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Maritime Activities segment of the HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan
Towards a Baltic Sea with maritime activities carried out in an environmentally friendly way

Introduction

The strategic goal of HELCOM is to have maritime activities in the Baltic Sea carried out in an environmentally friendly way. It should be understood, however, that due to its international character shipping is regulated by global provisions accepted within the framework of the specialised organisation, notably the International Maritime Organization (IMO).

The Baltic Sea is one of the most intensively trafficked areas in the world. Both the number and the size of the ships, especially oil tankers, have been growing during the last years, and this trend is expected to continue.

This heavy traffic is being carried out within narrow straits and in shallow water, covered with ice for a long period, which makes the Baltic a difficult area to navigate and leads to traffic junctions and an increased risk of shipping incidents.

The main negative environmental effects of shipping and other activities at sea include pollution to the air, illegal and accidental discharge of oil, hazardous substances and other wastes, and introduction of alien organisms via ships’ ballast water and hulls.

Management objectives

To reach the goal the following eight management objectives, indicating areas of major importance, have been agreed upon:

- Enforcement of international regulations - No illegal discharges
- Safe maritime traffic without accidental pollution
- Efficient emergency and response capability
- Minimum sewage pollution from ships
- No introductions of alien species from ships
- Minimum air pollution from ships
- Zero discharges from offshore platforms
- Minimum threats from offshore installations

These management objectives do not directly describe the good ecological and environmental state of the Baltic Sea, but they rather indicate the main areas of concern as to the human activity at sea and its possible negative impact.

Cross-reference with other objectives

Failure to reach the objectives for maritime activities will impair the achievement of a healthy Baltic Sea unaffected by eutrophication, with its life undisturbed by hazardous substances and with favourable status of biodiversity.

More specifically, actions to reduce air emissions from shipping and measures addressing oil accidents and illegal oil discharges agreed in this Action Plan will contribute to the decreased concentration of nutrients and hazardous substances in sea water; the actions to prevent introduction of invasive and alien species via shipping will be crucial for achievement of thriving and balanced communities of plants and animals.

To measure progress towards the management objectives, the set of indicators as on page 22 will be used.
Enforcement of international regulations – No illegal discharges

**WE CALL UPON** all Baltic Sea States to ratify and implement IMO conventions, and to this end

**WE WELCOME WITH APPRECIATION** that the 2001 International Convention on the Control of Harmful Anti-fouling Systems on Ships (**the AFS Convention**), will enter into force on 17 September 2008,

**WE AGREE** that all HELCOM Contracting States shall by 2008-2009 ratify the AFS Convention,

**WE ALSO AGREE** that as of 1 January 2010 no ships calling at a port in the Baltic Sea area may use organotin compounds which act as biocides in its antifouling system having in mind that this requirement is applicable to ports of EU member states already from 1 January 2008 and to ports of the Contracting Parties to the AFS Convention according to its Article 18,

**WE ALSO AGREE** to promote development of effective, environmentally friendly and safe TBT-free antifouling systems on ships,

**WE ALSO AGREE** that HELCOM should play a proactive role concerning the effective enforcement of the AFS Convention in the Baltic Sea area by developing a monitoring system enabling the detection of non-compliant ships entering the HELCOM area. Such a system should be based on the list possibly to be developed and updated in co-operation with the 1982 Paris Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control (**the 1982 Paris MoU**) and make use of the HELCOM Automatic Identification System (**HELCOM AIS**),

**FURTHERMORE WE AGREE** that all Contracting States will ratify Annex VI to the 1973 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships as modified by the Protocol of 1978 relating thereto (**MARPOL 73/78**), not later than 1 January 2010,

**WE DECIDE** in co-operation with the European Maritime Safety Agency to make full use of the satellite images made available to the Baltic Sea States and to establish harmonised satellite and aerial surveillance covering the whole Baltic Sea area to improve detection of illegal oil spills in the Baltic,

**WE ENCOURAGE** projects by local governments and local communities to remove litter from the coastal and marine environment, such as beach clean-up operations, “Fishing for Litter” initiatives and local litter campaigns, noting the leading role of the voluntary sector in such activities,

**WE AGREE** to extend the “no-special-fee” system for ship-generated wastes in the Baltic Sea region to cover also wastes caught in fishing nets and to consider adequate incentives to encourage delivery by fishermen of such waste to onshore port reception facilities. To this end **WE ADOPT** the revised HELCOM Recommendation 28/1 “Application of the “no-special-fee” system to ship-generated wastes in the Baltic Sea Area” as **HELCOM RECOMMENDATION 28E/10** (page 9),

