet been established in this Region by Iceland or the Kingdom of Denmark, whose EEZs extend into the Wider Atlantic. While the coverage of this Region by MPAs within national jurisdiction remains low, the collective establishment by all OSPAR CPs of the seven MPAs in ABNJ in 2010 and 2012 as well as the three MPA nominations by

¹⁸ Aichi Target 11 of the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD) Strategic Plan 2011-2020 (CBD Decision X/2).

Portugal and the United Kingdom in areas that are subject to their respective submission to the UN CLCS for an ECS have substantially increased the area coverage of the MPA network in this Region¹⁹.

In the Celtic Seas (OSPAR Region III) 7.6 % (27,795 km²) are covered by OSPAR MPAs, nominated by Ireland, the UK and France.

The Bay of Biscay and Iberian Coast (OSPAR Region IV) encompass a number of MPAs nominated by its three coastal states France, Portugal and Spain. Altogether, 5.9 % (32,076 km²) of this Region are covered by the OSPAR Network of MPAs.

The Arctic Waters (Region I) show the lowest MPA coverage with only 1.9 % (107,109 km²). This coverage is almost entirely due to the designation of two extensive sites around the Svalbard archipelago, namely *Svalbard West*, *Svalbard East* (Norway), the MPA site *Jan Mayen* (Norway) and the MPA *North-east Faroe-Shetland Channel* (United Kingdom).

Table 1.2. Absolute (km²) and the relative (%) coverage of the five OSPAR Regions by OSPAR MPAs (as of 1 October 2016).

| OSPAR Region | | Total Area [km ²] | Protected Area by OSPAR MPAs | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|
| | | | [km ²] | [%] |
| I | Arctic Waters | 5,529,716 | 107,109 | 1.9 |
| II | Greater North Sea | 766,624 | 112,968 | 14.7 |
| III | Celtic Seas | 366,459 | 27,795 | 7.6 |
| IV | Bay of Biscay and Iberian Coast | 539,153 | 32,076 | 5.9 |
| V | Wider Atlantic | 6,346,159 | 526,525 | 8.3 |
| | | | | |
| OSPAR Maritime Area | | 13,548,111 | 806,472 | 5.9 |

¹⁹ Reservation of the Kingdom of Denmark: The area to which the UK nominations is sought to apply falls within the proposed outer limits of the Kingdom of Denmark in relation to the Faroe-Rockall Plateau, which consistent with paragraph 8 of Article 76 of UNCLOS and Article 4 of the Annex II thereto, have been submitted to the UN CLCS, and whose consideration is currently pending.

1.2 OSPAR MPAs in areas beyond the limits of national EEZs

1.2.1 Background

The OSPAR Maritime Area encompasses extensive areas in the Wider Atlantic (OSPAR Region V) and the Arctic Waters (OSPAR Region I) that are beyond the limits of national EEZs, i.e. the High Seas, the Area, and ECS areas. These areas cover approximately 40 % of the OSPAR Maritime Area (see Annex III Figure 1).

In recent years, the protection of the marine environment and biodiversity in ABNJ/in the High Seas has attracted great attention at the global level, in particular in the context of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), the legal framework established by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). OSPAR has in this context assumed a pioneering role as a regional organisation to protect marine ecosystems and biodiversity in ABNJ/in the High Seas.

Being aware of the shared responsibilities and the need for a collaborative approach in ABNJ/in the High Seas, OSPAR has at the same time aimed at strengthening mutual exchange and cooperation with the various relevant international Competent Authorities responsible for the management of specific human activities in ABNJ, including the North East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (NEAFC), the International Seabed Authority (ISA), and the International Maritime Organization (IMO). The adoption of the collective arrangement between OSPAR and NEAFC on cooperation and coordination regarding selected areas in ABNJ in the North-East Atlantic in 2014 represents a significant step forward in this process (see also Chapter 2).

By the end of 2016 the OSPAR Network of MPAs comprised 10 MPAs situated in areas beyond the limits of national EEZs, i.e. the High Seas, the Area and ECS areas (see Figure 1.6). The process of the establishment and nomination of these MPAs is elaborated in the following sections as well as in Annex I and III.




Figure 1.6. OSPAR MPAs in areas beyond the limits of national EEZs (as of 1 October 2016)²⁰.

1.2.2 Establishment and nomination of OSPAR MPAs in areas beyond the limits of national EEZs

A national OSPAR MPA nominated by Portugal in an area subject to a submission for an ECS

In 2006, and in response to a proposal previously prepared by WWF, Portugal formally nominated the *Rainbow Hydrothermal Vent Field* as an MPA to the OSPAR Network of MPAs. While this MPA has originally been considered to be situated in ABNJ, Portugal considered the site to be situated on its ECS, *i.e.* the natural submerged prolongation of the landmasses of the Azores Archipelago. While the case is still pending, Portugal recognised its obligations under UNCLOS Article 192 to protect and preserve the marine environment, as well as the precautionary principle, and assumed responsibility for protecting the seabed and the sub-soil even prior to the final conclusion of the UN CLCS on

²⁰ The boundaries of CPs' EEZs have been obtained from the [open source VLIZ Maritime Boundaries Geodatabase](#). It is noted, that not all of these boundaries as shown in the map have been officially declared by CPs.

the ECS claims by Portugal. It has to be noted that this MPA encompasses only the seabed with no scientific case to extend the MPA to the water column.

OSPAR MPAs established collectively by all CPs in ABNJ/in the High Seas

At the OSPAR Ministerial Meeting in 2010 (20-24 September, Bergen/Norway) six proposals for OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ/in the High Seas were presented for adoption. The historical process of the elaboration of these proposals, including the collation and review of scientific information and data, the preparation of legal feasibility studies and consultations amongst CPs, is presented in Annex III. Taking into account the complex situation regarding the jurisdiction over these areas, the OSPAR Commission finally decided to collectively establish following MPAs in ABNJ/in the High Seas of the North-East Atlantic:

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| • <i>Charlie-Gibbs South MPA</i> | 146,032 km ² |
| • <i>Milne Seamount Complex MPA</i> | 20,914 km ² |
| • <i>Mid-Atlantic Ridge north of the Azores High Seas MPA</i> | 93,570 km ² |
| • <i>Altair Seamount High Seas MPA</i> | 4,384 km ² |
| • <i>Antialtair High Seas MPA</i> | 2,807 km ² |
| • <i>Josephine Seamount Complex High Seas MPA</i> | 19,363 km ² |

At the OSPAR Commission Meeting in 2012 (25-29 June 2012; Bonn/Germany) CPs further agreed to collectively establish the following MPA in the High Seas of the OSPAR Maritime Area:

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| • <i>Charlie-Gibbs North High Seas MPA</i> | 178,094 km ² |
|--|-------------------------|

National OSPAR MPAs nominated by the United Kingdom in areas subject to a submission for an ECS

In 2011, the United Kingdom nominated *North West Rockall SAC* as an OSPAR MPA, of which parts (covering 181 km²) are extending beyond their EEZ into an area subject to a submission by the UK to the UN CLCS for an ECS. The seabed and subsoil of this site is protected by the UK, while the water column remains unprotected.

In 2012 and 2014, the United Kingdom nominated two more OSPAR MPAs (*Hatton Bank SAC* and *Hatton-Rockall Basin*, respectively) entirely located in an area subject to a submission by the UK to the UN CLCS for an ECS²¹. The seabed and subsoil of these sites are protected by the UK, while the water column remains unprotected.

1.2.3 Jurisdiction of OSPAR MPAs in areas beyond the limits of national EEZs

The 10 OSPAR MPAs nominated until 1 October 2016 in areas beyond the limits of national EEZs of CPs, i.e. the High Seas, the Area, and ECS areas, can be grouped into different categories with regards to their jurisdictional regime:

1) *Charlie-Gibbs South MPA* and *Milne Seamount Complex MPA*

These two MPAs are situated entirely in ABNJ. The seabed, the subsoil and the water column are protected collectively by all OSPAR CPs.

²¹ Reservation of the Kingdom of Denmark: The area to which the UK nominations is sought to apply falls within the proposed outer limits of the Kingdom of Denmark in relation to the Faroe-Rockall Plateau, which consistent with paragraph 8 of Article 76 of UNCLOS and Article 4 of the Annex II thereto, have been submitted to the UN CLCS, and whose consideration is currently pending.

2) *Mid-Atlantic Ridge north of the Azores High Seas MPA, Altair Seamount High Seas MPA, Antialtair High Seas MPA and Josephine Seamount Complex High Seas MPA*

These four MPAs are situated within an area subject to a submission by Portugal to the UN CLCS for an ECS. Portugal has expressed the intention to assume the responsibility to take measures for the protection of the seabed and the subsoil within these areas. Upon invitation by Portugal, the OSPAR Commission agreed to collectively protect the water column of these MPAs.

3) *Charlie-Gibbs North High Seas MPA*

This MPAs is partly situated within an area subject to a submission by Iceland to the UN CLCS for an ECS. The water column is protected collectively by all CPs. The seabed and the subsoil remain unprotected.

4) *Rainbow Hydrothermal Vent Field, Hatton Bank SAC and Hatton-Rockall Basin*

These MPAs are situated within areas subject to a submission by a CP to the UN CLCS for an ECS. The seabed and subsoil of these sites are protected by the respective CP, while the water column remains unprotected.

2 Ecological coherence of the OSPAR MPA network

2.1 Background

At the 2010 OSPAR Ministerial Meeting in Bergen, Norway, OSPAR Ministers committed to ensuring that by 2012²² the OSPAR network of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) is ecologically coherent, includes sites representative of all biogeographic regions in the OSPAR Maritime Area, and is consistent with the Convention on Biological Diversity target for effectively conserved marine and coastal ecological regions.

The 2013 assessment of ecological coherence²³ was undertaken based on the OSPAR MPA network as it stood at the end of 2012. This showed some positive signs but concluded that the network was not yet ecologically coherent, and that further network development was required.

OSPAR (2006)²⁴ recommends that an assessment of MPA ecological coherence should be centred around five key principles: **‘features’**, **‘representativity’**, **‘connectivity’**, **‘resilience’** and **‘management’** (Box 1). Please note that work on assessing management progress is reported in Chapter 3 of this report. Since the 2013 assessment, the Intersessional Correspondence Group on Marine Protected Areas (ICG-MPA) have had in place a task group on ecological coherence (comprising representatives from UK, France, Germany and the Netherlands) to further develop criteria to assess ecological coherence.

Box 1 – OSPAR principles for assessing the ecological coherence of MPA networks

Features – MPAs should be designated in areas that best represent the range of habitats, species and ecological processes in the OSPAR Maritime Area. Proportions of features that should be protected by the MPA network may be higher for particularly threatened and/or declining features.

Representativity – MPAs should protect examples of the same features across their known biogeographical extent to reflect known sub-types. EUNIS Level 3 habitats are stated as a potentially useful way of characterising the OSPAR Maritime Area for the purposes of including biogeographic variation in the network.

Connectivity – In the absence of dispersal data, connectivity may be approximated by ensuring the MPA network is well distributed geographically. Where scientific understanding is further developed, the MPA network should reflect locations where a specific path between identified places is known (e.g. critical areas of a life cycle for a given species).

Resilience – Replication of features in separate MPAs in each biogeographic area is desirable where possible. The appropriate size of a site should be determined by the purpose of the site and be sufficiently large enough to maintain the integrity of the feature(s) for which it is selected.

Management (reported in Chapter 3) – OSPAR MPAs should be managed to ensure the protection of the features for which they were selected and to support the functioning of an ecologically coherent network.

The ‘Madrid Criteria’ were developed by the ICG-MPA task group on ecological coherence as an evolution of the three initial spatial tests defined in 2008²⁵. The Madrid Criteria were designed to reflect the key network principles outlined

²² OSPAR Recommendation 2010/02 amending 2003/03 on a network of Marine Protected Areas - <http://www.ospar.org/documents?d=32867>

²³ Johnson *et al* (2013) - <http://www.ospar.org/documents?d=7346>

²⁴ OSPAR Recommendation 2006/03 on developing an ecologically coherent network of Marine Protected Areas - http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/06-03e_Guidance%20ecol%20coherence%20MPA%20network.pdf

²⁵ OSPAR, 2008. Background document on three initial spatial tests used for assessing the ecological coherence of the OSPAR MPA

in OSPAR (2006) whilst acknowledging limitations of data concerning OSPAR MPAs and target species and habitats. Box 2 lists the Madrid Criteria used for the current assessment of ecological coherence and the underlying OSPAR network principle(s) each one relates to.

Box 2 – The ‘Madrid Criteria’ for assessing the ecological coherence of the OSPAR MPA network

- A: OSPAR MPAs are geographically well-distributed, with a maximum distance of up to 250km for nearshore/coastline, 500km for offshore and 1000km for the high seas areas between MPAs – links to OSPAR (2006) network principle of **connectivity**.
- B: OSPAR MPAs, in combination with other relevant spatial measures as deemed appropriate, cover at least 10% in area of all Dinter biogeographic provinces – links to OSPAR (2006) network principle of **representativity**.
- C: OSPAR MPAs represent all EUNIS Level 3 habitat classes and OSPAR threatened and/or declining (OSPAR T&D) species and habitats for which MPAs are considered appropriate more than once in all relevant Dinter biogeographic provinces a given feature is present – links to OSPAR (2006) network principles of **features** and **resilience**.

2.2 Summary of results

Application of the Madrid Criteria to the OSPAR MPA network as it stood at the end of 2016 illustrates that progress has been made in developing the network, but it cannot yet be considered to be ecologically coherent across the OSPAR Maritime Area.

The assessment against Madrid Criterion A (a proximity analysis of MPAs as a surrogate for the OSPAR MPA network principle of connectivity) suggests that the OSPAR MPA network is well distributed network in OSPAR Regions II (North Sea) and III (Celtic Seas); however considerable gaps remain in OSPAR Regions I (Arctic) and V (Wider Atlantic) and a small gap further offshore in OSPAR Region IV (Bay of Biscay and The Iberian Coast). Future work should consider addressing these geographical gaps.

The assessment against Madrid Criterion B (percentage coverage of MPAs of at least 10 % of all the Dinter biogeographic provinces) shows that the 10 %-target has been exceeded for three of the 19 provinces, and a further three have over 9 % coverage. At the other end of the scale four provinces have no OSPAR MPAs and a further five have less than 1 % surface coverage. These provinces are predominantly to the north of the OSPAR Maritime Area.

The assessment against Madrid Criterion C (protection of OSPAR Threatened and/or Declining species and habitats within OSPAR MPAs) shows that 19 of the 58 OSPAR Threatened and/or Declining habitats and species are protected within more than one MPA in the OSPAR Region(s) they are considered to be under threat/subject to decline: all five OSPAR Threatened and/or Declining invertebrates, three of the nine birds, one of the two reptiles, one of the four marine mammals, three of the 22 fish and six of the 15 habitats.

2.3 Criterion A: Geographical distribution of OSPAR MPAs

Madrid Criterion A shows how geographically well-distributed OSPAR MPAs are, with maximum distances set as no more than 250 km between nearshore/coastline OSPAR MPAs (within the territorial waters of Contracting Parties),

500 km for offshore OSPAR MPAs (within the Exclusive Economic Zones of Contracting Parties) and 1000 km for MPAs in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction within the OSPAR Maritime Area. These figures have been derived from previous work to assess the ecological coherence of the OSPAR MPA network undertaken in 2013²⁶.

