

Review of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Review of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive

Introduction

About the consultation

This consultation is part of the review of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (thereafter the [MSFD](#)). The marine environment is subject to multiple and sometimes increasing pressures from human activities, which have impacts on marine biodiversity, their habitats, and the ecosystems they sustain. In 2008, the EU adopted the MSFD to maintain marine ecosystems in a healthy, productive and resilient condition while securing a more sustainable use of the marine resources to the benefit of current and future generations. The MSFD requires Member States to develop national marine strategies in order to achieve, or maintain where it already exists, 'good environmental status' (GES) of their marine waters by 2020. More information can be found [here](#).

The review of the MSFD is a legal obligation set in its Article 23. It builds on the [implementation report](#) adopted in June 2020. As a first step, an evaluation will look at how the MSFD has performed so far and will assess the relevance of this instrument. As a second step, an impact assessment will elaborate different policy or legislative options and their potential impacts.

Guidance on the questionnaire

This public consultation aims to gather the views of EU citizens and stakeholders on the current status of implementation of the MSFD in the Member States and on the performance of the Directive so far in achieving its objectives. It also takes a forward-looking approach to consider what might be changed in the future.

The questionnaire consists of two parts. The first part includes general questions on the relevance and perception of the MSFD and is aimed at all respondents. The second part of the questionnaire includes more detailed questions on the implementation of the Directive, its performance and potential improvements. This second part would require more expert knowledge so might be of particular interest for respondents involved in or affected by the MSFD.

Replies may be submitted in any EU official language. It takes approximately 10 to 25 minutes to fill in the questionnaire, depending on whether you respond only to Part 1 or to Parts 1 and 2. You may interrupt your session at any time and continue answering at a later stage. If you do so, please remember to keep

the link to your saved answers as this is the only way to access them. Only questions marked with a red asterisk are mandatory. Once you have submitted your answers online, you will be able to download a copy of the completed questionnaire.

Thank you for taking part in this consultation!

About you

* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Irish
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association

- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

* First name

Julie

* Surname

Mac Namara

* Scope

- International
- Local
- National
- Regional

* Level of governance

- Local Authority
- Local Agency

* Level of governance

- Parliament
- Authority
- Agency

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

International Association of Oil & Gas Producers

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

3954187491-70

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea | <input type="radio"/> Malawi | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia | <input type="radio"/> Senegal |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica | <input type="radio"/> Estonia | <input type="radio"/> Maldives | <input type="radio"/> Serbia |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini | <input type="radio"/> Mali | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia | <input type="radio"/> Malta | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone |
| <input type="radio"/> Armenia | <input type="radio"/> Falkland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Marshall Islands | <input type="radio"/> Singapore |
| <input type="radio"/> Aruba | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands | <input type="radio"/> Martinique | <input type="radio"/> Sint Maarten |
| <input type="radio"/> Australia | <input type="radio"/> Fiji | <input type="radio"/> Mauritania | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia |

- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Finland
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar/Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga

- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena
- Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

- Denmark Liberia Saint Lucia

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **For the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association', 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

*** Contribution publication privacy settings**

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, your country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself.

Public

Your name, the type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, your country of origin and your contribution will be published.

*** Contribution publication privacy settings**

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

Part I: to be answered by all respondents

Your perception about Europe's seas

Overall, in your opinion, what is the state of Europe's marine environment?

- Very good
- Acceptable
- Not good
- Don't know*

Overall, how do you think the state of Europe's marine environment has changed in the last decade?

- Improved to a large extent
- Improved to some extent
- No change
- Worsened to some extent
- Worsened to a large extent
- Don't know*

What are your 3 major concerns when you think about Europe's seas? Please, write only keywords.

255 character(s) maximum

The MSFD is working well and making progress in many areas, however, it is still a work in progress, and we would like to draw attention to the necessary coherence between the MSFD, Regional Seas Conventions and international legislation. Further, several of the Descriptors covered under the MSFD would be better managed if there was greater coherence achieved.

What are the 3 major positive things that you attach to or you enjoy from Europe's seas? Please, write only keywords.