**WE FURTHER AGREE** to enhance the availability of adequate reception facilities for ship-generated wastes, mandatory delivery of waste and the application of the “no-special-fee” system in all the Baltic Sea ports,

**WE ALSO AGREE** to continue the enforcement of the existing legal regime e.g. through concentrated inspection campaigns under the 1982 Paris MoU and co-operation in prosecution of offenders of illegal discharges,

**WE DECIDE** to encourage development and use of innovative and cost-effective, integrated surveillance sensors permitting fast and reliable identification of pollutants on the sea surface and in the water column as well as emitted by ships to the air, e.g. light detection and ranging technologies,

**WE STRESS** the importance of the use of the **HELCOM AIS system** to ensure the effective enforcement of existing legal regimes, and **AGREE** to extend existing monitoring of non-compliant ships and of the movement of ships in the Baltic which have
been detained under the 1982 Paris MoU with a view to giving strong support to port state controls especially of these ships.

**Safe maritime traffic without accidental pollution**

**WE DECIDE** to advance winter navigation safety and efficiency in the Baltic Sea and enhance the co-operation between all Baltic Sea States during wintertime by strengthening our co-operation with the maritime authorities from all Baltic Sea States within the framework of [Baltic Icebreaking Management (BIM)](#). To this end **WE ADOPT** HELCOM RECOMMENDATION 28E/11 “Further measures to improve the safety of navigation in ice conditions in the Baltic Sea” ([page 12](#)).

**WE DECIDE** to encourage shipping companies to use ships with crew trained for winter navigation and to use voluntary pilotage for winter navigation under ice conditions also in the open Northern Baltic Sea, including the Gulf of Finland, for enhanced navigation safety,

**WE AGREE** to consider having in 2008 a joint submission by the HELCOM Contracting States to IMO on the needed modification of AIS information content in order to optimise the opportunities provided by AIS and to further improve safety of navigation and protection of the environment,

**WE ALSO AGREE** to cooperate in the investigation of the potential for [Differential Global Navigation Satellite System (DGNSS)](#) broadcast via AIS base stations in the Baltic Sea, pending a recommendation from the [International Association of Marine Aids to Navigation and Lighthouse Authorities (IALA)](#) on the subject,

**WE AGREE** to amend the HELCOM Agreement on Access to AIS Information by 2008 taking into account the proposal elaborated by [HELCOM AIS EWG 16/2007](#),

**WE DECIDE** to support in IMO initiatives for introducing a general carriage requirement for [Electronic Chart Display and Information System (ECDIS)](#) as early as possible, and to request IMO to develop a concrete time schedule.

**Efficient emergency and response capability**

**WE ADOPT** HELCOM RECOMMENDATION 28E/12 “Strengthening of sub-regional co-operation in response field“ ([page 14](#)),

**WE AGREE** to implement this Recommendation by 2013. To this end we **AGREE FURTHER:**

- **by 2008** to develop and agree upon common methodology for the assessment of risk and sufficiency of emergency and response capacity, to be used with “Guidance for the sub-regional plans to quantify needed emergency/response resources” ([page 15](#));
- **by 2009** to finalise the assessments by the Contracting States of the risks of oil and chemical pollution and to finalise the quantification of the emergency and response resources at the sub-regional level (emergency towing, fire-fighting and emergency lightering, hardware, human resources) needed to meet these risks;
- **by 2010**, based upon risk assessments, to identify the gaps in emergency and response resources at the sub-regional level and to prepare concrete plans/programmes for fulfilling them **by 2013**, except for emergency towing and response to accidents involving chemicals, for which the deadlines are **2013 and 2016**, respectively; however this postponed timing should not refrain the Contracting States from earlier, if possible, implementation of the requirements;

* including but not limited to skimmer capacity, vessels, booms, storage capacity, adequacy of aerial and satellite surveillance to provide guidance to response operations
by 2010, based upon sensitivity mapping, to identify the need for and to finalise the quantification of countermeasures for shoreline response, and to prepare concrete plans/programmes for fulfilling them by 2013.