This first criterion is intended as a proxy to the OSPAR MPA network principle of connectivity. In the absence of dispersal data, or information on critical areas for the life cycle of a given species, connectivity may be approximated by ensuring the MPA network is well distributed in space²⁷.




Figure 2.1. Proximity analysis of OSPAR MPAs as a proxy for the OSPAR MPA network principle of connectivity. White areas indicate gaps in the MPA network according to Madrid Criterion A.

Figure 1 presents the results of the application of Madrid Criterion A to the OSPAR MPA network as it stood at the end of 2016. Key observations from the information provided are that:

- In OSPAR Regions II (North Sea) and III (Celtic Seas) OSPAR MPAs are considered to be geographically well distributed.

²⁶ Johnson *et al* (2013) - <http://www.ospar.org/documents?d=7346>

²⁷ OSPAR Recommendation 2006/03 on developing an ecologically coherent network of Marine Protected Areas - http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/06-03e_Guidance%20ecol%20coherence%20MPA%20network.pdf

- In OSPAR Region IV (Bay of Biscay and The Iberian Coast) the geographical distribution of OSPAR MPAs has improved since the last assessment in 2013, but gaps still remain in the northwest of the region.
- In OSPAR Region V (Wider Atlantic), OSPAR MPAs in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) have contributed substantially to the network of MPAs. Gaps remain, however, in the southwest, north and west of the region.
- In OSPAR Region I (Arctic) there are considerable gaps remaining.

2.4 Criterion B: Coverage of OSPAR MPAs across biogeographic regions

Madrid Criterion B illustrates surface coverage of OSPAR MPAs across Dinter biogeographic provinces according to Dinter²⁸. In contrast to the OSPAR Regions (I-V), the Dinter biogeographic provinces account for the ecological variations present in a geographical sense across the OSPAR Maritime Area. A map of the Dinter biogeographic provinces used in the assessment against Madrid Criteria B is provided in Figure 2.2.

The target under Madrid Criterion B is for 10% coverage across each Dinter biogeographic province. This has its foundations in the Convention on Biological Diversity Aichi Target 11, which calls for 10% of coastal and marine areas to be effectively conserved (although this target is not only related to MPA coverage). The results of the assessment against Madrid Criterion B are presented in Table 2.1.

It is important to note that the Dinter biogeographic classification is less detailed in the deep sea and therefore they do not characterise the biogeographic features of OSPAR Region V (Wider Atlantic) and part of Region I (Arctic). In addition, this analysis excludes the three (holo) pelagic regions because they fully overlap with the benthic regions.

²⁸ OSPAR Recommendation 2010/02 amending 2003/03 on a network of Marine Protected Areas - <http://www.ospar.org/documents?d=32867>




Figure 2.2. Dinter biogeographic provinces and MPAs in the OSPAR maritime area.

Table 2.1. OSPAR MPA total surface area coverage²⁹ on the continental shelf & continental slope and deep-sea Dinter biogeographic provinces and regions

| Region | Sub-region | Province | Protected area (km ²) | Total area (km ²) | MPA coverage (%) |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Continental shelf and continental slope | | | | | |
| Arctic | | North-East Greenland Shelf | 0 | 288,563 | 0 |
| Arctic | | Northeast Water Polynya | 0 | 71,943 | 0 |
| Arctic | | High Arctic Maritime | 11,088 | 809,906 | 1.4 |
| Arctic | | Barents Sea | 67,240 | 1, 211, 755 | 5.5 |
| Arctic | | Barents Sea : White Sea | 0 | 86,372 | 0 |
| Arctic | | S-E Greenland-N. Iceland Shelf | 2,985 | 458 052,88 | 0.7 |
| Atlantic | East Atlantic Temperate | Boreal | 112,111 | 929,492 | 12.1 |
| Atlantic | East Atlantic Temperate | Boreal-Lusitanian | 36,464 | 559,988 | 6.5 |
| Atlantic | East Atlantic Temperate | Lusitanian-Boreal | 17,120 | 152,314 | 11.2 |
| Atlantic | East Atlantic Temperate | Lusitanian : Cool | 6,836 | 50,001 | 13.7 |
| Atlantic | East Atlantic Temperate | Lusitanian : Warm North | 4,053 | 44,410 | 9.1 |
| Atlantic | East Atlantic Temperate | Lusitanian : Warm South | 2,446 | 24,922 | 9.8 |
| Atlantic | East Atlantic Temperate | Macaronesian : Azores | 811,85 | 24,931 | 3.3 |
| Atlantic | East Atlantic Temperate | Norwegian Coast : Finnmark | 0 | 68,115 | 0 |
| Atlantic | East Atlantic Temperate | Norwegian Coast : Skagerrak | 2,200 | 24,343 | 9 |
| Atlantic | East Atlantic Temperate | Norwegian Coast : West Norway | 2,552 | 344,322 | 0.7 |
| Atlantic | East Atlantic Temperate | South Iceland-Faeroe Shelf | 559,75 | 390,850 | 0.1 |
| Deep sea | | | | | |
| Arctic | | | 20,865 | 2,234,393 | 0.9 |
| Atlantic | | | 498,523 | 6,996 557 | 7.1 |

Table 1 presents the results of the application of Madrid Criterion B to the OSPAR MPA network as it stood at the end of 2016. Key observations from the information provided are that:

- The 10 % coverage target has been met for three of the 19 Dinter Biogeographic Provinces/regions in the case of the continental shelf and slope of the OSPAR Maritime Area, all of them within the Eastern Atlantic Temperate sub-region.
- A further three of the 19 Dinter Biogeographic Provinces/regions exceed 9 % in terms of surface coverage (all within the Eastern Atlantic Temperate sub-region) and another two exceeding 5 % coverage (one each in the Eastern Atlantic sub-region and Atlantic deep-sea Region).
- Four of the 19 OSPAR Dinter Biogeographic provinces/regions have not any OSPAR MPAs and a further five have less than 1 % surface coverage. These provinces/regions are predominantly in the north of the OSPAR Maritime Area.

²⁹ Area calculations Projection EPSG 3035 (ETRS89 / ETRS-LAEA)

2.5 Criterion C: Representation and replication of marine habitats and species within OSPAR MPAs

Madrid Criterion C assesses the representation and replication of EUNIS Level 3 habitat classes and OSPAR Threatened and/or Declining habitats and species (where MPAs may be considered as part of the underlying recommendation).

Madrid Criterion C reflects the OSPAR (2006)³⁰ network principles of 'Features' (representing the range of habitats, species and ecological processes across the OSPAR Maritime Area), 'Representativity' (protecting features and EUNIS Level 3 habitats across their known geographic range), and 'Resilience' (protecting features in multiple MPAs).

At present the OSPAR MPA database is deficient in information regarding the protection of EUNIS Level 3 habitat type. There are also gaps regarding the protection of OSPAR T&D features and it has been necessary to use data on OSPAR T&D features considered to be present within MPAs as opposed to justifying the underlying designation. Therefore a full assessment of Madrid Criterion C has not been possible. Therefore, this assessment against Madrid Criterion C has been undertaken against the OSPAR regions. This provides a direct connection to the recommendations for OSPAR T&D habitats and species.

The results of the assessment against Madrid Criterion C are presented in Tables 2.2-7 per OSPAR T&D feature group (invertebrates, birds, reptiles, marine mammals, fish and habitats). The four threatened and/or declining features where recommendations are still pending were also included in the analyses. The criterion is met when the feature is protected by more than one MPA in the OSPAR region(s) for which they are listed by OSPAR as being under threat/subject to decline. Where a cell is greyed out, this indicates that the feature does not occur within that OSPAR region. A bold number indicates the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline in that particular region.

³⁰ OSPAR Recommendation 2006/03 on developing an ecologically coherent network of Marine Protected Areas - http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/06-03e_Guidance%20ecol%20coherence%20MPA%20network.pdf

Table 2.2. OSPAR T&D invertebrate protection within MPAs across the OSPAR regions³¹.

| OSPAR T&D invertebrate species | I - Arctic | II - Greater North Sea | III - Celtic Seas | IV - Bay of Biscay and Iberian coasts | V - Wider Atlantic | Protection in place |
|---|------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| <i>Arctica islandica</i> - Ocean quahog | 0 | 19 | 6 | 1 | | Yes – There is MPA replication in OSPAR region II where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline |
| <i>Megabalanus azoricus</i> - Azorean barnacle <i>Recommendation pending</i> | | | | | 3 | Yes – There is MPA replication in OSPAR region V where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline |
| <i>Nucella lapillus</i> - Dog whelk <i>Recommendation pending</i> | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | Yes – There is MPA replication in OSPAR region II where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline |
| <i>Ostrea edulis</i> - Flat oyster | 0 | 12 | 2 | 4 | | Yes – There is MPA replication in OSPAR region II where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline |
| <i>Patella ulyssiponensis aspera</i> - Azorean limpet | | | | | 3 | Yes – There is MPA replication in OSPAR region V where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline |

Table 2.3. OSPAR T&D bird protection within MPAs across the OSPAR regions.

| OSPAR T&D bird species | I - Arctic | II - Greater North Sea | III - Celtic Seas | IV - Bay of Biscay and Iberian coasts | V - Wider Atlantic | Protection in place |
|--|------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| <i>Larus fuscus</i> - Lesser black-backed gull | 0 | | | | | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I where it is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Pagophila eburnea</i> - Ivory gull | 0 | | | | | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I where it is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Polysticta stelleri</i> - Steller's eider | 0 | | | | | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I where it is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Puffinus assimilis baroli</i> - Little shearwater | | | | | 4 | Yes – There is MPA replication in OSPAR Region V where the feature is considered to |

³¹ *Megabalanus azoricus* (Azorean barnacle) and *Nucella lapillus* (Dog whelk) not included because recommendations for these species are pending. *Patella ulyssiponensis aspera* – (Azorean limpet) not included because recommendation does not consider the use of MPAs.

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|----|----|----|---|--|
| | | | | | | be under threat/subject to decline |
| <i>Puffinus mauretanicus</i> - Balearic shearwater | | 5 | 1 | 17 | 0 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region V and no replication in OSPAR Region III where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Rissa tridactyla</i> - Black-legged kittiwake | 0 | 36 | 13 | 15 | 0 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Sterna dougallii</i> - Roseate tern | | 9 | 2 | 5 | 4 | Yes – There is MPA replication in OSPAR Regions where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline |
| <i>Uria aalge</i> - Iberian guillemot (synonyms: <i>Uria aalge albionis</i> , <i>Uria aalge ibericus</i>) | | | | 14 | | Yes – There is MPA replication in OSPAR Regions where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline |
| <i>Uria lomvia</i> - Thick-billed murre | 0 | 1 | | 1 | | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |

Table 2.4. OSPAR T&D reptile protection within MPAs across the OSPAR regions

| OSPAR T&D reptile species | I - Arctic | II - Greater North Sea | III - Celtic Seas | IV - Bay of Biscay and Iberian coasts | V - Wider Atlantic | Protection in place |
|--|------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| <i>Caretta caretta</i> - Loggerhead turtle | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | Yes – There is MPA replication in all OSPAR Regions the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Dermochelys coriacea</i> - Leatherback turtle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 10 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Regions I, II & III where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |

Table 2.5. OSPAR T&D mammal protection within MPAs across the OSPAR regions.

| OSPAR T&D mammal species | I - Arctic | II - Greater North Sea | III - Celtic Seas | IV - Bay of Biscay and Iberian coasts | V - Wider Atlantic | Protection in place |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|---|----|---|--|
| <i>Balaena mysticetus</i> - Bowhead whale | 0 | | | | | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I where it is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Balaenoptera musculus</i> - Blue whale | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Regions I, II, III and IV where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Eubalaena glacialis</i> - Northern right whale | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Regions I,II,III & IV, and no replication in OSPAR Region V where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Phocoena phocoena</i> - Harbour porpoise | 0 | 29 | 2 | 10 | 1 | Yes – There is MPA replication in all OSPAR Regions the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |

Table 2.6. OSPAR T&D fish protection within MPAs across the OSPAR regions.

| OSPAR T&D fish species | I - Arctic | II - Greater North Sea | III - Celtic Seas | IV - Bay of Biscay and Iberian coasts | V - Wider Atlantic | Protection in place |
|---|------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| <i>Acipenser sturio</i> - Sturgeon | | 0 | | 3 | | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region II where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Alosa alosa</i> - Allis shad | | 11 | 3 | 10 | | Yes – There is MPA replication in all OSPAR Regions the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Anguilla Anguilla</i> - European eel | 0 | 15 | 1 | 6 | 1 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I and no replication in OSPAR Region III where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Centrophorus granulosus</i> - Gulper shark | | | | 1 | 8 | No – There is no MPA replication in OSPAR Region IV where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | to decline. |
| <i>Centrophorus squamosus</i> - Leafscale gulper shark | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Regions I, II & III and no replication in OSPAR Region IV where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Centroscymnus coelolepis</i> - Portuguese dogfish | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I and no replication in OSPAR Region III where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Cetorhinus maximus</i> - Basking shark | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I and no replication in OSPAR Regions II & III where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Coregonus lavaretus oxyrinchus</i> - Houting Recommendation pending | | | | | | Yes – There is MPA replication in the OSPAR Region the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Dipturus batis</i> - Common Skate | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Regions I & V where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Gadus morhua</i> - Cod | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region III where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Hippocampus guttulatus</i> - Long-snouted seahorse | | 6 | 0 | 5 | 2 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region III where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Hippocampus hippocampus</i> - Short-snouted seahorse | | 7 | 0 | 5 | 0 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Regions III & V where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Hoplostethus atlanticus</i> - | 0 | | | 1 | 8 | No – There is no MPA protection in |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|---|---|---|--|
| Orange roughy | | | | | | OSPAR Region I and no replication in OSPAR Region IV where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Lamna nasus</i> - Porbeagle | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I and no replication in OSPAR Regions III,IV & V where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Petromyzon marinus</i> - Sea lamprey | 0 | 18 | 7 | 8 | | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Raja clavata</i> - Thornback ray | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I and no replication in OSPAR Region III the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Raja montagui</i> - Spotted Ray | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region V and no replication in OSPAR Region III where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Rostroraja alba</i> - White skate | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Regions II, III & IV and no MPA replication in OSPAR Region V where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Salmo salar</i> - Salmon | 0 | 10 | 1 | 6 | | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I and no replication in OSPAR Region III where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Squalus acanthias</i> - [Northeast Atlantic] spurdog | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I and no replication in OSPAR Regions III,IV & V where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <i>Squatina squatina</i> - Angel shark | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | No – There is no MPA replication in OSPAR Regions II, III & IV where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Thunnus thynnus</i> - Bluefin tuna Recommendation pending | | | | | | Yes – There is MPA replication in the OSPAR Region the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |

Table 2.7. OSPAR T&D habitat protection within MPAs across the OSPAR regions.