255 character(s) maximum

*Contribution of the Regional Seas Conventions.
Potential to enable Blue Economy activities, such as energy activities (oil, gas, wind in particular) and CCS.*

Regarding the regulatory framework governing this area, a positive element of this is the contribution and value of the Regional Seas Conventions. These have helped to supplement the EU regulatory framework and form a robust and effective regulatory approach. The best way to ensure the achievement of GES in respect of the various descriptors is through increased coherence.

What are you ready to do to improve the health of the marine environment?

- Buy less plastic
- Pay more in function of the polluting content of products ('polluters pays' principle)

- Eat less fish and meat (animal-based proteins have large environmental impacts that end up affecting the oceans, e.g. greenhouse gas emissions & acidification, water use, destruction of habitats (on land and on the seabed), bycatch of sensitive species, pollution through excess nutrients, pesticides or pharmaceuticals).
- Choose fish and shellfish that have been obtained or produced sustainably
- Choose sustainable meat, vegetable and fruit produce
- Change your travel and/or commuting habits to less pollutant ones (e.g. decreasing greenhouse gas emissions & acidification, microplastics released from tyres)
- Pay for ecotourism alternatives, taxes or fees
- Buy “greener” products (these products have less carbon and water footprint, require less chemicals and prevent some habitat destruction)
- Reduce energy consumption and/or switch to energy sources that do not harm the climate and the environment
- Sponsor nature conservation or restoration initiatives
- Relay your concerns to your political representatives
- Nothing
- Other*

If other, please specify

255 character(s) maximum

There are various industry initiatives aimed at improving the health of the marine environment, such as the [E&P Sound & Marine Life Joint Industry Programme](#), for example. Further, the industry supports risk-based approach to chemical management and several other approaches to protect the EU marine environment.

A further example is the [INSITE](#) project, in respect of which we would be happy to share additional information if useful.

Other projects, such as those below, forming part of the Ocean Decade Programme, have also been recognised as contributing to ocean health.

The [EDNA JIP](#) project has brought oil and gas companies and industry associations together to better characterise the sounds that our industry produces and determine the potential impacts of these sounds on marine life and thereby to improve risk assessments and mitigation.

The [Sound & Marine Life](#) initiative represents a further example.

The building blocks of the MSFD

The main goal of the MSFD is to achieve ‘**good environmental status**’: “The status of marine waters where these provide ecologically diverse and dynamic oceans and seas which are clean, healthy and productive”. Good environmental status means that the different uses made of the marine resources are conducted at a sustainable level, ensuring their continuity for future generations.

However, achieving good environmental status is not the only objective of the MSFD. How important do you consider the following specific **objectives** of the MSFD?

| | Very important | Moderately important | Slightly important | Not at all important | Don't know |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Protect and preserve the marine environment | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Prevent deterioration and restore marine ecosystems | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Prevent and reduce pollution in the marine environment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Establish a strong and integrated framework to protect the marine environment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Integrate and expand the knowledge on the marine environment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Foster joint (EU-level and/or regional) concrete action to protect and improve the marine environment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Strengthen regional (cross-border) coordination | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Achieve or maintain good environmental status | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

To help Member States interpret what good environmental status means in practice, the MSFD sets out eleven aspects (called '**descriptors**') which characterize the condition of and the pressures on the marine environment. How important are, in your opinion, the following aspects when considering if the marine environment is in a good state?

| | Very important | Moderately important | Slightly important | Not at all important | Don't know |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| State of marine biodiversity | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Input and spread of non-indigenous marine species (they can sometimes replace indigenous species by competition or habitat alteration) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Intensity of fishing activities and the state of commercial fish & shellfish stocks | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Health of entire marine food webs/food chains | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Excess of nutrients in the seawater and their polluting effects (rapid and excessive growth of algae, water quality degradation, etc) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Integrity of seabed habitats | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Alteration of hydrographical conditions (temperature, salinity, currents, etc.) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Levels of contaminants and their pollution effects | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Levels of contaminants in seafood for human consumption | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Presence of marine litter | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Introduction of energy by human activities (especially underwater noise) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

If other, please specify

Key points

Science-based, robust monitoring and assessment is important, along with the sharing of data, and this can be used to inform about potential changes of impacts of activities and status.

