The Jastarnia Plan
Recovery Plan for Baltic Harbour Porpoises

• Recovery plan proposed in 1997
• Plan named after location of 2002 drafting workshop, Jastarnia, Poland
• Plan finally adopted at MOP6 in 2009
• Revision adopted at MOP8 in 2016

• The Jastarnia Group has met annually since 2005
• Coordinator in place since 2018
22 actions under 6 main themes

• Increase involvement, awareness and cooperation (3 actions)
• Monitoring and estimate abundance and distribution (4 actions)
• Monitor, estimate and reduce bycatch (9 actions)
• Monitor and mitigate impact of underwater noise (2 actions)
• Monitor and assess population status (2 actions)
• Protected areas (2 actions)
Abundance and distribution - population-wide surveys
Abundance and distribution - population-wide surveys

SAMBAH II is being planned and will hopefully start in 2022
Informative SNP panel for population assignment under development
Abundance and distribution – national monitoring

Countries are increasingly introducing national monitoring using PAM, based on SAMBAH methodology.
Bycatch monitoring and estimation

PBR calculated based on SAMBAH results and bycatch estimates from the Belt Sea

→ Mortality limit 0.7 animals/year
All bycatch estimates exceeds this number
Source: NAMMCO & IMR 2019

Spatial distribution of average fishing effort (mW fishing hours) in the Baltic Sea during 2015-2018 for static gear. Fishing effort data are only shown for vessels >12 m carrying VMS. Russian data are absent as they were not received. (Source: ICES, 2019).
## Bycatch monitoring and estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Legal obligation for fishermen to report bycatch</th>
<th>Legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>No (EU legislation directed at Member States, not at individual fishermen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fishing act § 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fisheries legislation § 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany Schleswig-Holstein</td>
<td>Yes, within &lt;12 nm</td>
<td>KüFischV §9(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany Mecklenburg-Vorpommern</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ministry of Marine Affairs, Fisheries, and Food § 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Directives and Decisions Regarding Waters and Economic Zone Waters §8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>No, only landed catch should be reported. Bycatch over 50 kg should be reported. However, the harbour porpoise is the property of the state, and should therefore be reported, but this is not mentioned in fisheries legislation.</td>
<td>§ 33 Jaktförordningen (hunting regulation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Waiting to hear about the ICES advice? I’ll get there 😊*
Underwater noise – impulsive noise

Source: ICES Noise Register (Sep 2020)
Underwater noise – impulsive noise

Proposed locations of offshore windfarms in Polish waters

Source: Polish Wind Energy Association
Underwater noise – continuous noise

Annual median noise maps for the full water column for the 63 Hz third-octave (left), the 125 Hz third-octave (middle), and the 2kHz third-octave (right) (Source: Folegot et al., 2016).
Assessing population status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Red list status</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark*</td>
<td>Least Concern (LC)*</td>
<td>Wind &amp; Pihl (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
<td>Liukko et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany*</td>
<td>Endangered (EN)</td>
<td>Haupt et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Probably extinct (0)</td>
<td>Andrušaitis (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Rašomavičius (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Least Concern (LC)</td>
<td>Glowacinski et al. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>Uncertain Status (4)</td>
<td>Iliashenko &amp; Iliashenko (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Critically Endangered (CR)</td>
<td>Artdatabanken (2020)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No separate assessment has been made for the Baltic harbour porpoise population

Failure to list Baltic Proper harbour porpoise in CMS Appendix I at CMS COP13
Protected areas

- German management plans were just out for consultation
- Swedish fisheries regulations expected for consultation this year
- Denmark has no measures in place
- Poland has no measures in place

ASCOBANS Workshop on Management of MPAs for Small Cetaceans – postponed
RECOMMENDATIONS

• Carry out SAMBAH II project for
  ➔ A second abundance estimate
  ➔ New data on distribution
  ➔ Indicative bycatch risk map of entire area

• Collection of genetic samples from all animals stranded in the Jastarnia area

• Implement the ICES advice on bycatch mitigation and monitoring in full
Questions?
Bycatch – the ICES advice on Emergency Measures

• In July 2019 a group of NGOs submitted a proposal for emergency measures to the EC
  → For the Baltic Proper harbour porpoise and the common dolphin in the Bay of Biscay
• The EC then asked ICES for advice in relation to this proposal
• ICES process during spring, WGMME, WGBYC and WKEMBYC
• Advice published on 26 May 2020
  → Largely similar to the original NGO proposal
  → It is underlined that long-term measures are needed
Bycatch mitigation – the ICES advice

• Closure of Northern Midsea bank for all fisheries except pots, traps etc
• Closure of SAC Hoburgs bank och Midsjöbankarna and the Polish part of the Southern Midsea bank for all static net fisheries
• Closure of “German/Polish SAC cluster” during Nov-Jan (Jastarnia group comment to EC to extend time period to Nov-April)
• Within the SAC, obligatory use of pingers on static nets in the area west of the sandbank Ryf Mew and closure of static net fisheries in the area east of the sandbank
Bycatch monitoring – the ICES advice

• Accurate spatio-temporal recording of fishing effort (in appropriate metrics on métiers used by all vessels)
• Increased dedicated monitoring of bycatch of PETS
• Monitoring of harbour porpoise occurrence
• Compliance control of mitigation measures (pinger use)
Bycatch – the ICES advice

• EC now expecting Member States to propose Joint Recommendations
• In the Baltic this is done through Baltfish, which convened Monday and Tuesday of this week
• The Baltfish draft JR excludes key elements of the ICES advice
  → measures not sufficient
• EC ready to implement Emergency Measures under CFP Art 12

• This also relates to the infringement procedure recently initiated towards Sweden for non-compliance with Habitats directive Art 6.2 and 12.4