| OSPAR T&D habitats | I - Arctic | II - Greater North Sea | III - Celtic Seas | IV - Bay of Biscay and Iberian coasts | V - Wider Atlantic | Protection in place |
|--|------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| Carbonate mounds | 0 | | | 1 | 1 | No – There is no MPA replication in OSPAR Region V where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| Coral gardens | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 10 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Regions I and III, and no replication in OSPAR Region IV where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Cymodocea</i> meadows | | | | 0 | | No – There is no MPA protection in the OSPAR Region the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| Deep-sea sponge aggregations | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 10 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Regions I and III, and no replication in OSPAR Region IV where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| Intertidal mudflats | 0 | 26 | 16 | 11 | | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| Intertidal <i>Mytilus edulis</i> beds on mixed and sandy sediments | | 14 | 6 | 3 | | Yes – There is MPA replication in the OSPAR Regions the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|
| Littoral chalk communities | | 6 | 1 | | | Yes – There is MPA replication in the OSPAR Region the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Lophelia pertusa</i> reefs | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13 | No – There is no MPA replication in OSPAR Regions II, III & IV where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| Maerl beds | 0 | 11 | 14 | 6 | 0 | Yes – There is MPA replication in the OSPAR Region the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Modiolus modiolus</i> beds | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | No – There is no MPA replication in OSPAR Regions I, IV & V where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| Oceanic ridges with hydrothermal vents/fields | 0 | | | | 4 | Yes – There is MPA replication in the OSPAR Region the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Ostrea edulis</i> beds | | 2 | 1 | 3 | | No – There is no MPA replication in OSPAR Region III where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reefs | 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region III where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| Seamounts | 0 | | | 1 | 11 | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I and no replication in OSPAR Region IV where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| Sea-pen and burrowing megafauna communities | 0 | 13 | 13 | 1 | 4 | Yes – There is MPA replication in the OSPAR Regions the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |
| <i>Zostera</i> beds | 0 | 26 | 18 | 12 | | No – There is no MPA protection in OSPAR Region I where the feature is considered to be under threat/subject to decline. |

Tables 2.2-7 present the results of the application of Madrid Criterion C to the OSPAR MPA network as it stood at the end of 2016. Key observations are that:

- All OSPAR Threatened and/or Declining invertebrates are considered to be adequately represented and replicated within MPAs in the OSPAR regions they are considered to be under threat/subject to decline (Table 2.2).
- Three of the nine bird species listed by OSPAR as threatened and/or declining are considered to be adequately represented and replicated within MPAs in the OSPAR Regions they are considered to be under threat/subject to decline. Five of the other species lack representation and replication in OSPAR Region I where they are considered under threat/subject to decline (Table 2.3).
- Of the two species of turtle listed by OSPAR as Threatened and/or Declining, *Caretta caretta* is considered to be adequately represented and replicated within the OSPAR MPA network but protection for *Dermochelys coriacea* is lacking in OSPAR Regions I, II and III (Table 2.4).
- Of the four species of marine mammal listed as threatened and/or declining, only *Phocoena phocoena* is considered to be adequately represented and replicated by the OSPAR MPA network (Table 2.5).
- Only three of the 22 species of fish listed by OSPAR as threatened and/or declining are considered to be adequately represented and replicated by the OSPAR MPA network (Table 2.6).
- Six of the 16 habitats listed by OSPAR as threatened and/or declining are considered to be adequately represented and replicated by the OSPAR MPA network. OSPAR Region I is notably underrepresented (Table 2.7).

Conclusions and next steps

Application of the Madrid Criteria to the OSPAR MPA network illustrates that considerable progress has been made in developing the network since the 2013 assessment. However, the network cannot yet be considered to be ecologically coherent across the OSPAR Maritime Area.

MPAs within OSPAR Regions II (Greater North Sea) and III (Celtic Seas) are considered to be geographically well distributed, but significant geographical gaps remain within the MPA network in OSPAR Regions I (Arctic) and V (Wider Atlantic), and a smaller gap in OSPAR Region IV (Bay of Biscay and Iberian coasts). Three Dinter biogeographic provinces have exceeded the target of 10 % MPA coverage, and another three have over 9 % coverage. At the other end of the scale, four Dinter Biogeographic provinces do not contain any MPAs and a further five have less than 1 % surface coverage. Only 19 of the 58 OSPAR Threatened and/or Declining habitats and species are considered to be protected within more than one MPA in the OSPAR Region(s) they are considered to be under threat/subject to decline in.

Work moving forward should focus on considering the nomination of further MPAs to OSPAR in Regions I, IV and V and in the more northerly Dinter biogeographic provinces. In addition, further work is required to identify MPAs for OSPAR Threatened and/or Declining habitats and species where MPAs are an appropriate conservation measure.

In addition, work is also required to improve the ecological and scientific robustness of the OSPAR eco-coherence assessment methodology in time for the next Quality Status Report. Specifically, the following work is recommended to improve the evidence base for future assessments:

- Updating the OSPAR MPA database:
 - with information on the protection of OSPAR Threatened and/or Declining habitats and species; and

- information on EUNIS Level 3 habitat protection
- Building a better understanding of EUNIS level 3 habitat distribution across the OSPAR Maritime Area;
- Assessing the contribution of 'other area-based measures' to the OSPAR MPA network;
- Developing a database of OSPAR Threatened and/or Declining species distribution across the OSPAR Maritime Area;
- Improve understanding of the life history traits of OSPAR Threatened and/or declining habitats and species;
- Using case-studies of connectivity to illustrate how the use of life-history traits information in combination with oceanographic modelling products can improve confidence in MPA network connectivity assessments; and
- Using pilot species to illustrate how connectivity analysis could be developed for highly mobile species based on the protection of critical areas to the life histories of these species.

3 Management of the OSPAR Network of MPAs

3.1 Background

At the 2010 OSPAR Ministerial Meeting in Bergen, Norway, OSPAR Ministers committed to ensuring that by 2016 the OSPAR MPA network is well-managed; namely that coherent management measures have been set up and are being implemented to achieve the conservation objectives of the protected features of OSPAR MPAs.

The OSPAR Intersessional Correspondence Group on Marine Protected Areas (ICG-MPA) developed a questionnaire-based approach to assess the degree to which OSPAR MPAs can be considered to be well-managed. Whilst there is no formal agreement on what constitutes 'well managed' in terms of an MPA – the questionnaire poses four key questions that reflect progress around the implementation cycle of an MPA:

- **A – Is MPA management documented?** This question explores whether information concerning the management of an OSPAR MPA has been published. Management in this context is interpreted as establishing the conservation objectives for protected features, documenting known pressures and threats that could affect protected features, listing management actions to address known pressures and threats, and finally showing spatial information on the distribution of protected features within a given OSPAR MPA.
- **B – Are measures to achieve conservation objectives being implemented?** This question explores whether specific management actions have been identified and put into place by site managers by a legal mechanism or other effective means to address known pressures and threats.
- **C – Is monitoring in place to assess if measures are working?** This question explores whether specific monitoring focussed on the ecological status of protected features of OSPAR MPAs has taken place, or as a minimum, having a means of monitoring the compliance of site users with implemented measures.
- **D – Is the MPA moving towards or has it reached its conservation objectives?** This question explores whether information collected on the ecological status of the protected features of OSPAR MPAs show the achievement, or indicate movement towards achieving, a sites conservation objectives.

The UK, on behalf of the *Ad Hoc* Task Group on Management, developed guidance for Contracting Parties on how to complete the management questionnaire for OSPAR MPAs to aid consistency in the approach undertaken across Contracting Parties. Contracting Parties were asked to answer each question with a *Yes*, *Partial*, *No* or *Unknown* response and to provide additional information that helps explain the response for each of their OSPAR MPAs. Work to collate information on the management of OSPAR MPAs in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) was undertaken by the UK.

As of 1st October 2016, there were 423 OSPAR MPAs and 25 new OSPAR MPA nominations (submitted in 2016 by Spain and the UK) for the OSPAR Maritime Area; hereafter these two categories will be collectively called OSPAR MPAs. Full management information was completed and reported for 326 (73 %) of these OSPAR MPAs; partial information was completed and reported for 34 (8 %), and no information was reported for the remaining 88 MPAs (representing 19 % of the total).

The next section of this chapter provides a summary of the management information received, which is then followed by a more detailed review of the responses against each of the four questions to assess the degree to which OSPAR MPAs are well-managed. This chapter also examines the special case of managing OSPAR MPAs in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) before providing an overall conclusion and highlighting the next steps in the process.

3.2 Summary of results

Figure 3.1 represents the 'OSPAR MPA Management Barometer': an indicator of the extent to which the OSPAR MPA network may be considered to be well-managed. This summary figure provides an overview of 'yes' and 'partial' responses to each of the four questions considered important in determining whether the OSPAR MPA network may be considered to be 'well-managed' for all OSPAR MPAs up to and including 2016 nominations.




Figure 3.1. The OSPAR MPA Management Barometer

Figure 3.1 shows that approximately two-thirds (61 %) of the OSPAR MPA network has full management information in place which is publicly documented, with a further 16 % of OSPAR MPAs having partial management information in place. The partial response is largely due to Contracting Parties updating conservation objectives or because work is ongoing to identify the management actions that may be required to address the known pressures and threats to the protected features of OSPAR MPAs. Figure 3.1 also indicates that whilst there is progress on taking management action and implementing measures to achieve conservation objectives, such actions are largely only partially completed across the OSPAR Maritime Area; a similar picture emerged for the implementation of site condition monitoring for OSPAR MPAs. Consequently, the predominant response to whether OSPAR MPAs are moving towards achieving their conservation objectives is 'unknown' and only 11 % are moving towards or have achieved their conservation objectives because site-specific data on the ecological status of the protected features of OSPAR MPAs are not available.

Work moving forward should focus on the implementation of management measures necessary to achieve the conservation objectives of the protected features of OSPAR MPAs. In parallel, long-term monitoring programmes should be established to evaluate the effectiveness of such management measures to state with greater confidence whether the conservation objectives of the protected features of OSPAR MPAs are being achieved.

In addition, work should progress on improving methods of evaluating the degree to which the OSPAR MPA network is well-managed to support a more sophisticated assessment that can be fed into the OSPAR Quality Status Report 2021. This assessment should build on sound ecological data to determine whether or not the OSPAR MPA network is delivering a genuine conservation benefit to targeted habitats, species and ecological processes.

For OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ, there should be continued effort to further collective arrangements with competent management authorities such that all management recommendations for OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ might be implemented. In addition, Contracting Parties should continue to raise awareness of OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ with relevant stakeholders and interest groups and look to further our scientific understanding of these sites.

3.3 Question 1: Is MPA management documented?

This question explores whether information concerning the management of an OSPAR MPA has been published. Documenting 'management' in the context of this question refers to the publication of the following information:

- Conservation objectives for the protected features of the site;
- Identifying known pressures and threats to achieving those conservation objectives;
- Listing the actions and measures that may need to be undertaken to address those known pressures and threats; and
- Showing spatial information on the location/distribution of protected features within the site.

If all of this information has been published, a 'yes' response to this question can be given. If conservation objectives and known threats and pressures to achieving those conservation objectives have been published, a 'partial' response can be given; anything less receives a 'no' response. If the status of management information in the public domain is unknown, an 'unknown' response is given. A 'no response' is given where the information has not been reported to OSPAR.




Figure 3.2. OSPAR 2016 data call results to the question: 'Is the MPA management documented?'

Figure 3.2 presents the results to the question 'Is the MPA management documented' for the 448 OSPAR MPAs reported against in the 2016 MPA management data call. Some key observations from the information provided are:

- The majority of the OSPAR MPAs (61 %) have management documented in the public domain; namely information that includes protected feature conservation objectives, known threats and pressures assessed, actions identified that may be required to address known pressures and/or threats and information on the spatial extent of protected features within OSPAR MPAs.
- For those that received a partial response (16 %), the main comments noted that either conservation objectives are in the process of being revised or work is ongoing to identify the management actions that may be required to address the known threats and/or pressures to the protected features of OSPAR MPAs.
- Of those OSPAR MPAs that received a 'no' response to the question (3 %), the comments reported shortcomings in the legal framework for establishing and publishing specific management actions for OSPAR MPAs or noting that OSPAR MPAs have only recently been designated and work is progressing to produce management documentation.
- There were no 'unknown' responses reported to this question based on the 2016 data call, but reports were not received for 20 % of OSPAR MPAs.

3.4 Question 2: Are measures implemented?

This question explores whether the specific management actions identified by site managers to address known threats and pressures have been put into effect by a legal mechanism or other appropriate means.

If all specific management actions required to address known threats and pressures have been put into effect, a 'yes' response to this question is given. If only some of the specific management actions required have been put in place, a 'partial' response to this question applies. If none of the required specific management actions have been put in place, a 'no' response applies. 'Unknown' applies if the assessor is unsure on the status of management actions or if there are measures in place but it is unclear whether they address known threats and pressures to the protected features of the site. A 'no response' is given where no information has been reported.




Figure 3.3. OSPAR 2016 data call results to the question: ‘Are the measures to achieve the conservation objectives being implemented?’

Figure 3.3 presents the results to the question ‘Are the measures to achieve the conservation objectives being implemented’ for the 448 OSPAR MPAs reported against in the 2016 MPA management data call. Some key observations from the information provided are:

- 12 % of the OSPAR MPAs are considered to have all the necessary management measures in place to achieve the conservation objectives of their protected features.
- Just over half (54 %) of OSPAR MPAs have partially implemented management measures because work is ongoing to identify and implement measures for the management of non-licensable activities (particularly in relation to fishing activities).
- For the 8 % of OSPAR MPAs that received a ‘no’ response, the reason was predominantly related to MPAs only having been recently designated and so measures have not yet been put in place to achieve the conservation objectives of their protected features.
- There were no ‘unknown’ responses reported to this question in the 2016 data call, but reports were not provided for 26 % of OSPAR MPAs.

3.5 Question 3: Is monitoring taking place?

This question explores whether specific monitoring has taken place that concentrates on the ecological status of protected features of OSPAR MPAs. Whilst monitoring will ideally focus on ecological monitoring, this question also acknowledges the role that monitoring compliance of site users with implemented measures can play in achieving a site’s conservation objectives.

A 'yes' response shows that a regularly implemented monitoring programme is in place that covers all the protected features of an OSPAR MPA. If a monitoring programme only focuses on some of the protected features of an OSPAR MPA or monitoring is only based on site user compliance with implemented measures then a 'partial' response to this question is given. A 'no' response applies when there is no ecological status nor compliance monitoring in place for a given OSPAR MPA. 'Unknown' applies if the assessor is unsure on the status of monitoring for a given OSPAR MPA. A 'no response' is given where no information has been reported.




Figure 3.4. OSPAR 2016 data call results to the question: 'Is monitoring in place to assess if measures are working?'

Figure 3.4 presents the results to the question 'Is monitoring in place to assess if measures are working' for the 448 OSPAR MPAs reported against in the 2016 MPA management data call. Some key observations from the information provided are:

- 14 % of OSPAR MPAs have a long-term monitoring programme in place addressing the ecological condition of all the protected features of the site.
- Just under half (46 %) of the OSPAR MPAs have been partially monitored. This response is predominantly driven by the fact that whilst there are mechanisms in place to monitor the compliance of site users with implemented measures, there is often not a regularly implemented programme to assess the ecological status of all the protected features of OSPAR MPAs. However, many cases noted that baseline ecological condition monitoring surveys have taken place and the on-going ecological condition of some protected features is being monitored. Generally speaking, resource constraints are cited as a significant barrier to the implementation of regular ecological monitoring programmes.

- The 13 % of OSPAR MPAs that received a 'no' response was predominantly due to MPAs only having been recently designated and the fact that wider MPA monitoring strategies are being developed to address these sites.
- There were no 'unknown' responses reported to this question based on the 2016 data call, but reports were not provided for 27 % of OSPAR MPAs.

3.6 Question 4: Are MPAs moving towards or have they reached their conservation objectives?

This question explores whether information collected on the ecological status of the protected features of OSPAR MPAs shows progress towards achieving a site's conservation objectives.