Mature marine ecosystems have developed around much of the man-made infrastructure in European seas. The future removal of this infrastructure put those ecosystems at risk. The European Seas are at the centre of Blue Economy and Renewable Energy developments plans. WindEurope estimates offshore wind turbines will grow from approx. 1,300 offshore turbines today to 20,000 in 2050. Other new industries - hydrogen, CCS and Geothermal may explore opportunities to develop offshore.

Encouraged by the launch of the INSITE Programme in 2014, there now exists a significant body of evidence (including peer reviewed literature) that demonstrates the value of ecosystems associated with man-made structures and their role in the marine environment. Recent research under the [INSITE programme](#) and with CEFAS indicates that removal of these man-made structures would be likely to fragment this network of connectivity. For further information, please consult the [Final report on the Assessment of Ecological connectivity between man-made structure in the North Seas](#) and [its presentation](#).

The recommendation is for the utilisation of robust science to support high quality decision-making around the ultimate fate of such structures at decommissioning, and on the influence of large numbers of wind energy structures being installed in coming decades. The science can already assist in determining the potential contributions of oil and gas installations in a conservation or restoration context in support of the EU Green Deal, Blue Economy and Biodiversity Strategy 2030.

Regarding pollutants, a risk-based approach should be employed in terms of assessment, based on their effects, and founded on scientific evidence.

Oil spills

As illustrated through annual reports on spills and discharges, and confirmed through OSPAR assessments, there is clear evidence that the trend has been improving in this regard.

A robust regulatory framework is already in place in respect of marine protection and pollution prevention, supported by several sector guidelines and regional specific regulations.

Harmonization across Europe is challenging, and the most pragmatic, stable and efficient way to address this is to build on the existing frameworks as provided by the Regional Seas Conventions.

There are many discussions currently ongoing as to the definition of 'significant' oil spills, and consensus has not yet been reached. Therefore, it would be premature as of yet to draw conclusions based on the current unfinished discussions.

There are robust and established systems in place that have delivered improvements in tanker safety and environmental protection; these need to be maintained and implemented effectively:

Prevention: *this includes improved safety of navigation, ship construction, training and risk reduction, and has successfully reduced both the number and volume of oil spills over the past decades.*

Preparedness and Response: *these have continued to evolve as both awareness and technology have advanced and practical experience has led to a better response to spills when they occur.*

Underwater Noise

*Clarity of definitions and key concepts is essential, so that all the relevant stakeholders have the same understanding of terms such as “**exposure**” to sound and “**impact**” due to exposure to sound. Threshold values associated with duration and extent of maritime activities that generate underwater sound will not fully represent GES defined in terms of 'adverse impacts to marine mammal populations. Establishing threshold values to avoid adverse impacts at a population level should be based on current scientific understanding and available data through evaluation of population consequences.*

Availability of data can represent a challenge, and it is important to ensure that the threshold values are based on fully informed decisions. Even after threshold values have been set, it is key that TG Noise should continue to maintain a scientific overview of the developments in this context as they continue to evolve.

255 character(s) maximum

For those aspects considered “not at all important”, why is this?

- Not significant compared to others on the list
- Overlap with others in the list
- Confusing / imprecise
- Too difficult to measure
- The list is overall too long, and some should be cut
- I don't know

The implementation of the MSFD requires Member States to set and report a **national marine strategy** made up of: 1) assessments of the marine environment, determinations of good environmental status, establishment of environmental targets (done so far in 2012 and 2018), 2) monitoring programmes (in 2014 and 2020) and 3) programmes of measures to achieve good environmental status (in 2016 and expected in 2022).

Do you think your country would have developed a national marine strategy without the MSFD?