WE FURTHER AGREE to promote an efficient emergency management and efficient support for ships in need of assistance taking into account the specific needs of the Baltic Sea Region,

WE ALSO AGREE to encourage ships in need of assistance to accept in time the most appropriate response to a threat of pollution,

WE RECOGNISE the great importance of an efficient use of places of refuge and for that reason DECIDE to develop by 2009 and implement by 2010 a mutual plan for places of refuge in the Baltic Sea,

WE AGREE to further investigate issues of liability and compensation related to a mutual plan on places of refuge. This should include possible recovery of costs between different HELCOM Contracting States involved in a response action going beyond reimbursement schemes according to existing international conventions,

WE FURTHER AGREE on the need for a sufficient liability and compensation regime for damage in relation to carriage of hazardous and noxious substances by sea and to support ongoing work at the global level to put such a regime in place,

WE AGREE FURTHERMORE to make full use of satellite surveillance to assist response to accidental oil spills in the Baltic,

WE ALSO AGREE by 2009 to develop and agree on a decision support (approval) system for use of dispersants in the Baltic Sea setting the rules for dispersant application based on appropriate IMO Guidelines, Net Environmental Benefit Analyses (NEBA) and the existing knowledge of properties of oil transported in the Baltic,

WE FURTHER AGREE to promote development and to enhance the use of technology to respond to accidents at night and in bad visibility, in bad weather, oil on ice, accidents involving heavy oil, chemical accidents, and to continue the research work and information exchange to close gaps in the knowledge in this field,

WE AGREE to cooperate in order to develop best practices for shoreline response, to continue the research work and information exchange to close gaps in the knowledge in this field, in order to improve regional co-operation especially when introducing coastal planning and regional agreements on co-operation in response actions,

WE AGREE FINALLY to integrate the subject of oiled wildlife response into oil pollution contingency plans either on a national or sub-national/local level, as deemed appropriate by the relevant Contracting State.

Minimum sewage pollution from ships

WE AGREE to have in 2009 a joint submission by HELCOM Contracting States to IMO in order to elaborate relevant new regulations for ships covered by the existing Annex IV to MARPOL 73/78, including further consideration of designation of the Baltic Sea as a special area, with the aim to eliminate the discharge of sewage from ships, especially from passenger ships and ferries,

WE FURTHER AGREE to encourage voluntary activities in ports and shipping companies to dispose of sewage to the port reception facilities. To this end WE AGREE to undertake all the necessary improvements in the availability of these port reception facilities.
**No introductions of alien species from ships**

**WE ADOPT** the road map towards ratification and harmonised implementation of the 2004 International Convention for Control and Management of Ships’ Ballast Water and Sediments (BWM Convention) as contained on page 24,

**WE AGREE** in 2008, in co-operation with the OSPAR Convention, to investigate and if possible determine areas outside the Baltic Sea area for Ballast Water Exchange,

**WE FURTHER AGREE THAT** the ultimate goal of implementing the road map is ratification of the BWM Convention by the HELCOM Contracting States preferably by 2010, but in all cases not later than 2013.

**Minimum air pollution from ships**

**WE AGREE** by 2009 to investigate and when appropriate take into consideration introduction of feasible and effective economic incentives in the Baltic Sea for reducing emissions by ships. To this end **WE ADOPT HELCOM RECOMMENDATION 28E/13 “Introduction of economic incentives as a complement to existing regulations to reduce emissions from ships”** (page 17).

**WE ACKNOWLEDGE** the serious impact on the particularly sensitive Baltic Sea ecosystem from regional, and due to the transboundary character of air emissions, also global shipping activities. Therefore, **WE AGREE** to support efforts within IMO under the ongoing review process of Annex VI of MARPOL 73/78 to tighten sulphur content in fuel oil at the global level, by having a joint submission to IMO as contained on page 26 by 25 January 2008 prior to MEPC 57 in April 2008, with the aim of addressing also the regional component of the issue,

**WE AGREE** to contribute to the work by IMO aiming at implementing more stringent requirements for emissions from shipping by evaluating the impact of NOx emissions from shipping in the Baltic on the marine environment of the Baltic Sea. To this end **WE AGREE:**

- to have in **2008** a joint submission by the HELCOM Contracting States to IMO evaluating the environmental effect on the Baltic Sea of possible new NOx emission control measures,
- to further estimate the contribution of NOx emissions from shipping to eutrophication of the Baltic Sea to encourage revision of Annex VI of MARPOL 73/78.