If the condition of all protected features of a given OSPAR MPA are improving or they have achieved their conservation objectives, then a 'yes' response is given. If some of the protected features of a given OSPAR MPA are improving in their condition or have achieved their conservation objectives whilst others remain static or are declining in their condition, a 'partial' response is appropriate. If available data suggest no indication of improvement in the condition of protected features or that some protected features may be declining in condition, a 'no' response is given. If there are no data available with which to make a judgement on the degree to which the conservation objectives of a given OSPAR MPA are being met then an 'unknown' response is given. A 'no response' is given where no information has been reported.




Figure 3.5. OSPAR 2016 data call results to the question: 'Is the MPA moving towards or has it reached its conservation objectives?'

Figure 3.5 presents the results to the question 'Is the MPA moving towards or has it reached its conservation objectives' for the 448 OSPAR MPAs reported against in the 2016 MPA management data call. Some key observations from the information provided are:

- 11 % of OSPAR MPAs are considered to have met their conservation objectives. This conclusion is either based on direct site condition monitoring information or a judgement that no activities take place (or have taken place) that could result in threats and/or pressures affecting the protected features and therefore the features achieve their conservation objectives by default. Of course without direct observation, there would still be a risk that the default conclusion is not valid.
- One quarter of OSPAR MPAs (25 %) are considered to be partially achieving their conservation objectives. There are multiple reasons cited for a partial response:
 - Some of the protected features are considered to be meeting their conservation objectives based on the analysis of feature condition monitoring information whilst others are declining or remain static in their condition;
 - Monitoring information has yet to be analysed to make a judgement on the degree to which a feature's conservation objectives have been met; and
 - There is no direct site condition monitoring information available, but using information on the exposure of a feature to known pressures and/or threats as a proxy suggests all protected features of a given OSPAR MPA are likely to be meeting their conservation objectives.
- Of the 9 % of OSPAR MPAs that received a 'no' response, comments indicated this judgement was based on the fact that site condition monitoring information suggests the conservation objectives of all protected features of a given OSPAR MPA are static or declining.
- Nearly one third of the responses (28 %) to this question suggested it was 'unknown' as to whether the protected features of OSPAR MPAs are moving towards their conservation objectives. This conclusion is primarily due to no long-term ecological status information being available to make a judgement on the degree to which conservation objectives have been achieved.
- Twenty-seven percent of OSPAR MPAs were not reported against as part of the 2016 data call.

3.7 OSPAR MPAs in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction

As part of the OSPAR Convention, fifteen governments and the European Union cooperate to protect the marine environment across the North-East Atlantic, including in those Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ). OSPAR Contracting Parties have a collective responsibility to support the identification of OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ and to report annually to the OSPAR Commission on any specific actions that have been undertaken to implement the management actions identified for those sites.

The 2010 Ministerial Meeting of the OSPAR Commission designated six OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ (listed below) and adopted corresponding Recommendations for the management for each:

- Milne Seamount Complex MPA
- Charlie-Gibbs South MPA
- Altair Seamount High Seas MPA
- Antialtair Seamount High Seas MPA

- Josephine Seamount High Seas MPA
- MAR north of the Azores High Seas MPA

The Decisions designating these OSPAR MPAs came into force on 12th April 2011, as did their accompanying Recommendations. Decision 2012/1 of the OSPAR Convention resulted in the designation of a further OSPAR MPA in ABNJ – Charlie Gibbs North, which came into force on 14th January 2013, together with Recommendation 2012/1 on the management of this MPA.

It is important to note that Annex V of the OSPAR convention specifically exclude from OSPAR's mandate the adoption of any management measures for the concerning fishing. It also directs that any questions relating to maritime transport should be addressed to the IMO.

Successful management of OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ therefore require cooperation with organisations competent for the management of various human activities not within the mandate of OSPAR. Consequently, the OSPAR Commission has sought to share information of relevance to these areas with the organisations such as, the International Maritime Organisation (IMO), the North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC), and the International Seabed Authority (ISA) amongst others. A non-legally binding text called the Collective arrangement sets out the terms for cooperating on management of areas outside of national jurisdiction. It has been formally established in 2014, initially between OSPAR and NEAFC. Figure 3.6 shows the overlap of OSPAR MPAs and NEAFC fishery closure areas.




Figure 3.6. OSPAR MPAs in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction and closed areas to bottom fishing as implemented by NEAFC.

For OSPAR Contracting Parties in particular, key management actions in relation to OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ to date have involved the following types of activities:

- **Awareness raising** - sharing information with relevant authorities, the general public and relevant organisations who may have a stake in a given OSPAR MPA in ABNJ.

Key activities include the creation of a website for the Charlie-Gibbs OSPAR MPA (charlie-gibbs.org) and the integration of OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ into the navigational systems of relevant organisations (e.g. the Military sector).

- **Information building** – facilitating the collection and sharing of information on the protected features of OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ and activities taking place.

Key activities include analysis of fishing activities in MPAs in ABNJ based on Vessel Monitoring System data.

- **Marine science** – *promoting the application of best-practice in terms of scientific research within OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ.*

Key activities include the production, distribution and promotion of an OSPAR Code of Conduct for Marine Research (OSPAR agreement 2008-1) for those undertaking scientific research in OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ.

- **New developments** – *ensuring the implementation of new activities in an OSPAR MPA in ABNJ is considered in terms of its effects on the protected features of the site.*

Assessing how well-managed OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ are is a special case based on the information provided above. However, the following paragraphs present a broad-level assessment across OSPAR MPAs within ABNJ as a whole:

Q1: Is MPA management documented?

A: Partially: All OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ are underpinned by an OSPAR formal Recommendation, background document and Decision. Collectively, this suite of documents is available in the public domain and list the conservation objectives, known pressures and threats and management actions. However, spatial information on the distribution of protected features is often not provided because such information is generally not available.

Q2: Are measures to achieve conservation objectives being implemented?

A: Partially: The OSPAR-NEAFC collective arrangement has enabled significant progress to be made in the implementation of management measures considered to be required to meet the conservation objectives of OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ. However, further work is required; particularly with regards to seabed mining, cable laying, shipping and military activities.

Q3: Is monitoring in place to assess if measures are working?

A: No: Whilst some scientific survey activities have taken place within OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ, there are no dedicated site condition monitoring programmes in place.

Q4: Is the MPA moving towards or has it reached its conservation objectives?

A: Unknown: Given the lack of dedicated site condition monitoring programmes in place and the way in which compliance of site users with the management measures of OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ is monitored, the response to this question is unknown.

3.8 Conclusions and next steps

The results of the 2016 assessment of the management status of OSPAR MPAs show that whilst there is progress on taking management action and implementing measures to achieve conservation objectives, such actions are

largely only partially completed across the OSPAR Maritime Area; a similar picture emerged for the implementation of site condition monitoring for OSPAR MPAs. Consequently, the predominant response to whether OSPAR MPAs are moving towards achieving their conservation objectives is 'unknown' and only 11 % are moving towards or have achieved their conservation objectives because site-specific data on the ecological status of the protected features of OSPAR MPAs are not available. The overall conclusion from this chapter therefore is that the OSPAR MPA network cannot be considered to be 'well-managed' at the end of 2016.

It is important to note that in many cases there remain institutional barriers and resourcing issues to the implementation and evaluation of effective management measures for MPAs across the OSPAR Maritime Area; this was cited as a primary reason for limited progress by many Contracting Parties, as well as the infancy of many of the OSPAR MPAs.

Work moving forward should focus on the implementation of all management measures Contracting Parties feel are required to achieve the conservation objectives of the protected features of OSPAR MPAs within national jurisdiction. In parallel, there is a need for long-term monitoring programs to be established that evaluate the effectiveness of such management measures to conclude with greater confidence whether the conservation objectives of the protected features of OSPAR MPAs are being achieved. In addition, work should progress on improving methods of evaluating the degree to which the OSPAR MPA network is well-managed to support a more sophisticated assessment as to whether or not the OSPAR MPA network is delivering a genuine conservation benefit to targeted habitats, species and ecological processes.

For OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ, there should be continued effort to further the collective arrangements and Memorandums of Understanding with relevant competent management authorities so that they can consider appropriate management actions to help deliver the conservation objectives for OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ. Contracting Parties should continue to raise awareness of OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ with relevant stakeholders and interest groups and look to further our scientific understanding of these sites.

Annex I – List of OSPAR MPAs

(as of 1 October 2016)

| CP | WDPAID | OSPAR MPA | Year of Report | Jur. | Area (km ²) |
|----------------|-----------|---|----------------|------|-------------------------|
| ABNJ/High Seas | 555512236 | Antialtair Seamount High Seas MPA | 2010 | HS | 2,807 |
| | 555512237 | Altair Seamount High Seas MPA | 2010 | HS | 4,384 |
| | 555512238 | Josephine Seamount High Seas MPA | 2010 | HS | 19,365 |
| | 555512239 | Milne Seamount Complex MPA | 2010 | ABNJ | 20,914 |
| | 555512240 | MAR North of the Azores High Seas MPA | 2010 | HS | 93,572 |
| | 555512241 | Charlie-Gibbs South MPA | 2010 | ABNJ | 146,029 |
| | 555557228 | Charlie-Gibbs North High Seas MPA | 2012 | HS | 178,094 |
| Belgium | 555557150 | SBZ3 | 2012 | TW | 57 |
| | 555557219 | Vlaamse Banken, SBZ 1 and SBZ2 | 2012 | TW | 749 |
| | | | | EEZ | 433 |
| Denmark | 555556910 | Agger Tange, Nissum Bredning, Skibsted Fjord og Agerø | 2009 | TW | 166 |
| | 555556912 | Ålborg Bugt, østlige del | 2009 | TW | 1,542 |
| | | | | EEZ | 239 |
| | 555556913 | Ålborg Bugt, Randers Fjord og Mariager Fjord | 2009 | TW | 617 |
| | 555556916 | Anholt og havet nord for | 2007 | TW | 112 |
| | 555556980 | Ebbeløkkerev | 2009 | TW | 1 |
| | 555556991 | Farvandet nord for Anholt | 2007 | TW | 348 |
| | | | | EEZ | 2 |
| | 555557007 | Gilleleje Flak og Tragten | 2009 | TW | 26 |
| | | | | EEZ | 22 |
| | 555557011 | Gule Rev | 2009 | TW | 44 |
| | | | | EEZ | 429 |
| | 555557018 | Havet og kysten mellem Hundested og Rørvig | 2009 | TW | 14 |
| | 555557019 | Havet omkring Nordre Rønner | 2007 | TW | 186 |
| | 555557022 | Herthas Flak | 2007 | TW | 14 |
| | 555557023 | Hesselø med omliggende stenrev | 2007 | TW | 20 |
| | | | | EEZ | 21 |
| | 555557024 | Hirsholmene, havet vest herfor og Ellinge Å's udløb | 2009 | TW | 91 |
| | 555557042 | Jyske Rev, Lillefiskerbanke | 2009 | EEZ | 242 |
| | 555557047 | Kims Top og den Kinesiske Mur | 2007 | EEZ | 262 |
| | 555557050 | Knudegrund | 2007 | TW | 8 |
| Denmark | 555557051 | Kobberhage kystarealer | 2009 | TW | 6 |
| | 555557055 | Læsø Trindel og Tønneberg Banke | 2007 | TW | 79 |
| | | | | EEZ | 8 |
| | 555557056 | Læsø, sydlige del | 2007 | TW | 260 |
| | | | | EEZ | 105 |
| | 555557070 | Løgstør Bredning, Vejlerne og Bulbjerg | 2009 | TW | 0 |
| | 555557071 | Lønstrup Rødgrund | 2007 | TW | 93 |
| | 555557077 | Lysegrund | 2007 | TW | 32 |

2012 DRAFT Status Report on the OSPAR Network of Marine Protected Areas

| | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|--|------|-----|-------|
| | 555557100 | Nissum Fjord | 2009 | TW | 0 |
| | 555557139 | Ringkøbing Fjord og Nymindestrømmen | 2009 | TW | 0 |
| | 555557148 | Sandbanker ud for Thorsminde | 2007 | TW | 64 |
| | 555557149 | Sandbanker ud for Thyborøn | 2007 | TW | 64 |
| | 555557152 | Schultz og Hastens Grund samt Briseis Flak | 2007 | TW | 49 |
| | | | 2007 | EEZ | 160 |
| | 555557161 | Skagens Gren og Skagerrak | 2009 | TW | 1,285 |
| | | | | EEZ | 1,412 |
| | 555557178 | Store Middelgrund | 2009 | EEZ | 21 |
| | 555557179 | Store Rev | 2009 | EEZ | 109 |
| | 555557181 | Strandenge på Læsø og havet syd herfor | 2007 | TW | 628 |
| | 555557193 | Sydlige Nordsø | 2007 | TW | 36 |
| | | | | EEZ | 2,437 |
| | 555557207 | Thyborøn Stenvolde | 2009 | TW | 37 |
| | | | | EEZ | 42 |
| | 555557218 | Vadehavet med Ribe Å, Tved Å og Varde Å vest for Varde | 2009 | TW | 1,137 |
| DK FO | | | | TW | 0 |
| | | | | EEZ | 0 |
| DK GL | | | | TW | 0 |
| | | | | EEZ | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----------|---|------|-----|-------|
| France | 555544124 | Iroise | 2008 | TW | 3,431 |
| | 555544125 | Baie de Somme | 2006 | TW | 34 |
| | 555544126 | Estuaire de la Seine | 2007 | TW | 120 |
| | 555544127 | Domaine de Beauguillot | 2006 | TW | 5 |
| | 555544128 | Baie de Saint-Brieuc | 2006 | TW | 11 |
| | 555544129 | Sept-Iles | 2007 | TW | 4 |
| | 555544130 | Moëze-Oléron | 2007 | TW | 64 |
| | 555544131 | Banc d'Arguin | 2006 | TW | 25 |
| | 555544132 | Baie de l'Aiguillon | 2006 | TW | 25 |
| | 555556909 | Abers - côtes des Légendes | 2012 | TW | 227 |
| | 555556918 | Archipel des Glénan | 2012 | TW | 587 |
| | 555556920 | Au droit de l'étang d'Hourtin-Carcans | 2012 | TW | 501 |
| | | | | EEZ | 5 |
| | 555556922 | Baie de Morlaix | 2012 | TW | 266 |
| | 555556923 | Baie de Seine occidentale | 2012 | TW | 454 |
| | 555556925 | Bancs des Flandres | 2012 | TW | 906 |
| | | | | EEZ | 216 |
| | 555556926 | Bassin d'Arcachon et Cap Ferret | 2012 | TW | 227 |
| | 555556931 | Belle Île en mer | 2012 | TW | 174 |
| | 555556956 | Côte Basque rocheuse et extension au Large | 2012 | TW | 78 |
| | 555556957 | Côte de Granit rose - Sept-Îles | 2012 | TW | 721 |
| | 555556958 | Côte de Granit rose – Sept-Îles | 2012 | TW | 695 |
| | 555556989 | Falaise du Bessin Occidental | 2012 | TW | 13 |
| | 555557009 | Golfe du Morbihan, côte Ouest de Rhuy | 2012 | TW | 206 |
| | 555557033 | Ile de Groix | 2012 | TW | 284 |
| | 555557062 | Littoral Cauchois | 2012 | TW | 46 |
| | 555557079 | Marais du Cotentin et du Bessin - Baie des Veys | 2012 | TW | 287 |
| | 555557082 | Massif dunaire Gavres-Quiberon et zones humides associées | 2012 | TW | 68 |
| | 555557117 | Panache de la Gironde | 2012 | TW | 565 |
| | | | | EEZ | 388 |
| | 555557118 | Panache de la Gironde et plateau rocheux de Cordouan | 2012 | TW | 565 |
| | | | | EEZ | 388 |
| | 555557122 | Pertuis charentais | 2012 | TW | 3,177 |
| | | | | EEZ | 1,385 |
| | 555557123 | Pertuis charentais - Rochebonne | 2012 | TW | 3,228 |
| | | | | EEZ | 4,967 |
| | 555557125 | Plateau rocheux de l'île d'Yeu | 2012 | TW | 120 |
| | 555557129 | Portion du littoral sableux de la côte Aquitaine | 2012 | TW | 501 |
| | | | | EEZ | 5 |
| | 555557135 | Récifs et marais arrière-littoraux du Cap Lévi à la Pointe de Saire | 2012 | TW | 154 |
| | 555557141 | Roches de Penmarc'h | 2012 | TW | 458 |
| | 555557153 | Secteur de l'île d'Yeu | 2012 | TW | 1,752 |
| | | | | EEZ | 704 |
| | 555557196 | Tatihou - Saint-Vaast-la-Hougue | 2012 | TW | 8 |
| | 555557212 | Trégor Goëlo | 2012 | TW | 910 |
| | 555557229 | Estuaire de la Seine | 2012 | TW | 85 |
| | 555557232 | Trégor Goëlo | 2012 | TW | 912 |