- Yes, one of similar or greater quality and ambition
- Yes, but one of less quality and ambition
- No
- Don't know*

To what extent do you find that the MSFD has contributed or led to the following (intended) benefits in EU Member States?

| | Very important | Moderately important | Slightly important | Not at all important | Don't know |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strong and integrated marine strategies to protect the marine environment (including assessments, monitoring, programmes of measures, targets, etc.) | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Adequate action and progress to achieve or maintain good environmental status | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| More control and sustainability of the human activities that can affect marine ecosystems (e.g. fishing, agriculture, tourism, maritime transport, energy developments) | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| A more efficient monitoring of marine ecosystems and of the human pressures affecting them (at lower cost or to a greater extent) | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| More transparency, data availability and shared knowledge to support marine management at all scales | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased awareness of the public and economic operators about the state of the marine environment and the impact of human activities on it | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Facilitated involvement of the public and other stakeholders in the development of marine strategies | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The establishment and/or coherence of marine protected areas | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| The restoration of marine habitats and species | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| An increase of resources for marine environmental protection | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Greater coordination at national, regional and EU levels | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Contribution to the EU's global commitments to protect the marine environment, like the Sustainable Development Goals | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Other (please explain)



What other benefit(s) from the MSFD would you like to highlight?

255 character(s) maximum

By way of explanation of the above responses:

The opportunity to contribute to TG Noise among other stakeholders is valuable and should be continued

Would you like to respond to the second part of the questionnaire? It may require more in-depth knowledge of the Directive but it is not restricted to experts. All inputs are welcome.

- Yes
- No

Part II: specific questions

Good environmental status

The [Commission Decision on good environmental status](#) of 2017 contains a number of criteria and methodological standards for determining the status of marine waters under the MSFD. It has been a major step towards a clearer, more concise and more coherent monitoring and assessment of the EU marine environment. Still, Member States have sufficient flexibility to apply different approaches (e.g. select the parameters or the scale of assessment) and to report different threshold values to, ultimately, determine whether the status is 'good' or 'not good'.

Do you think that the concept of good environmental status is the correct one to steer the MSFD?

- Yes
- Maybe*
- No
- Don't know

Should Member States continue to set the characteristics and the boundaries for the determination of good environmental status in their marine waters?

- Yes
- Yes, but there should be stronger minimum requirements/guidance provided by the EU
- Yes, but only for some of the 'descriptors'
- No, these should be defined at a marine region only
-

No, these should be defined at EU level only

- No
- Don't know

If you wish, you can develop your response (e.g. for which reason, for which 'descriptors')

D11: Underwater Sound: *Threshold values associated with duration and extent of maritime activities that generate underwater sound will not fully represent GES defined in terms of 'adverse impacts to marine mammal populations. Establishing threshold values to avoid adverse impacts at a population level should be based on current scientific understanding and available data through evaluation of population consequences. Clarity of definitions and key concepts is essential, so that all the relevant stakeholders have the same understanding of terms such as "exposure" to sound and "impact" due to exposure to sound. Availability of data can represent a challenge, and it is important to ensure that the threshold values are based on fully informed decisions. Even after threshold values have been set, it is key that TG Noise should continue to maintain a scientific overview of the developments in this context as they continue to evolve.*

500 character(s) maximum

As of 2020, despite progress, many Member States had not yet fully achieved good environmental status for all descriptors in all their marine waters. According to you, how important are these potential obstacles to achieving good environmental status at national level?

| | Very important | Moderately important | Slightly important | Not at all important | Don't know |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Unsuitable implementation of the Directive (e.g. lack of ambition, lack of detail in the strategies) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Lack of enforceability or concreteness in the Directive (e.g. identification of deficient measures, quantitative determination of good environmental status, fix environmental targets) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Too tight timeline for achieving good environmental status | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Insufficient effectiveness or actual implementation of the programmes of measures | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Lack of data, information or knowledge | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Lack of transboundary common monitoring and assessment methodologies and harmonised standards | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Scarce stakeholder/public involvement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Insufficient collaboration with the sectors/activities that ultimately affect the marine environment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Lack of internal coherence in EU policy and legislation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Lack of national policy and legislative coherence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Insufficient resources (e.g. human power or material needs of the authorities responsible for implementing the directive) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Inadequate governance (e.g. clear mandates among institutions, cross-border cooperation) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

If other, please explain

255 character(s) maximum

If the MSFD 2020 deadline to achieve good environmental status were changed, what should it be?

- Different per 'descriptor' and/or region*
- 2020-2025
- 2026-2030
- 2031-2040
- Longer
- No deadline
- Don't know

What do you base your previous answer on? (you can select multiple choices)

- Action is urgent
- Action is urgent but need time for ecosystems to recover
- The response from ecosystems is different across pressures and across*

regions

- Alignment with international commitments*
- To provide time for economic activities to adjust*
- It should be a continuous exercise
- The goal is unreachable
- Other

Feel free to elaborate your answer

500 character(s) maximum

In respect of D11 Underwater Noise, in terms of science used, there is need to wait for data to be complete and available in order to make informed decisions.