**Zero-discharge from offshore platforms**

**WE AGREE** on the Action Plan for the protection of the environment from offshore platforms to apply a “zero-discharge” principle for the offshore platforms in the Baltic Sea starting from 1 January 2010, as contained on page 27.

**Minimum threats from offshore installations**

**HAVING IN MIND** that the Baltic Sea faces an increasing number of – in many cases - competing uses and that the installations such as underwater cables, pipelines and offshore wind farms put increasing pressure on the Baltic Sea ecosystem, **WE AGREE** that HELCOM Contracting Parties will carefully follow the relevant processes with the understanding that any environmentally significant adverse impacts on the environment that may be caused by any offshore installation should be prevented, reduced or offset as fully as possible.
APPLICATION OF THE NO-SPECIAL-FEE SYSTEM TO SHIP-GENERATED WASTES AND MARINE LITTER CAUGHT IN FISHING NETS IN THE BALTIC SEA AREA

THE COMMISSION,

RECALLING Article 8 of the Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area, 1992 (the Convention) which calls for development and application of uniform requirements for the provision of reception facilities,

RECALLING ALSO Article 9 of the Convention stipulating a need for special measures in relation to pleasure craft, which includes the establishment of adequate reception facilities for wastes from pleasure craft,

CONSCIOUS that the "no-special-fee" system constitutes a system with the dual purpose of encouraging ships to deliver waste ashore and to avoid undesirable waste streams between ports, thereby encouraging a sound sharing of the waste burden,

CONSCIOUS ALSO that the no-special-fee system constitutes one of the prerequisites for a substantial decrease in the number of operational and illegal discharges and thus for the prevention of pollution of the marine environment from ships,

NOTING that the port authorities are responsible for providing reception facilities for wastes covered by Annex I (oil), Annex II (noxious liquid substances), Annex IV (sewage) and Annex V (garbage) of the 1973 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships as modified by the Protocol of 1978 relating thereto (MARPOL 73/78),

NOTING ALSO that the consignor in the loading port is responsible for reception arrangements for cargo-related wastes covered by Annex I (oil residues from cargo tanks) of MARPOL 73/78,

NOTING FURTHER that the consignee in the unloading port is responsible for reception arrangements for wastes covered by Annex II (residues of noxious liquid substances) of MARPOL 73/78,

RECOMMENDS that the Governments of the Contracting Parties apply the attached Guidelines for the establishment of a harmonised "no-special-fee" system for the operation of reception facilities in their ports as of 1 January 2000 for ship-generated wastes covered by Annex I (oily wastes from machinery spaces) of MARPOL 73/78 and as of 1 January 2006 for wastes covered by Annex IV (sewage) and Annex V (garbage) of MARPOL 73/78,

RECOMMENDS ALSO that the litter caught in fishing nets be covered by the “no-special-fee” system,

TAKING NOTE of the adoption within the European Union of Directive 2000/59/EC on port reception facilities for ship-generated waste and cargo residues,

REQUESTS the Contracting Parties to support or seek active co-operation with the North Sea States for the purpose of establishing a similar "no-special-fee" system also in the North Sea Region,

REQUESTS ALSO the Governments of the Contracting Parties to report on the implementation of this Recommendation and attached Guidelines in accordance with Article 16(1) of the Convention.
Guidelines for the establishment of a harmonised "no-special-fee" system for the delivery of ship-generated oily wastes originating from machinery spaces and for the delivery of sewage and garbage, including marine litter caught in fishing nets, to port reception facilities

1 Definition of the "no-special-fee" system

1.1 In this context the "no-special-fee" system is defined as a charging system where the cost of reception, handling and disposal of ship-generated wastes, originating from the normal operation of the ship, as well as of marine litter caught in fishing nets, is included in the harbour fee or otherwise charged to the ship irrespective of whether wastes are delivered or not.

1.2 The "no-special-fee" system is not restricted to any specific type of ship-generated waste.

2 Obligation to pay

2.1 Every sea-going ship's obligation to pay for reception, handling and disposal of oil residues, sewage and garbage is deemed to arise with the arrival of a ship in any port of the participating countries, irrespective of whether or not that particular ship will actually make use of the reception facilities, which are available there.

2.2 The above fee covers the waste collecting, handling and processing including infrastructure and shall be distributed among ships and collected as part of or in addition to the port dues.