2012 DRAFT Status Report on the OSPAR Network of Marine Protected Areas

| | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|--|------|-----|-------|
| Germany | 555557146 | S-H Wadden sea National Park | 2005 | TW | 4,602 |
| | 555556969 | Doggerbank | 2008 | EEZ | 1,696 |
| | 555557194 | Sylt.Aussenr.-Oestl.Dt.Bucht | 2008 | EEZ | 5,595 |
| | 555557145 | S-H Seabird Protection Area | 2005 | TW | 1,618 |
| | 555556937 | Borkum-Riffgrund | 2008 | EEZ | 625 |
| | 555557099 | Nationalpark Niedersächsisches Wattenmeer | 2005 | TW | 2,747 |
| Iceland | 555556983 | Eldey | 2012 | TW | 14 |
| | 555557025 | Hornarfjardardjup, coral reef 1 | 2008 | EEZ | 8 |
| | 555557026 | Hornarfjardardjup, coral reef 2 | 2008 | EEZ | 37 |
| | 555557031 | Hverastrytur i Eyjafirdi | 2008 | TW | 0 |
| | 555557032 | Hverastrytur i Eyjafirdi, north of Arnanesnöfum | 2008 | TW | 1 |
| | 555557137 | Reynisdjup, coral reef | 2008 | TW | 9 |
| | 555557159 | Skaftardjup, coral reef 1 | 2008 | EEZ | 7 |
| | 555557160 | Skaftardjup, coral reef 2 | 2008 | EEZ | 22 |
| | 555557190 | Surtsey | 2012 | TW | 66 |
| | 555586883 | Lónsdjúp | 2014 | EEZ | 77 |
| | 555586884 | Lónsdjúp-Papagrunn landgrunnskantur | 2014 | EEZ | 78 |
| | 555586885 | Papagrunn | 2014 | EEZ | 17 |
| | 555586886 | Rósagarður | 2014 | EEZ | 164 |
| | 555586887 | Skeiðarárdjúp | 2014 | EEZ | 65 |
| Ireland | 555556924 | Ballyness Bay | 2009 | TW | 12 |
| | 555556930 | Belgica Mound Province | 2009 | EEZ | 411 |
| | 555556936 | Blasket Islands | 2009 | TW | 227 |
| | 555556962 | Cummeen Strand/Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) | 2009 | TW | 49 |
| | 555556975 | Dundalk Bay | 2009 | TW | 52 |
| | 555557005 | Galway Bay Complex | 2009 | TW | 144 |
| | 555557027 | Hovland Mound Province | 2009 | EEZ | 1,086 |
| | 555557044 | Kenmare River | 2010 | TW | 433 |
| | 555557045 | Kilkieran Bay and Islands | 2010 | TW | 213 |
| | 555557048 | Kingstown Bay | 2009 | TW | 1 |
| | 555557078 | Malahide Estuary | 2009 | TW | 8 |
| | 555557096 | Mullet/Blacksod Bay Complex | 2009 | TW | 141 |
| | 555557097 | Mulroy Bay | 2009 | TW | 32 |
| | 555557103 | North-West Porcupine Bank | 2009 | EEZ | 715 |
| | 555557106 | North Dublin Bay | 2010 | TW | 15 |
| | 555557140 | Roaringwater Bay and Islands | 2009 | TW | 143 |
| | 555557168 | South-West Porcupine Bank | 2009 | EEZ | 329 |
| | 555557210 | Tralee Bay and Magharees Peninsula, West To Cloghane | 2009 | TW | 116 |
| | 555557211 | Tramore Dunes and Backstrand | 2009 | TW | 8 |
| Netherlands | 555557049 | Klaverbank | 2009 | EEZ | 1,240 |
| | 555557101 | Noordzeekustzone | 2009 | TW | 1,416 |
| | 555557220 | Vlakte van de Raan | 2009 | TW | 199 |
| | 555557221 | Voordelta | 2009 | TW | 819 |
| | 555557231 | Doggerbank | 2009 | EEZ | 4,698 |

| | | | | | |
|----------|-------------------------|--|------|-----|--------|
| Norway | 555557155 | Selligrunnen | 2005 | TW | 1 |
| | 555557142 | Røstrevet | 2005 | EEZ | 316 |
| | 555557185 | Sularevet | 2005 | TW | 12 |
| | | | | EEZ | 973 |
| | 555557040 | Iverryggen | 2005 | EEZ | 621 |
| | 555557227 | Ytre Hvaler | 2009 | TW | 340 |
| | 555557192 ³² | Svalbard West | 2009 | TW | 20,064 |
| | 555557191 | Svalbard East | 2009 | TW | 55,451 |
| | 555556934 | Bjørnøya | 2009 | TW | 2,806 |
| | 555557041 | Jan Mayen | 2012 | TW | 4,319 |
| | 555557052 | Korallen | 2012 | TW | 4 |
| | 555557208 | Trænarevet | 2012 | EEZ | 445 |
| | 555556940 | Breisunddjupet | 2012 | TW | 44 |
| | | | | EEZ | 21 |
| | 555592852 | Saltstraumen | 2015 | TW | 25 |
| | 555592853 | Tauterryggen | 2015 | TW | 44 |
| | 555592854 | Framvaren | 2015 | TW | 6 |
| Portugal | 555557000 | Formigas Bank | 2005 | TW | 524 |
| | 555557074 | Lucky Strike hydrothermal vent | 2006 | EEZ | 191 |
| | 555557084 | Menez Gwen hydrothermal vent field | 2006 | EEZ | 95 |
| | 555557131 | Rainbow hydrothermal vent field | 2006 | ECS | 22 |
| | 555557154 | Sedlo Seamount | 2007 | EEZ | 4,016 |
| | 555556955 | Corvo Island | 2006 | TW | 257 |
| | 555556986 | Faial-Pico Channel | 2006 | TW | 240 |
| | 555556963 | D. João de Castro seamount | 2006 | EEZ | 354 |
| | 555599535 | Berlengas | 2015 | TW | 96 |
| | 555599536 | Lagoas de Santo Andre e Sancha (area maritima) | 2015 | TW | 21 |
| | 555599537 | Arrabida (area maritima) | 2015 | TW | 53 |
| | 555599538 | Litoral Norte (area maritima) | 2015 | TW | 74 |
| | 555599539 | Sudoeste Alentejano e Costa Vicentina (area maritima) | 2015 | TW | 290 |
| Spain | 555556982 | El Cachucho | 2008 | EEZ | 2,395 |
| | 555557037 | Islas Atlanticas | 2007 | TW | 85 |
| | 555583112 | Espacio marino de la Ria de Mundaka-Cabo de Ogoño | 2014 | TW | 175 |
| | 555583113 | Espacio marino de los Islotes de Portios - Isla Conejera - Isla de Mouro | 2014 | TW | 15 |
| | 555583114 | Espacio marino de Cabo Peñas | 2014 | TW | 320 |
| | 555583115 | Espacio marino de Punta de Candela - Ria de Ortigueira - Estaca de Bares | 2014 | TW | 771 |
| | 555583116 | Espacio marino de la Costa de Ferrolterra - Valdoviño | 2014 | TW | 68 |
| | 555583117 | Espacio marino de la Costa da Morte | 2014 | TW | 2,627 |
| | | | | EEZ | 533 |
| | 555583118 | Banco de Galicia | 2014 | EEZ | 10,227 |
| | 555583119 | Espacio marino de las Rias Baixas de Galicia | 2014 | TW | 1,713 |

³² For 555557192; 555557191; 555556934: The outer boundary for this MPA is the 12 nm border of the Norwegian territorial waters. Accordingly, the area of this MPA should be completely within territorial waters. The deviation in the area calculation presented in this report arises from differences between datasets used by the Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management and the standard datasets (official shape file for the OSPAR maritime area & open source VLIZ Maritime Boundaries Geodatabase) used by BfN. Further harmonization of datasets in future reports is anticipated for future calculations.

2012 DRAFT Status Report on the OSPAR Network of Marine Protected Areas

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|------|-----|-------|
| | | | | EEZ | 507 |
| | 555583120 | Golfo de Cadiz | 2014 | TW | 1,477 |
| | | | | EEZ | 840 |
| | 555583121 | Espacio marino del Tinto y del Odiel | 2014 | TW | 49 |
| | 555583122 | Espacio marino de la Bahia de Cadiz | 2014 | TW | 36 |
| | 555593028 | Volcanes del fango del Golfo de Cádiz | 2016 | EEZ | 2,433 |
| | 555593029 | Sistema de cañones submarinos de Avilés | 2016 | TW | 1,247 |
| | | | | EEZ | 2,141 |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------|--|------|-----|-------|
| Sweden ³³ | 555557054 | Kungsbackafjorden | 2005 | TW | 79 |
| | 555557059 | Lilla Middelgrund | 2005 | TW | 89 |
| | | | | EEZ | 89 |
| | 555556997 | Fladen | 2005 | TW | 96 |
| | | | | EEZ | 8 |
| | 555557102 | Nordre älvs estuarium | 2005 | TW | 71 |
| | 555557053 | Kosterfjorden-Väderöfjorden | 2005 | TW | 592 |
| | 555557012 | Gullmarsfjorden | 2005 | TW | 114 |
| | 555557177 | Stora Middelgrund och Röde bank | 2009 | EEZ | 114 |
| | 555557094 | Morups bank | 2009 | TW | 6 |
| United Kingdom | 555556939 | Bratten | 2012 | TW | 48 |
| | | | | EEZ | 1,159 |
| | 555557020 | Havstensfjorden | 2012 | TW | 19 |
| | 555556911 | Ailsa Craig | 2011 | TW | 27 |
| | 555556914 | Alde Ore and Butley Estuaries | 2005 | TW | 11 |
| | 555556915 | Alde—Ore Estuary | 2011 | TW | 11 |
| | 555556917 | Anton Dohrn Seamount | 2012 | EEZ | 1,429 |
| | 555556919 | Ascrib, Isay and Dunvegan | 2005 | TW | 26 |
| | 555556921 | Bae Caerfyrddin / Carmarthen Bay | 2011 | TW | 334 |
| | 555556927 | Bassurelle sandbank | 2011 | EEZ | 67 |
| | 555556928 | Belfast Lough Open Water | 2011 | TW | 56 |
| | 555556929 | Belfast Lough | 2011 | TW | 3 |
| | 555556932 | Benfleet and Southend Marshes | 2011 | TW | 20 |
| | 555556933 | Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast | 2005 | TW | 650 |
| | 555556935 | Blackwater Estuary (Mid-Essex Coast Phase 4) | 2011 | TW | 26 |
| | 555556938 | Braemar Pockmarks | 2008 | EEZ | 5 |
| | 555556941 | Breydon Water | 2011 | TW | 5 |
| | 555556942 | Buchan Ness to Collieston Coast | 2011 | TW | 53 |
| | 555556943 | Burry Inlet | 2011 | TW | 48 |
| | 555556944 | Calf of Eday | 2011 | TW | 25 |
| | 555556945 | Canna and Sanday | 2011 | TW | 54 |
| | 555556946 | Cape Wrath | 2011 | TW | 58 |
| | 555556947 | Cardigan Bay / Bae Ceredigion | 2005 | TW | 952 |
| | 555556948 | Carlingford Lough | 2011 | TW | 5 |
| | 555556949 | Carmarthen Bay and Estuaries / Bae Caerfyrddin ac Aberoedd | 2005 | TW | 632 |
| | 555556950 | Chesil and the Fleet | 2005 | TW | 12 |
| | 555556951 | Chesil Beach and The Fleet | 2011 | TW | 5 |
| | 555556952 | Chichester and Langstone Harbours | 2011 | TW | 51 |
| | 555556953 | Colne Estuary (Mid-Essex Coast Phase 2) | 2011 | TW | 12 |
| | 555556954 | Copinsay | 2011 | TW | 35 |
| | 555556959 | Croker Carbonate Slabs | 2012 | EEZ | 66 |
| | 555556960 | Cromarty Firth | 2011 | TW | 36 |
| | 555556961 | Crouch and Roach Estuaries (Mid-Essex Coast Phase 3) | 2011 | TW | 6 |
| UK | 555556964 | Darwin Mounds | 2008 | EEZ | 1,380 |

³³ The deviation in the area calculation presented in this report arises from differences between datasets used by "Metria" on behalf of the Swedish authorities and the standard datasets (official shape file for the OSPAR maritime area & open source VLIZ Maritime Boundaries Geodatabase) used by BfN. Further harmonization of datasets in future reports is projected.