Use of resources

Do you think that the actual costs of implementing the MSFD are:

- Relatively low
- Affordable
- Cumbersome
- Don't know*

In your opinion, do you think the benefits and added value of the MSFD (improve the health of the marine environment, foster coordinated action to protect marine ecosystems, integrate and expand the marine knowledge) justify the efforts (costs) spent implementing it?

- Benefits much greater than costs
- Benefits slightly greater than costs
- Costs similar to benefits
- Costs slightly greater than benefits
- Costs much greater than benefits
- Don't know*

In your view, has there been sufficient resources invested to implement the MSFD?

| | Yes | Yes, to a moderate extent | No | Don't know |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| From EU funding | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| From polluters in line with the 'polluters pays' principle | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| From national funding | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| From other funding (e.g. private funding, fees from users, payment for ecosystem services) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

If you wish, please elaborate your response and/or provide references

500 character(s) maximum

In the context of the above, it is important to note that there is a difference between sectors, and therefore it is not possible to give a definitive answer.

International dimension

Four regional sea conventions cover Europe's seas: the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea ([Helsinki Convention](#)), the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-east Atlantic ([Oslo-Paris Convention](#)), the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean ([Barcelona Convention](#)) and the Convention for the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution ([Bucharest Convention](#)). These conventions were already in place when the MSFD was adopted, but the Directive boosted their activity and objectives (e.g. imposing legal requirements for regional cooperation to the contracting parties, through direct funding, research projects, etc.).

In your opinion, has the MSFD contributed to strengthen the coordination to manage the marine environment within each marine region?

| | Very importantly | Moderately importantly | Slightly importantly | Not at all importantly | Don't know |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| North-east Atlantic Ocean | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Baltic Sea | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Mediterranean Sea | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Black Sea | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

In your opinion, are the Regional Sea Conventions sufficiently aligned with the MSFD to be important contributors to its implementation (e.g. agree on standards required by the Decision on good environmental status, develop joint assessments that can be reported under the MSFD, align programmes of measures)?

| | Very importantly | Moderately importantly | Slightly importantly | Not at all importantly | Don't know |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Helsinki Convention | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Oslo-Paris Convention | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Barcelona Convention | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Bucharest Convention | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

Policy coherence

In your opinion, are there any significant gaps, overlaps or inconsistencies between the MSFD and the following EU environmental legislation/policies? (you can select multiple choices per row)

| | Gaps | Overlaps | Inconsistencies | No problem | Don't know |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Water Framework Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Floods Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Drinking Water Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Environmental Quality Standards Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Priority Substances Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Nitrates Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Birds and Habitats Directives | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bathing Water Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Waste Framework Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| REACH and other chemical legislation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Industrial Emissions Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Single-use Plastics Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment Directives | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Regulation on invasive alien species | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| INSPIRE Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| The European Green Deal initiatives (e.g. Biodiversity Strategy, Zero Pollution Action Plan, Farm to Fork) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

In your opinion, are there any significant gaps, overlaps or inconsistencies between the MSFD and the following sectoral EU policies? (you can select multiple choices per row)

| | Gaps | Overlaps | Inconsistencies | No problem | Don't know |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Common Fisheries Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Regulation on fisheries control | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Maritime Spatial Planning Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Port Reception Facilities Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Regulation on the European Fund for Maritime, Affairs and Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| The energy union strategy followed up by the 2019 Clean energy for all Europeans package | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| EU strategy on offshore renewable energy | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Directive on safety of offshore oil and gas operations | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ship-source Pollution Directive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Regulation setting maximum levels for certain contaminants in foodstuffs | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Communication on innovation in the Blue Economy | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Common Agricultural Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| EU Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Feel free to elaborate and provide examples to justify your answers to the last two questions and to propose additional legislation/policies.

500 character(s) maximum

The current body of legislation is sufficient and there are no overlaps. However, in reviewing the MSFD it is important to pursue an approach that aligns with the Regional Sea Conventions in order to avoid overlap, inefficiencies and waste of resources.