3 Exemptions

3.1 A ship may be exempted by the competent authority from the obligation to pay, when engaged in regular services and it is ensured that the disposal requirements will be met on the ship's own account.

3.2 For the purpose of these Guidelines "regular services" means a series of ship crossings operated so as to serve traffic between the same two or more ports, or a series of voyages from and to the same port without intermediate calls, either:

   i. according to a published timetable, or
   ii. with crossings so regular or frequent that they constitute a recognisable schedule.

A crossing should be considered as frequent if the ship visits the port once a fortnight.

3.3. When a ship applies for an exemption, the competent authority of the Port State should require evidence of the ship's scheduled traffic as well as evidence of waste management practice (contract, receipts, copy of garbage record book, oil record book etc.). The ship has to organise its waste management according to a contract and deliver its waste regularly under this arrangement in a certain port/ports. If it chooses to deliver elsewhere, a port can charge the ship according to the real costs (direct fee).

3.4. The Contracting States should also inform about the issued exemptions to other Port States along the scheduled route. The Contracting States will inform the HELCOM Secretariat of their competent authority responsible for granting exemptions from the mandatory delivery and notification requirements.

4 Basis of calculation of the no-special-fee

4.1 The waste management fee imposed on a ship should be independent of the volume of the wastes delivered to the port reception facilities. To obtain the maximum of truth and fairness in specifying the ship’s contribution to the no-special-fee system the
gross tonnage, as indicated in the vessel's Data Sheet, could be taken as the basis of calculation by the port. Basis of calculation of oil, garbage and sewage may depend on the type and size of the ship as well as the number of crew and passengers.

4.2 A high quality standard of the applied waste management procedures and waste processing equipment on board can also be taken into account in scaling the waste management fee, having in mind the general aim of minimisation of waste production, and the benefit of waste separation.

4.3 The waste management fee shall be fair, transparent and non-discriminatory to all ships, i.e. the size of the waste management fee shall be visible to every ship even if it is included in the harbour fee.

4.4 The waste management fees received from ships shall be used for no other purposes than:
- investments in reception facilities, stationary and mobile;
- operation of reception facilities;
- repair and maintenance costs of such facilities;
- costs of handling, treatment and final disposal of the received wastes.

5 Avoidance of competitive distortion

5.1 To avoid competitive distortions between ports located in different sea areas, all possible efforts shall be made to achieve as soon as possible a harmonised waste management fee system for the ports in the Baltic Sea and in the North Sea Regions.

5.2 The Contracting States involved shall make the necessary efforts in order to implement a harmonised fee system simultaneously in the ports of the Baltic Sea as well as in the North Sea Regions.

5.3 Provisions should be made to preclude any subsidising of the waste management fee through public funds for the operation of reception facilities.

5.4 The Governments of the Contracting States shall exchange periodic reports on the implementation of these Guidelines in their ports, including reports on the financing and operation of reception facilities, and evaluate such reports at the meetings of the Maritime Group of the Helsinki Commission.
HELCOM RECOMMENDATION 28E/11
Adopted 15 November 2007
having regard to Article 20, Paragraph 1 b)
of the Helsinki Convention

FURTHER MEASURES TO IMPROVE THE SAFETY OF NAVIGATION IN ICE CONDITIONS IN THE BALTIC SEA

THE COMMISSION,

BEING CONSCIOUS that parts of the Baltic Sea are ice-covered for several winter months, which places some limitation on maritime transportation and entails greater risks of accidents and pollution,

NOTING the increasing vessel traffic and especially transportation of oil products in the Baltic and the expected future significant growth of shipping activities in general,

BEING AWARE of the technical difficulties in responding to oil spills in ice,

BEING FURTHER AWARE that the increasing vessel traffic will also increase demands for icebreaking services, especially during severe winters and in difficult ice conditions,

OBSERVING that the capability of vessels to navigate in ice has constantly improved due to the technological development, while there seems to be a lack of relevant experience and know-how among the ship crews, and that the risk of accidents during ice conditions can be decreased by well-trained and experienced ship crew,

RECOGNISING that timely and reliable information on ice conditions, recommended routes and available icebreaking services are of crucial importance when assisting the ships in their route through the Baltic,

RECALLING the Declaration on the Safety of Navigation and Emergency Capacities in the Baltic Sea Area (HELCOM Copenhagen Declaration) adopted on 10 September 2001 in Copenhagen,