2012 DRAFT Status Report on the OSPAR Network of Marine Protected Areas

| | | | | |
|-----------|--|------|-----|--------|
| 555556965 | Deben Estuary | 2011 | TW | 8 |
| 555556966 | Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy | 2008 | TW | 135 |
| 555556967 | Dengie (Mid-Essex Coast Phase 1) | 2011 | TW | 25 |
| 555556968 | Dogger Bank | 2011 | EEZ | 12,337 |
| 555556971 | Dornoch Firth and Loch Fleet | 2011 | TW | 54 |
| 555556972 | Dornoch Firth and Morrich More | 2005 | TW | 69 |
| 555556973 | Drigg Coast | 2005 | TW | 7 |
| 555556974 | Duddon Estuary | 2011 | TW | 52 |
| 555556976 | East Caithness Cliffs | 2011 | TW | 114 |
| 555556977 | East Mingulay | 2012 | TW | 115 |
| 555556978 | East Rockall Bank | 2012 | EEZ | 3,698 |
| 555556979 | East Sanday Coast | 2011 | TW | 13 |
| 555556981 | Eileanan agus Sgeiran Lios mór | 2005 | TW | 11 |
| 555556984 | Essex Estuaries | 2005 | TW | 383 |
| 555556985 | Exe Estuary | 2011 | TW | 19 |
| 555556987 | Fair Isle | 2011 | TW | 63 |
| 555556988 | Fal and Helford | 2005 | TW | 62 |
| 555556990 | Faray and Holm of Faray | 2005 | TW | 7 |
| 555556992 | Fetlar | 2011 | TW | 144 |
| 555556993 | Firth of Forth | 2011 | TW | 61 |
| 555556994 | Firth of Lorn | 2005 | TW | 210 |
| 555556995 | Firth of Tay; Eden Estuary | 2011 | TW | 66 |
| 555556996 | Firth of Tay; Eden Estuary | 2005 | TW | 151 |
| 555556998 | Flamborough Head | 2005 | TW | 62 |
| 555556999 | Flannan Isles | 2011 | TW | 58 |
| 555557001 | Forth Islands | 2011 | TW | 97 |
| 555557002 | Foula | 2011 | TW | 67 |
| 555557003 | Foulness (Mid-Essex Coast Phase 5) | 2011 | TW | 97 |
| 555557004 | Fowlsheugh | 2011 | TW | 13 |
| 555557006 | Gibraltar Point | 2011 | TW | 2 |
| 555557008 | Glannau Môn: Cors heli / Anglesey Coast: Saltmarsh | 2005 | TW | 9 |
| 555557010 | Gruinart Flats, Islay | 2011 | TW | 10 |
| 555557013 | Haig Fras | 2008 | EEZ | 481 |
| 555557014 | Haisborough, Hammond and Winterton | 2011 | TW | 598 |
| | | | EEZ | 871 |
| 555557015 | Hamford Water | 2011 | TW | 12 |
| 555557016 | Handa | 2011 | TW | 29 |
| 555557017 | Hatton Bank | 2012 | ECS | 15,722 |
| 555557021 | Hermaness, Saxa Vord and Valla Field | 2011 | TW | 52 |
| 555557028 | Hoy | 2011 | TW | 88 |
| 555557029 | Humber Estuary | 2008 | TW | 336 |
| 555557030 | Humber Estuary | 2011 | TW | 337 |
| 555557034 | Inner Clyde Estuary | 2011 | TW | 17 |
| 555557035 | Inner Dowsing, Race Bank and North Ridge | 2011 | TW | 345 |
| | | | EEZ | 501 |
| 555557036 | Inner Moray Firth | 2011 | TW | 21 |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|--|------|-----|-------|
| United Kingdom | 555557038 | Isle of May | 2005 | TW | 3 |
| | 555557039 | Isles of Scilly Complex | 2005 | TW | 267 |
| | 555557043 | Kenfig / Cynffig | 2005 | TW | 3 |
| | 555557046 | Killough Bay | 2011 | TW | 1 |
| | 555557057 | Land's End and Cape Bank | 2011 | TW | 302 |
| | | | | EEZ | 0 |
| | 555557058 | Larne Lough | 2011 | TW | 3 |
| | 555557060 | Limestone Coast of South West Wales / Arfordir Calchfaen de Orllewin Cymru | 2005 | TW | 2 |
| | 555557061 | Lindisfarne | 2011 | TW | 31 |
| | 555557063 | Liverpool Bay / Bae Lerpwl | 2011 | TW | 1,702 |
| | | | | EEZ | 2 |
| | 555557064 | Lizard Point | 2011 | TW | 140 |
| | 555557065 | Loch Creran | 2005 | TW | 12 |
| | 555557066 | Loch Laxford | 2005 | TW | 12 |
| | 555557067 | Loch Moidart and Loch Shiel Woods | 2005 | TW | 3 |
| | 555557068 | Loch nam Madadh | 2005 | TW | 19 |
| | 555557069 | Lochs Duich, Long and Alsh Reefs | 2005 | TW | 24 |
| | 555557072 | Lough Foyle | 2011 | TW | 21 |
| | 555557073 | Luce Bay and Sands | 2005 | TW | 479 |
| | 555557075 | Lundy | 2005 | TW | 31 |
| | 555557076 | Lyme Bay and Torbay | 2011 | TW | 313 |
| | 555557080 | Margate and Long Sands | 2011 | TW | 511 |
| | 555557080 | Margate and Long Sands | 2011 | EEZ | 137 |
| | 555557081 | Marwick Head | 2011 | TW | 5 |
| | 555557083 | Medway Estuary and Marshes | 2011 | TW | 33 |
| | 555557085 | Mersey Estuary | 2011 | TW | 40 |
| | 555557086 | Mingulay and Berneray | 2011 | TW | 69 |
| | 555557087 | Mòine Mhór | 2005 | TW | 3 |
| | 555557088 | Monach Islands | 2005 | TW | 33 |
| | 555557089 | Montrose Basin | 2011 | TW | 8 |
| | 555557090 | Moray and Nairn Coast | 2011 | TW | 16 |
| | 555557091 | Moray Firth | 2005 | TW | 1,514 |
| | 555557092 | Morecambe Bay | 2005 | TW | 552 |
| | 555557093 | Morecambe Bay | 2011 | TW | 323 |
| | 555557095 | Mousa | 2005 | TW | 5 |
| | 555557098 | Murlough | 2005 | TW | 112 |
| | 555557104 | North Caithness Cliffs | 2011 | TW | 141 |
| | 555557105 | North Colonsay and Western Cliffs | 2011 | TW | 24 |
| | 555557107 | North Norfolk Coast | 2011 | TW | 37 |
| | 555557108 | North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef | 2011 | EEZ | 3,609 |
| | 555557109 | North Rona and Sula Sgeir | 2011 | TW | 67 |
| | 555557110 | North Rona | 2005 | TW | 5 |
| | 555557111 | North Uist Machair and Islands | 2011 | TW | 10 |
| | 555557112 | North West Rockall Bank | 2011 | EEZ | 4,190 |
| | | | | ECS | 179 |
| | 555557113 | Noss | 2011 | TW | 30 |
| | 555557114 | Outer Ards | 2011 | TW | 11 |

2012 DRAFT Status Report on the OSPAR Network of Marine Protected Areas

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|---|------|-----|-------|
| United Kingdom | 555557115 | Outer Thames Estuary | 2011 | TW | 2,955 |
| | | | | EEZ | 839 |
| | 555557116 | Pagham Harbour | 2011 | TW | 3 |
| | 555557119 | Papa Stour | 2005 | TW | 21 |
| | 555557120 | Pembrokeshire Marine / Sir Benfro Forol | 2005 | TW | 1,251 |
| | | | | EEZ | 120 |
| | 555557121 | Pen Llyn a'r Sarnau / Llyn Peninsula and the Sarnau | 2005 | TW | 1,442 |
| | 555557124 | Pisces Reef Complex | 2012 | EEZ | 9 |
| | 555557126 | Plymouth Sound and Estuaries | 2005 | TW | 57 |
| | 555557127 | Pobie Bank Reef | 2012 | TW | 333 |
| | | | | EEZ | 633 |
| | 555557128 | Poole Harbour | 2011 | TW | 13 |
| | 555557130 | Portsmouth Harbour | 2011 | TW | 12 |
| | 555557132 | Ramsey, Isle of Man | 2012 | TW | 94 |
| | 555557133 | Rathlin Island | 2005 | TW | 31 |
| | 555557134 | Rathlin Island | 2011 | TW | 31 |
| | 555557136 | Red Bay | 2011 | TW | 10 |
| | 555557138 | Ribble and Alt Estuaries | 2011 | TW | 97 |
| | 555557143 | Rousay | 2011 | TW | 49 |
| | 555557144 | Rum | 2011 | TW | 360 |
| | 555557147 | Sanday | 2005 | TW | 110 |
| | 555557151 | Scanner Pockmark | 2008 | EEZ | 3 |
| | 555557156 | Severn Estuary | 2011 | TW | 223 |
| | 555557157 | Severn Estuary / Môr Hafren | 2008 | TW | 722 |
| | 555557158 | Shell Flat and Lune Deep | 2011 | TW | 106 |
| | 555557162 | Skerries and Causeway | 2012 | TW | 109 |
| | 555557163 | Solan Bank Reef | 2012 | TW | 11 |
| | | | | EEZ | 846 |
| | 555557164 | Solent and Southampton Water | 2011 | TW | 33 |
| | 555557165 | Solent Maritime | 2005 | TW | 94 |
| | 555557166 | Solway Firth | 2005 | TW | 424 |
| | 555557167 | Sound of Arisaig (Loch Ailort to Loch Ceann Traigh) | 2005 | TW | 46 |
| | 555557169 | South-East Islay Skerries | 2005 | TW | 15 |
| | 555557170 | South Uist Machair and Lochs | 2011 | TW | 3 |
| | 555557171 | South Wight Maritime | 2005 | TW | 196 |
| | 555557172 | St Abb's Head to Fast Castle | 2011 | TW | 16 |
| | 555557173 | St Kilda | 2011 | TW | 281 |
| | 555557174 | St Kilda | 2005 | TW | 245 |
| | 555557175 | Stanton Banks | 2008 | EEZ | 818 |
| | 555557176 | Start Point to Plymouth Sound and Eddystone | 2011 | TW | 341 |
| | 555557180 | Stour and Orwell Estuaries | 2011 | TW | 31 |
| | 555557182 | Strangford Lough | 2005 | TW | 149 |
| | 555557183 | Strangford Lough | 2011 | TW | 147 |
| | 555557184 | Studland to Portland | 2012 | TW | 332 |
| | 555557186 | Sule Skerry and Sule Stack | 2011 | TW | 39 |
| | 555557187 | Sullom Voe | 2005 | TW | 27 |
| | 555557188 | Sumburgh Head | 2011 | TW | 24 |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|--|------|-----|-------|
| United Kingdom | 555557189 | Sunart | 2005 | TW | 55 |
| | 555557195 | Tamar Estuaries Complex | 2011 | TW | 16 |
| | 555557197 | Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast | 2011 | TW | 6 |
| | 555557198 | Thames Estuary and Marshes | 2011 | TW | 27 |
| | 555557199 | Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay | 2011 | TW | 13 |
| | 555557200 | Thanet Coast | 2005 | TW | 28 |
| | 555557201 | The Dee Estuary | 2011 | TW | 111 |
| | 555557202 | The Maidens | 2012 | TW | 75 |
| | 555557203 | The Shiant Isles | 2011 | TW | 68 |
| | 555557204 | The Swale | 2011 | TW | 29 |
| | 555557205 | The Wash and North Norfolk Coast | 2005 | TW | 1,043 |
| | 555557206 | The Wash | 2011 | TW | 589 |
| | 555557209 | Traeth Lafan / Lavan Sands, Conway Bay | 2011 | TW | 27 |
| | 555557214 | Treshnish Isles | 2005 | TW | 19 |
| | 555557215 | Troup, Pennan and Lion`s Heads | 2011 | TW | 33 |
| | 555557216 | Tweed Estuary | 2005 | TW | 2 |
| | 555557217 | Upper Solway Flats and Marshes | 2011 | TW | 382 |
| | 555557222 | West Westray | 2011 | TW | 34 |
| | 555557223 | Wight-Barfleur Reef | 2012 | EEZ | 1,374 |
| | 555557224 | Wyville Thomson Ridge | 2011 | EEZ | 1,740 |
| | 555557225 | Y Fenai a Bae Conwy / Menai Strait and Conwy Bay | 2005 | TW | 265 |
| | 555557226 | Yell Sound Coast | 2005 | TW | 8 |
| | 555583005 | Aln Estuary | 2014 | TW | 0 |
| | 555583006 | Beachy Head West | 2014 | TW | 24 |
| | 555583007 | Blackwater, Crouch, Roach and Colne Estuaries | 2014 | TW | 279 |
| | 555583008 | Chesil Beach and Stennis Ledges | 2014 | TW | 38 |
| | 555583009 | Cumbria Coast | 2014 | TW | 18 |
| | 555583010 | Folkestone Pomerania | 2014 | TW | 34 |
| | 555583011 | Fylde | 2014 | TW | 261 |
| | 555583012 | Isles of Scilly | 2014 | TW | 58 |
| | 555583013 | Kingmere | 2014 | TW | 48 |
| | 555583014 | Lundy | 2014 | TW | 31 |
| | 555583015 | Medway Estuary | 2014 | TW | 58 |
| | 555583016 | Padstow Bay and Surrounds | 2014 | TW | 90 |
| | 555583017 | Pagham Harbour | 2014 | TW | 3 |
| | 555583018 | Poole Rocks | 2014 | TW | 4 |
| | 555583019 | Skerries Bank and Surrounds | 2014 | TW | 250 |
| | 555583020 | Tamar Estuary | 2014 | TW | 15 |
| | 555583021 | Thanet Coast | 2014 | TW | 64 |
| | 555583022 | The Manacles | 2014 | TW | 3 |
| | 555583023 | Torbay | 2014 | TW | 20 |
| | 555583024 | Upper Fowey and Pont Pill | 2014 | TW | 2 |
| | 555583025 | Whitsand and Looe Bay | 2014 | TW | 52 |
| | 555583026 | South Dorset | 2014 | TW | 134 |
| | | | | EEZ | 59 |
| | 555583027 | East of Haig Fras | 2014 | EEZ | 400 |
| | 555583028 | North East of Farnes Deep | 2014 | EEZ | 492 |

2012 DRAFT Status Report on the OSPAR Network of Marine Protected Areas

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|---|------|-----|--------|
| United Kingdom | 555583029 | South West Deep (West) | 2014 | EEZ | 1,827 |
| | 555583030 | Swallow Sand | 2014 | EEZ | 4,748 |
| | 555583031 | The Canyons | 2014 | EEZ | 661 |
| | 555583032 | Clyde Sea Sill | 2014 | TW | 712 |
| | 555583033 | East Caithness Cliffs | 2014 | TW | 114 |
| | 555583034 | Fetlar to Haroldswick | 2014 | TW | 215 |
| | 555583035 | Loch Creran | 2014 | TW | 12 |
| | 555583036 | Loch Sunart | 2014 | TW | 49 |
| | 555583037 | Loch Sunart to the Sound of Jura | 2014 | TW | 741 |
| | 555583038 | Loch Sween | 2014 | TW | 41 |
| | 555583039 | Lochs Duich, Long and Aish | 2014 | TW | 37 |
| | 555583040 | Monach Isles | 2014 | TW | 62 |
| | 555583041 | Mousa to Boddam | 2014 | TW | 13 |
| | 555583042 | Noss Head | 2014 | TW | 8 |
| | 555583043 | Papa Westray | 2014 | TW | 33 |
| | 555583044 | Small Isles | 2014 | TW | 803 |
| | 555583045 | South Arran | 2014 | TW | 280 |
| | 555583046 | Upper Loch Fyne and Loch Goil | 2014 | TW | 88 |
| | 555583047 | Wester Ross | 2014 | TW | 599 |
| | 555583048 | Wyre and Rousay Sounds | 2014 | TW | 16 |
| | 555583049 | Firth of Forth Banks Complex | 2014 | TW | 6 |
| | | | | EEZ | 2,125 |
| | 555583050 | North-west Orkney | 2014 | TW | 1,298 |
| | | | | EEZ | 3,073 |
| | 555583051 | Central Fladen | 2014 | EEZ | 925 |
| | 555583052 | East of Gannet & Montrose Fields | 2014 | EEZ | 1,840 |
| | 555583053 | Faroe-Shetland Sponge Belt | 2014 | EEZ | 5,271 |
| | 555583054 | Geikie Slide and Hebridean Slope | 2014 | EEZ | 2,218 |
| | 555583055 | Hatton-Rockall Basin | 2014 | ECS | 1,257 |
| | 555583056 | North-east Faroe-Shetland Channel | 2014 | EEZ | 23,667 |
| | 555583057 | Norwegian Boundary Sediment Plain | 2014 | EEZ | 164 |
| | 555583058 | Rosemary Bank Seamount | 2014 | EEZ | 6,937 |
| | 555583059 | The Barra Fan and Hebrides Terrace Seamount | 2014 | EEZ | 4,388 |
| | 555583060 | Turbot Bank | 2014 | EEZ | 251 |
| | 555583061 | West Shetland Shelf | 2014 | EEZ | 4,095 |
| | 555583062 | Mersey Narrows and North Wirral Foreshore | 2014 | TW | 20 |
| | 555583063 | Loch Roag Lagoons | 2014 | TW | 0 |
| | 555583064 | The Vadills | 2014 | TW | 1 |
| | 555583065 | Sound of Barra | 2014 | TW | 125 |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|---|------|-----|-------|
| United Kingdom | 555593952 | Glannau Aberdaron and Ynys Enlli / Aberdaron Coast and Bardsey Island | 2015 | TW | 335 |
| | 555593953 | Grassholm | 2015 | TW | 17 |
| | 555593954 | North-West of Jones Bank | 2016 | EEZ | 398 |
| | 555622017 | Allonby Bay | 2016 | TW | 39 |
| | 555622018 | Bideford to Foreland Point | 2016 | TW | 104 |
| | 555622019 | Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds | 2016 | TW | 320 |
| | 555622020 | Coquet to St Mary's | 2016 | TW | 192 |
| | 555622021 | Dover to Deal | 2016 | TW | 10 |
| | 555622022 | Dover to Folkestone | 2016 | TW | 20 |
| | 555622023 | Farnes East | 2016 | TW | 356 |
| | | | 2016 | EEZ | 589 |
| | 555622024 | Fulmar | 2016 | EEZ | 2,437 |
| | 555622025 | Greater Haig Fras | 2016 | TW | 0 |
| | | | 2016 | EEZ | 2,041 |
| | 555622026 | Hartland Point to Tintagel | 2016 | TW | 304 |
| | 555622027 | Holderness Inshore | 2016 | TW | 309 |
| | 555622028 | Mounts Bay | 2016 | TW | 12 |
| | 555622029 | Newquay and The Gannel | 2016 | TW | 9 |
| | 555622030 | Offshore Brighton | 2016 | EEZ | 863 |
| | 555622031 | Offshore Overfalls | 2016 | TW | 140 |
| | | | 2016 | EEZ | 455 |
| | 555622032 | Runnel Stone (Land's End) | 2016 | TW | 20 |
| | 555622033 | Runswick Bay | 2016 | TW | 68 |
| | 555622034 | The Needles | 2016 | TW | 11 |
| | 555622035 | The Swale Estuary | 2016 | TW | 53 |
| | 555622036 | Utopia | 2016 | TW | 3 |
| | 555622037 | West of Walney | 2016 | TW | 308 |
| | | | 2016 | EEZ | 80 |
| | 555622038 | Western Channel | 2016 | EEZ | 1,614 |