How important is it to get stronger mutual support between the MSFD and the legislation and policies in the following sectors?

| | Very important | Moderately important | Slightly important | Not at all important | Don't know |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Maritime spatial planning | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Fisheries and aquaculture | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Maritime transport and ports | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Tourism | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Marine renewable energy / Ocean energy | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Non-renewable energy | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Climate policies | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Blue bioeconomy | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Marine minerals | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Maritime defence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Emissions control | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Product and industrial policies | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Agricultural policies | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neighbourhood policies | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| EU Regional policies | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Research policies | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Space policy (Earth observation and modelling) | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Feel free to elaborate your answer on the mutual support (or lack of) between the MSFD and these policies

500 character(s) maximum

The current body of EU legislation is comprehensive. It is important that there are no overlaps.

Added value of the MSFD

How important do you consider to maintain a dedicated EU framework for the integrated protection and sustainable use of the marine environment?

- Very important
- Moderately important*
- Slightly important
- Not at all important
- Don't know

During the last decade, the EU has accomplished the following achievements to a

certain extent. In your opinion, how important is the MSFD contribution (alone) to them?

| | Very important | Moderately important | Slightly important | Not at all important | Don't know |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Improved management and systematic planning for the conservation of marine ecosystems and its sustainable use | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Reduce pressures on marine ecosystems | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Enhance coordinated action at regional level | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved knowledge on the marine environment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved data collection and monitoring | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved data availability, knowledge sharing and best practice | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Consistent and adequate programmes of measures to protect the marine environment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Raise public awareness and political level of ambition | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If other, please add the achievement(s)

255 character(s) maximum

*The MSFD represents only one of several tools that have served to better protect the marine environment; due recognition must also be given to the important role of the Regional Sea Conventions.
Further; consideration must be given to the important role of best practices within industry and the contribution of well-established regional specific and sectoral specific guidelines.*

Has the MSFD been an important instrument to strengthen collaboration and cooperation to protect Europe's marine waters?

| | Very important | Moderately important | Slightly important | Not at all important | Don't know |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Among EU Member States in the same marine region | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| With non-EU countries in the same marine region | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Between/with private sector entities | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Between/with scientific institutions | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Between/with other stakeholders, like NGOs | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Between public organisations responsible for different policies | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Between organisations working on land-based issues and marine issues | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Potential improvements of the MSFD

Do you think the MSFD should:

- Continue as it is*
- Become less prescriptive
- Become more prescriptive and stronger enforcement
- Don't know

What is your level of support of the following actions, should they be taken in the future?

| | Very important | Moderately important | Slightly important | Not at all important | Don't know |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Change the process to determine good environmental status to ensure more quantifiable and harmonised EU /regional objectives | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Co-design and investment on a pan-EU ocean observation and modelling service to support MSFD implementation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Set legally-binding quantifiable objectives (e.g. threshold values, minimum measures) to facilitate fair and uniform enforcement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Use non-MSFD reported information (like satellite observation or scientific data) to support marine assessments under the MSFD | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Simplify key messages from MSFD implementation, for example making use of headline indicators to demonstrate progress in the achievement of good environmental status | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Require an estimation of the effectiveness of the programmes of measures put in place by Member States | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Change the format/governance of regional cooperation (which so far is mostly dependent on the regional sea conventions) | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Improve access to funding or dedicate new instruments (from the EU or otherwise) to benefit the management, protection and restoration of the marine environment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Adopt specific measures or legal initiatives for specific risks/pressures to the marine environment (similarly to the Single-use Plastics Directive) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Add more specific requirements about marine protected areas or restoration actions within the MSFD | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduce administrative burden by decreasing the frequency or the content of the reported information | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Investigate new aspects (e.g. links between human health and ocean health, impacts of climate change) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Improve the alignment and re-use of information from other EU legislation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Enforce digitalisation requirements (e.g. for assessments or reporting) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Other? Please add your suggestions.

500 character(s) maximum

Regarding the response above on the use of non-MSFD reported information to support marine assessments under the MSFD, it is important that any such information is peer-reviewed scientific data, to ensure solid and reliable information is used.