BEING CONVINCED of the need for further measures to advance the safety and efficiency of winter navigation in the Baltic Sea and to create unified rules and regulations and operational practises for navigation in ice conditions,

ACKNOWLEDGING the successful development of co-operation among maritime authorities from all the Baltic Sea Coastal States within the framework of the Baltic Icebreaking Management organisation,

WELCOMING closer exchange of information with Baltic Icebreaking Management (BIM) in order to join forces of the two organisations: HELCOM as environmental policy-maker on one side and BIM as a platform for exchange of information and knowledge related to navigation in ice conditions on the other,

APPRECIATING the initiative by BIM to create a single source of timely and reliable information on ice conditions, traffic restrictions, icebreakers and other issues relevant to mariners navigating in the Baltic Sea during wintertime, which can be obtained from the website www.baltice.org,

RECOMMENDS that the Governments of the Contracting States take necessary steps to ensure that there are sufficient icebreaking services available to assist ships bound for ports in their territory,

RECOMMENDS FURTHER that the Governments of the Contracting States, when arranging icebreaking services, try to prioritise the provision of service according to the risk areas, including heavy traffic routes, routes to oil terminals, ports with a large number of calls in ice conditions, and others,

RECOMMENDS FURTHERMORE the Governments of the Contracting States to advance educational offers for seafarers of high quality training programmes in navigation in ice
conditions according to the 1978 International Convention on Standards in Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers. Such training programmes should provide knowledge, understanding and proficiency required for operating a ship in ice-covered waters, including:

- ice conditions, ice types and ice chart;
- ice classes, ship’s construction and traffic restrictions;
- icing and winterisation;
- voyage planning and operation in ice;
- icebreakers and assistance,

**RECOMMENDS ALSO** the Contracting Parties to promote the use of the Electronic Chart Display and Information System (ECDIS) and the use of qualified Baltic Sea Pilots during their voyage in the Baltic Sea in ice conditions until the Master or Senior Watchkeeping Officer of the vessel has achieved sufficient experience in winter navigation,

**INVITES** experts on icebreaking within BIM to contribute to the relevant work of the HELCOM Maritime and Response Groups,

**REQUESTS** the Governments of the Contracting States to implement the above mentioned measures as soon as possible and to report on the implementation of this Recommendation in accordance with Article 16, Paragraph 1 of the Helsinki Convention.
HELCOM RECOMMENDATION 28E/12

Adopted 15 November 2007
having regard to Article 20, Paragraph 1 b)
of the Helsinki Convention

STRENGTHENING OF SUB-REGIONAL CO-OPERATION IN RESPONSE FIELD

THE COMMISSION,

BEING AWARE that the increasing maritime traffic is causing a potential threat of a pollution incident at sea,

BEING ALSO AWARE that spills of oil or other harmful substances can have a long-lasting harmful impact on the sensitive marine environment and the coastal areas of the Baltic Sea,

RECOGNISING the efficiency of an operational “three tier” approach for planning and response to pollution incidents in the Baltic, whereby minor oil spills are addressed by one Contracting State, spills of medium size are addressed by well-organised and timely action by several Contracting State located in the vicinity of the accident, and the largest spills are addressed by the co-ordinated efforts of all Contracting Parties and, if necessary, with use of external assistance,

NOTING the significance of sub-regional approach to ensure timely and well-organised emergency towing, fire-fighting and lightering and, if needed, response to a pollution incident, including shoreline response, and in that way to minimise environmental damage caused by an accident,

NOTING FURTHER that sub-regional co-operation is of crucial importance when effectively using the emergency and response resources,

RECOMMENDS that the Contracting Parties take necessary steps to assess the risk of oil and chemical pollution and on that basis review emergency and response resources on a sub-regional basis in order to ensure that:

1. there are sufficient emergency resources in the area to provide adequate emergency towing, fire-fighting and lightering capacity to a ship in need of assistance within a reasonable period of time;
2. there are sufficient response resources/capacity to ensure effective collection of pollutants in case of a “medium-size” pollution incident or to control large-scale pollution incidents until the assisting forces arrive on the scene;
3. there is adequate response capacity to enable effective shoreline response,

RECOMMENDS ALSO that the Contracting Parties draw up bilateral or multilateral agreements and/or response plans for major risk areas and/or dangerous objects located in the vicinity of their borders and where co-ordinated efforts are needed to ensure adequate response to pollution incidents,