Annex II – Evolution of the OSPAR Network of MPAs

Summary of the gradual development of the OSPAR Network of MPAs as result of the selection and nomination of sites by CPs in the time period 2005– 1 October 2014.

12th Reporting Period of new MPAs (2 October 2015 – 1 October 2016)

The **United Kingdom** submitted its seventh tranche of marine sites as a further contribution to the OSPAR network of Marine Protected Areas. This tranche comprised the marine area of 23 Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs) that were designated in 2016, as well as the re-submission of 10 existing Marine Conservation Zones submitted to OSPAR in 2014 as further features were added to these sites in 2016. In addition, **Spain** submitted two new OSPAR MPAs and amended the boundary of one of its previously submitted MPAs, Banco de Galicia. In total, the area of the OSPAR Network of MPAs increased by over 18,000 km².

11th Reporting Period of new MPAs (2 October 2014 – 1 October 2015)

The **United Kingdom** submitted its sixth tranche of marine sites to the OSPAR MPA network of supplementing the UK's previous submissions in 2005, 2008, 2011, 2012 and 2014. The tranche comprised two SPAs and an amendment to an existing OSPAR MPA - Haig Fras SAC that had its site boundary amended in 2015. **Norway** nominated three additional MPAs as components to the OSPAR Network of MPAs and **Portugal** another five. Collectively, these 10 new MPAs cover an area of over 600 km².

10th Reporting Period of new MPAs (2 October 2013 – 1 October 2014)

The **United Kingdom** submitted its fifth tranche of sites to the OSPAR Network of MPAs. A total of 61 sites have been reported to the OSPAR Commission, comprising of three additional SACs and one SPA designated under the EC Habitats Directive and EC Birds Directive, as well as 27 MCZs and 30 NCMPAs designated under UK legislation. Altogether, these sites have a total area of 71,153 km². **Spain** has nominated a total of 11 SPAs designated under the EC Birds Directive to the OSPAR Commission. These sites protect 17,843 km² of Spanish waters. **Iceland** has nominated five MPAs as components to the OSPAR Network of MPAs. Collectively, these MPAs cover an area of about 401 km².

9th Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 January 2013 – 1 October 2013)

No new OSPAR MPAs were nominated in the 9th Reporting Period.

8th Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 January 2012 – 31 December 2012)

At the meeting of the OSPAR Commission in 2012 (25-29 June 2012, Bonn/Germany), CPs agreed to establish the *Charlie-Gibbs North High Seas MPA* with the goal of protecting and conserving the biodiversity and ecosystems of the waters superjacent to the seabed in the northern part of the Charlie-Gibbs Fracture Zone. The seabed in the area is subject to a submission by Iceland to the UN CLCS. With the nomination of two MPAs by **Belgium**, all twelve OSPAR CPs have contributed to the OSPAR Network of MPAs. **France** submitted 30 MPAs (8 SPAs and 22 SACs) and the **United Kingdom** submitted its fourth tranche of sites (1 Nature Reserve and 12 SACs) to the OSPAR Network of MPAs. **Norway** nominated four MPAs and **Iceland** two.

7th Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 January 2011 – 31 December 2011)

The **United Kingdom** has submitted its third tranche of sites to the OSPAR Network of MPAs, supplementing UK's previous submissions in 2005 and 2008. A total of 117 sites, 14 SACs and 93 SPAs designated by the United Kingdom under the EC Habitats Directive and EC Birds Directive, that are relevant to the OSPAR Convention have been reported to the OSPAR Commission. The sites have been identified by reference to the OSPAR MPA identification guidelines (OSPAR 2003 Annex 10 Ref A-4.44b(i)). Information on marine habitats and species of interest for each site as well as information on management within these OSPAR MPAs has been provided for inclusion in the OSPAR MPA database.

6th Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 June 2010 – 31 December 2010)

MPA nominations in 2010 – Part II

In the context of the OSPAR Ministerial Meeting 2010 (20-24 September, Bergen/Norway) OSPAR CPs have agreed to collectively establish six MPAs in ABNJ of the North-East Atlantic. These areas, *i.e.* *Charlie-Gibbs South MPA*, *Milne Seamount Complex MPA*, *Josephine Seamount High Seas MPA*, *Altair Seamount High Seas MPA*, *Antialtair High Seas MPA*, and the *Mid-Atlantic Ridge north of the Azores High Seas MPA*, collectively cover about 285.000 km² within OSPAR Region V.

Portugal has at the same time announced the intention to designate and protect the sea floor and sub-sea floor within the areas of the *Josephine Seamount High Seas MPA*, *Altair Seamount High Seas MPA*, *Antialtair High Seas MPA*, and the *Mid-Atlantic Ridge north of the Azores High Seas MPA*, as components of the OSPAR Network of MPAs. These areas are subject to the submission of Portugal to the UN CLCS regarding the establishment of the outer limits of the Portuguese continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured, in accordance with Article 76 and Annex II of UNCLOS. In accordance with Articles 76 and 77(3) of UNCLOS, the sovereign rights and the jurisdiction of Portugal are referred to the seabed and subsoil of the areas indicated in the Portuguese submission to the UN CLCS. With its submission Portugal also committed itself to the conservation of living resources and biodiversity in the continental shelf. This duty is concurrent with the protection and conservation of a set of OSPAR priority habitats: seamounts, cold water coral reefs, cold water coral gardens and sponge aggregations.

Denmark has rectified the information presented in the previous Status Report (Publication Number 493/2010) with regards to the MPAs nominated to OSPAR in 2009. The information has been revised accordingly in the relevant section below and taken into account in the analysis of the OSPAR Network of MPAs in the main sections of this report.

5th Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 January 2009 – 31 May 2010)

MPA nominations in 2010 – Part I

Sweden has contributed Natura 2000 sites to be included in the OSPAR Network of MPAs, collectively covering 726 km².

On the west coast bordering Norway, Sweden has established the *Koster-Väderö Archipelago MPA*, covering 606 km² of territorial waters. The area is encompassing the Koster archipelago and the Väderö Islands and the 65 km long and up to 250 m deep Koster-Väderö Trough. Due to the influence by the Atlantic the area hosts a high diversity of biotopes and species. Of the 6000 marine species that have been identified in Kosterhavet, about 200 are found nowhere else in Sweden. In particular there are very rich deep hard bottom habitats with the only known live *Lophelia* reef in Sweden at a depth of 80 m. Also kelp forests, maërl beds and soft corals are found within the MPA. Together with the OSPAR MPA *Ytre Hvaler* nominated by Norway, the area covers an entire ecosystem (see also information below on the MPA nominations by Norway in 2010).

With a view to protect and conserve a coastal bank area representative for the Swedish West coast in the Kattegat, the *Morups bank* MPA (5.67 km²) has been established. This relatively small bank is characterised by rock and stones with rich algae vegetation and rich fauna of polychaete worms, particularly at depths of 20 – 30 meters.

With a view to protect representative offshore banks in the eastern Kattegat, Sweden has nominated *Stora Middelgrund and Röde Bank* (114 km²). These banks still seem to have a rather intact ecological structure, providing potentially important seed areas for a variety of invertebrates associated with hard bottoms and kelp beds, as well as for fishes.

Norway has nominated the *Ytre Hvaler National Park* as an OSPAR MPA, covering 340 km² of the Hvaler-Fredrikstad archipelago, situated in the coastal areas of south eastern Norway. It hosts a rich diversity of species both on land and in the sea while being a popular recreational area. The national park includes terrestrial areas, but for the purpose of designating this area as an OSPAR MPA only the marine part of the national park has been included. The national park borders up to the *Kosterhavet Marine National Park* in Sweden. These national parks were established in close collaboration between the Norwegian and Swedish regional governments. The management of the sites will also be coordinated between Norway and Sweden. Due to the close relationship between the two areas they are now nominated to the OSPAR Network of MPAs as a jointly managed transboundary MPA. For practical reasons separate nomination proformas have been elaborated for the areas from each of the two CPs (see information above on the MPA nominations by Sweden in 2010). Two MPAs previously nominated by Norway, *i. e. Tisler* and *Fjellknausene* are now encompassed in the *Ytre Hvaler National Park*. These two areas therefore have been withdrawn from the OSPAR Network of MPAs as independent components, as they are now covered by the new Ytre Hvaler MPA.

MPA nominations in 2009

Ireland has selected 19 Natura 2000 sites as a contribution to the OSPAR Network of MPAs. For a list of these sites, please see Annex I. The sites have been designated to protect particularly the following species and habitats that OSPAR has identified as being threatened or in decline: intertidal mudflats, *Lophelia pertusa* reefs, maërl beds, *Zostera* beds and Harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*). The total area covered by these sites is 4,136 km², of which 1,593 km² are in Irish territorial waters and 2,543 km² in the EEZ. The sites are located to the north, south, east and west of Ireland and offshore on the edge of Ireland's inner Continental Shelf and contribute to the network coverage in the Celtic Seas (OSPAR Region III). While no formal management plans have yet been prepared or implemented, management measures are already taken in these sites.

Denmark has decided to nominate all their marine Natura 2000 sites, which so far have not been reported to the OSPAR Commission, as components to the OSPAR Network of MPAs. Altogether 30 new sites have been nominated, while another four sites nominated in 2007 have been expanded. It should be noted that in the course of expanding previously nominated MPAs, names have been changed for two sites, with one of these now encompassing three individual sites nominated in 2007.

The **Netherlands** has nominated five Natura 2000 sites as components of the OSPAR Network of MPAs, together covering approximately 8,400 km² in the Greater North Sea (OSPAR Region II). Three of these sites are situated in the Dutch territorial waters, namely the *Noordzeekustzone* (ca. 1400 km²), the *Voordelta* (ca. 900 km²), and the *Vlakte van de Raan* (226 km²). Two sites have been nominated in the Dutch EEZ, namely the *Doggerbank* (4718 km²), and the *Klaverbank* (1,238 km²). All these areas will be designated according to Dutch legislation of the Nature Conservation Act and the Flora and Fauna Act in 2010. The management plan for the *Voordelta* has been finalised and is currently being implemented. Management plans for the other MPAs will be set at the latest three years after their designation in 2010.

Norway has nominated three sites covering a total area of 78,411 km² in the territorial waters around the Svalbard archipelago. The three areas, namely *Svalbard West* (20,033 km²), *Svalbard East* (55,573 km²) and *Bjørnøya* (2,805 km²) consist of the marine parts of four existing nature reserves and seven national parks within the archipelago. They are grouped into three OSPAR MPAs based on an evaluation of geography, biology

and legal status of existing environmental protection measures. The major part of these sites is situated within the Barents Sea. The northern parts extend into the High Arctic maritime province. Each of the four nature reserves and seven national parks, from which the three OSPAR MPAs originate, is established by separate national regulations. The degree of protection and restrictions varies between the ten areas. Svalbard and the sea territory out to 12 nm are protected through the Svalbard Environmental Act. Svalbard falls within the perimeter of the Barents Sea management plan. In addition, separate management plans for each of the national parks and nature reserves are, or will be, elaborated. The nomination of these three MPAs by Norway has not only substantially increased the coverage of the OSPAR Network of MPAs in the Arctic Waters (OSPAR Region I) but also more than doubled the total coverage of the network.

4th Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 January 2008 – 31 December 2008)

France has nominated *La Mer d'Iroise*, off the coast of western Brittany, as a component to the OSPAR Network of MPAs. This site is situated in the coastal waters with a total area of 3,431.75 km² extending across the boundaries of OSPAR Region II, the Greater North Sea (1758.43 km²) and OSPAR Region III, the Celtic Seas (1673.32 km²). It has not yet been reported as a Natura 2000 area. No information on management has been reported.

Germany has nominated an additional set of six MPAs³⁴ to the OSPAR Network of MPAs of which three sites are located in the EEZ, namely the *Dogger Bank* (1,700 km²), the *Borkum Reef Ground* (625 km²) and the *Sylt Outer Reef – Eastern German Bight* (5,600 km²); while the other three sites are situated in territorial waters, namely the *Schleswig-Holstein Wadden Sea National Park and adjacent Coastal Areas* (4,524.55 km²), the *Steingrund* (174.50 km²), and *Helgoland mit Helgoländer Felssockel* (55.09 km²). All of these sites have previously been established as Natura 2000 areas (SCI, SPA) and are located within OSPAR Region II, the Greater North Sea. The total area protected has in 2008 increased by 4,723 km². For the *Schleswig-Holstein Wadden Sea National Park and adjacent Coastal Areas* for which (sectoral) national and an overall trilateral management plan(s) exist; for the OSPAR MPA *Helgoland mit Helgoländer Felssockel* and the SPA within the OSPAR MPA *Sylt Outer Reef – Eastern German Bight* ordinances according to national law are implemented. Management plans for the remaining sites are being prepared.

Iceland has nominated its first set of seven MPAs as components to the OSPAR Network of MPAs, of which four sites are located in the EEZ: namely *Hornafjarðardjúp Coral Reef 1* (7.89 km²), *Hornafjarðardjúp Coral Reef 2* (31.27 km²), *Skaftárdjúp Coral Reef 1* (7.36 km²), and *Skaftárdjúp Coral Reef 2* (22.31 km²), while the other three sites are situated in the coastal waters, namely *Eyjafjörður Hydrothermal Vents 1* (0.12 km²), *Eyjafjörður Hydrothermal Vents 2* (0.56 km²), and *Reynisdjúp Coral Reef* (9.45 km²). All of these MPAs are within OSPAR Region I, the Arctic, and together cover an area of about 78.96 km². No information on management has been reported.

Spain has nominated *El Cachucho* (2,349.66 km²), also known as the *Le Danois Bank*, to the OSPAR Network of MPAs. This site is situated in Spain's EEZ about 65 km off the northern coast of the Iberian Peninsula in the Cantabrian Sea. It is located within OSPAR Region IV, the Bay of Biscay and Iberian Coast. This MPA has also been proposed as a site of Special Community Importance (SCI) for the European Network Natura 2000. The relevant authorities are in the process of establishing natural resources and fishing management plans for the area.

³⁴ It has to be noted that the MPA *Sylt Outer Reef – Eastern German Bight* incorporates and thus supersedes the SPA *Eastern German Bight*, which was nominated to OSPAR during 2005. This (old) smaller site now lies inside the newly designated larger OSPAR MPA, and therefore OSPAR was invited to remove the former from the OSPAR MPA list and database. A similar situation applies with regard to the MPAs nominated in coastal waters. They are either within (*Steingrund*) or extend (*Helgoland mit Helgoländer Felssockel*) the previously nominated *Seabird Protection Area Helgoland* or extend the *Schleswig-Holstein Wadden Sea National Park* (*Schleswig-Holstein Wadden Sea National Park and adjacent Coastal Areas*).

The **United Kingdom** has nominated a set of eight additional SACs as components to the OSPAR Network of MPAs, all of which have become Natura 2000 sites since 2005. This includes five offshore/EEZ SACs, namely *Braemar Pockmarks* (5.18 km²; OSPAR Region II), *Scanner Pockmarks* (3.35 km²; OSPAR Region II), *Haig Fras* (481.34 km²; OSPAR Region III), *Stanton Banks* (817.87 km²; III) and *Darwin Mounds* (1377.26 km²; OSPAR Region V) and three inshore/coastal waters SACs, namely *Severn Estuary* (721.96 km²; OSPAR Region III), *Dee Estuary* (134.47 km²; OSPAR Region III) and *Humber Estuary* (336.40 km²; OSPAR Region II). For all of these MPAs, management measures, arising from requirements of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC, are being developed and taken forward.

3rd Reporting Period of new MPAs (1 January 2007 – 31 December 2007)

In the 2007 reporting period, new MPAs nominated by Denmark, Spain and Portugal increased the number of sites from 87 to 106 with an area increase from 26,619 km² to 38,178 km². At the same time, the United Kingdom withdrew one site previously nominated and recalculated its total area coverage by MPAs.

Denmark reported its first OSPAR MPAs, 18 sites totalling 5,398.66 km². Seven of the 18 sites are within their EEZ. All of these MPAs are Natura 2000 sites with the same boundaries. Please refer to Annex I with regards to their names and further details.

Spain likewise reported its first OSPAR MPA, a conglomerate of four sites under the name *Islas Atlánticas de Galicia*, totalling 85.42 km² in territorial waters. This MPA is a Natura 2000 site, with similar boundaries, but somewhat larger (85.24 km² vs. 71.38 km²).

Portugal reported its eighth and at the same time largest site, the *Sedlo Seamount* with an area of 4,012.53 km², increasing the total area being protected to 5,698.25 km². This MPA is situated within the Portuguese EEZ, but it is not a Natura 2000 site at all. As noted in the 2006 Status Report, of the EU Member States, only Portugal Azores has nominated sites that are not wholly Natura 2000 sites, which was an important development. Of the eight Portuguese sites, four are not Natura 2000 at all, and the remaining four are larger and more extensive than the smaller Natura 2000 sites contained within them.

The **United Kingdom** submitted updated GIS files and provided area calculations for all of its sites, except for its three Northern Ireland MPAs. One site was withdrawn, due to its negligible marine area, reducing the total number of UK sites to 55.

2nd Reporting Period of new MPAs (10 April 2006 – 31 December 2006)

In the 2006 reporting period, new MPAs nominated by Portugal increased the number of sites from 81 to 87, and the total network area increased from 25,426 km² to 26,619 km².

Portugal reported six additional areas as components of the OSPAR Network of MPAs. These MPAs are situated in the waters surrounding the Azores, of which two sites (*Faial-Pico channel*, *Corvo Island*) are in territorial waters, three in the EEZ (*D. João de Castro Seamount*, *Lucky Strike Hydrothermal Vent Field*, *Menez Gwen Hydrothermal Vent Field*), and one on the ECS (*Rainbow Hydrothermal Vent Field*). This amounts to 497.42 km² in territorial waters, 640.88 km² in Portugal's EEZ, and 22.15 km² on the ECS, totalling 1,160.45 km². Only Portugal has nominated an MPA on the continental shelf beyond the EEZ.

It should be noted that due to the extension of the first year's reporting deadline, most of the MPAs in the initial report were actually put forward in the period between January and April 2006. This meant that the second reporting period was less than a calendar year.

1st Reporting Period of new MPAs (2005 - 9 April 2006)

The 2005 MPA nominations are summarized below in the order they were received.

Portugal: One site, *Formigas/Dollabarat Bank*, within the waters of the Azores, was reported to MASH 2005. It was the first OSPAR MPA nomination. It is a nature reserve with a delimited area of 525.27 km², extending to below 1500 m in depth. Of that, 36.28 km² is also a Natura 2000 site, down to the 200 m isobath.

Norway: Six sites were reported in December 2005. The six sites are: *Selligrunnen* (Nature Reserve), *Røstrevet*, *Sularevet*, *Iverryggen*, *Tisler*, and *Fjellknausene*, the latter five of which have fisheries closures to bottom-tending gear. The six in total cover an area of about 1,905.39 km².

Germany: Two extensive sites were reported in January 2006, and two more in April 2006. The sites are: *Helgoland Seabird Protected Area* (a Natura 2000 SPA), *Schleswig-Holstein Wadden Sea* (National Park and Natura 2000 SCI), *SPA-Eastern German Bight* (Natura 2000 SPA), and *Lower Saxony Wadden Sea National Park* (Natura 2000 SPA and SAC). The sites comprise a total of 11,922.78 km². In all, more than 90% of German coastal waters are also OSPAR MPAs, with large sections of the EEZ waters included as well.

Sweden

Six sites were reported in January 2006: *Koster-Väderö Archipelago* (some enhanced protections including fisheries restrictions), *Gullmarn Fjord* (also with enhanced protections), *Nordre Älv Estuary* (fisheries closures), *Kungsbacka Fjord* (nature reserve), *Fladen*, and *Lilla Middelgrund*. The six sites overlap Natura 2000 sites, and cover a total of 971.77 km². *Fladen* and *Lilla Middelgrund* both have portions extending into the EEZ (37.62 km² and 159.21 km², respectively).

UK: Fifty-six sites were reported as OSPAR MPAs in January 2006. All sites are also Natura SACs. Please refer to Annex I with regards to their names and details.

France: Eight sites were reported in March 2006: *Réserve Naturelle Nationale de la Baie de Somme*, *Réserve Naturelle de l'Estuaire de la Seine*, *Réserve Naturelle Nationale du Domaine de Beauquillot*, *Réserve Naturelle de la Baie de l'Aiguillon*, *Réserve Naturelle de la baie de Saint Brieuc*, *Archipel des Sept îles*, *Réserve Naturelle de Moëze-Oléron*, and *Réserve Naturelle du Banc d'Arguin*. They together cover an area of about 274.53 km².

Annex III – Historical process of the elaboration of proposals for OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ/in the High Seas

Designation of OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ/in the High Seas requires collective agreement and action by the OSPAR Commission. Any proposal for an OSPAR MPA in ABNJ/in the High Seas needs to be considered and eventually agreed by all OSPAR CPs.

In 2003, a map of the OSPAR Maritime Area has been prepared as a spatial planning tool indicating those areas that do not fall under the jurisdiction of any CP and thus would be considered ABNJ (Figure1). At that time, ABNJ have been determined by the boundaries of the EEZ of CPs at 200 nautical miles from the shoreline.




Figure 1. ABNJ in the OSPAR Maritime Area as defined in 2003³⁵.

³⁵ It has to be noted that since 2003 a number of OSPAR CPs have made submissions to the UN CLCS for an ECS. These submissions have substantially changed the legal situation in the OSPAR Maritime Area (see Figure 3).

Over the years, a number of proposals for OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ have been elaborated. The proposals were originally prepared by the Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) World Wide Fund For Nature (WWF) and the University of York³⁶, subsequently reviewed by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) in 2008 (ICES Advice 2008 Book 1), and gradually finalized by the relevant OSPAR bodies, namely ICG-MPA, BDC, and the Working Group on Marine Protected Areas, Species and Habitats (MASH). As a result, following marine areas have been identified as potential OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ (see Figure 2):

- *Charlie-Gibbs Fracture Zone/Mid-Atlantic Ridge*
- *Reykjanes Ridge*
- *Mid-Atlantic Ridge north of the Azores*
- *Milne Seamount Complex*
- *Altair Seamount*
- *Antialtair Seamount*
- *Josephine Seamount Complex*




Figure 2. Marine areas proposed as OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ in 2008.

³⁶ The University of York has elaborated these proposals under a contract (2008-2010) provided by the BfN.

Table 3. Milestones in the elaboration of proposals for OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ until 2010.

| 2006 | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| MASH Working Group March 2007 | 1 st presentation of the nomination proforma for the <i>Charlie-Gibbs Fracture Zone</i> as a potential MPA in ABNJ |
| 2008 | |
| OSPAR Commission June 2008 | <i>Charlie-Gibbs Fracture Zone</i> approved <i>in principle</i> as a potential MPA in ABNJ. |
| MASH Working Group October 2008 | <p>1st presentation of nomination proformas for <i>Reykjanes Ridge</i>, <i>Mid-Atlantic Ridge north of the Azores</i>, <i>Milne Seamount Complex</i>, <i>Altair Seamount</i>, <i>Antialtair Seamount</i>, and <i>Josephine Seamount Complex</i> as potential OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ.</p> <p>The <i>Rockall and Hatton Banks</i> proposal was set aside following concerns brought forward by the UK and Ireland, that the seabed within the proposed area was expected to be subject to submissions for an ECS by a number of States, namely the UK, Ireland, Iceland and Denmark (on behalf of the Faeroe Islands) and that it was not possible to say at this stage which of these four states (if any) may eventually assume sovereign rights over the continental shelf in the proposed area. Furthermore, the proposed sites for <i>Rockall & Hatton Banks</i> intruded into Ireland's national EEZ.</p> |
| 2009 | |
| NEAFC Annual Meeting April 2009 | NEAFC decided to close five areas on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge to bottom fisheries with a view to protect Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems in ABNJ of the North-East Atlantic (see Figure 3). Pursuant to the competence of NEAFC, this implies that fishing activities by vessels flying the flags of NEAFC CPs or Co-Operating Non-CPs, with fishing gear which is likely to contact the seafloor during the normal course of fishing operations, are prohibited within these areas. As shown in Figure 3, these areas largely overlapped with four of the proposed OSPAR MPAs (<i>i.e. Charlie-Gibbs Fracture Zone, Mid-Atlantic Ridge north of the Azores, Altair Seamount, Antialtair Seamount</i>), while the area closure by NEAFC on the <i>Reykjanes Ridge</i> was situated next to the proposed MPA by OSPAR. No area has been closed to bottom fisheries by NEAFC in the proposed OSPAR MPAs <i>Milne Seamount Complex</i> and <i>Josephine Seamount Complex</i> . |
| OSPAR Commission June 2009 | <p>General and specific conservation objectives for the <i>Charlie-Gibbs Fracture Zone</i> agreed upon.</p> <p><i>Reykjanes Ridge, Mid-Atlantic Ridge north of the Azores, Milne Seamount Complex, Altair Seamount, Antialtair Seamount, and Josephine Seamount Complex</i> approved <i>in principle</i>³⁷ as potential MPAs in ABNJ; general and specific conservation objectives for all these areas agreed upon.</p> |
| OSPAR CPs Any time | A number of OSPAR CPs made submissions to the UN CLCS for an ECS, pursuant to article 76, paragraph 8, of UNCLOS of 10 December 1982 ³⁸ . As a consequence, apart from the <i>Milne Seamount Complex</i> all other areas proposed as OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ have entirely or partly been encompassed by areas subject to submissions for an ECS (see Figure 3). |

³⁷ Until the OSPAR Ministerial Meeting in September 2010 the approval of these MPAs was subject to study reservations from some CPs.

³⁸ Visit [UN CLCS](#) for details of the submissions made in 2009 by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Ireland, Iceland, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, and Spain.

A number of OSPAR CPs have already made submissions to the UN CLCS for an ECS. These submissions have substantially changed the legal situation in the OSPAR Maritime Area (see Figure 3).




Figure 3. Submissions of OSPAR CPs to the UN CLCS for an ECS affected the legal situation within the proposed OSPAR MPAs in ABNJ (as of May 2010)³⁹.

³⁹ The boundaries of CPs' EEZs have been obtained from the [open source VLIZ Maritime Boundaries Geodatabase](#). It is noted, that not all of these boundaries as shown in the map have been officially declared by CPs.

Annex IV – List of Abbreviations

| | |
|------------------|--|
| ABNJ | Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction |
| BDC | OSPAR Biodiversity Committee |
| BfN | German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation |
| CBD | Convention of Biological Diversity |
| CP | Contracting Party |
| ECS | Extended Continental Shelf |
| EEZ | Exclusive Economic Zone |
| HELCOM | The Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission |
| ICCAT | International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas/ |
| ICES | International Council for the Exploration of the Sea |
| ICG-MPA | OSPAR Intersessional Correspondence Group on Marine Protected Areas |
| IMO | International Maritime Organization |
| ISA | International Seabed Authority |
| IWC | International Whaling Commission |
| MASH | OSPAR Working Group on Marine Protected Areas, Species and Habitats |
| MCZ | Marine Conservation Zone |
| MPA | Marine Protected Area |
| NAMMCO | North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission |
| NASCO | North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization |
| NCMPA | Nature Conservation MPA |
| NEAFC | North East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organisation |
| OSPAR Convention | Convention for the Protection of the marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic |
| SAC | Special Area of Conservation |
| SPA | Special Protection Area |
| UN CLCS | United Nations Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf |
| UNCLOS | United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea |
| UNGA | United Nations General Assembly |
| VMEs | Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems |
| WDPAID | World Database of Protected Areas ID |
| WWF | World Wide Fund For Nature |



Victoria House
37-63 Southampton Row
London WC1B 4DA
United Kingdom

t: +44 (0)20 7430 5200
f: +44 (0)20 7242 3737
e: secretariat@ospar.org
www.ospar.org

**OSPAR's vision is of a clean, healthy and biologically diverse
North-East Atlantic used sustainably**

ISBN 978-1-911458-33-3
Publication Number: 693/2017

© OSPAR Commission, 2017. Permission may be granted by the publishers for the report to be wholly or partly reproduced in publications provided that the source of the extract is clearly indicated.

© Commission OSPAR, 2017. La reproduction de tout ou partie de ce rapport dans une publication peut être autorisée par l'Editeur, sous réserve que l'origine de l'extrait soit clairement mentionnée.