RECOMMENDS FURTHER that the Contracting States cooperate by carrying out joint surveillance operations and/or flights by one Contracting State over the responsibility area of the other Contracting State(s) in order to ensure that the minimum HELCOM requirements on aerial surveillance are fulfilled,

RECOMMENDS ADDITIONALLY that the Contracting States endeavour to do their best in order to ensure that a ship in need of assistance would be accommodated in the most appropriate place of refuge without undue delay,

RECOMMENDS FINALLY that the Contracting States integrate shoreline response into national contingency plans, and cooperate by conducting trainings and organising exchange programmes to ensure swift and adequate response capacity and to develop best practices.
Guidance for sub-regional plans to quantify needed emergency/response resources

The idea of enhanced sub-regional co-operation, which has been discussed and agreed in HELCOM RESPONSE, rests on a four-step logic:

- Analysis of the likely accident scenarios taking into account sub-regional specifics;
- Identification (both quantitative and spatial) of the emergency and response resources needed sub-regionally to respond to an accident of Tier 1 and 2 and how to deal with a Tier 3 accident until the assistance arrives;
- Comparison of the identified needs to the available resources and development of plans to meet the needs for resources in the sub-region in the most effective way;
- By the above standing steps, achieving adequate emergency and response preparedness in the most cost-efficient way.

Even though the risks and likely accident scenarios certainly vary sub-regionally, it might be beneficial to have a general discussion on certain aspects of the assessments in order to facilitate sub-regional actions:

- Likely maximum accident for which the sub-regions should be prepared;
- Principles for the estimation of the needed emergency and response resources as well as their preparedness and spatial allocation.

Emergency towing

Every sub-region should have adequate emergency towing capacity to be able to handle the largest vessels sailing in the region in rough sea conditions (e.g. Beaufort 10-12 in the Baltic Sea).

Spatial allocation and preparedness should correspond to the time limits for approaching and securing a ship in distress along the major shipping lane(s) in the sub-region before it reaches shallow waters.

Emergency lightering

Emergency lightering capacity (pumping capacity, intermediate storing and possible places of refuge) should be analysed for a lightering operation of the biggest ships sailing in the area (up to 150,000 tonnes).

Emergency fire fighting

Emergency fire fighting capacity should ensure at least availability of Fire Fighters class 1 according to Det Norske Veritas (DNV) or similar (around 20,000 litres/minute).

Places of refuge

Based on risk assessment in a sub-regional context, including evaluation of the environmental factors, adequate response capacities should be available for places of refuge.

Shoreline response

Every sub-region should have adequate equipment and trained personnel to protect the coast, especially vulnerable habitats and areas (Baltic Sea Protected Areas, BSPAs) and to ensure immediate and appropriate action on shore.

Shoreline response capacity should be addressed and arranged in its complexity within sub-regional agreements between adjacent Contracting States. Such agreements are aimed at ensuring fast and sharp reaction when a second and/or third tier or transboundary pollution accident has occurred.
The logic described in HELCOM Recommendation 11/13 serves as a basis to analyse and utilise the personnel, amount and type of booms, skimmers, vacuum cleaners, washers and other relevant equipment needed to maintain readiness for actual operations in such accidents.

All priorities related to vulnerable areas (BSPAs) are to be pre-planned within sub-regional action plans; this may include wildlife response as deemed feasible.

**Response capacity**

Response capacity should be available for responding to a 1,000- 5,000 tonnes (depending on the likely accident in the area) oil spill at sea in favourable weather within 3 days. Local geographical and other specifics (e.g. archipelago area, shallow water, etc.) should be taken into account.

**Action Plan**

When the above standing analysis has been performed, there should be an action plan for how together to improve the capacity. Who buys what and when? How do the others get hold of it in an emergency situation, etc.

**Notification**

NB - There is no need for special alarm procedures, etc. Normal HELCOM routines should be applied, but of course it is permitted to call or mail the sub-regional partners as a first notification.
HELCOM RECOMMENDATION 28E/13
Adopted 15 November 2007
having regard to Article 20, Paragraph 1 b) and Annex II
of the Helsinki Convention

INTRODUCING ECONOMIC INCENTIVES AS A COMPLEMENT TO
EXISTING REGULATIONS TO REDUCE EMISSIONS FROM SHIPS

THE COMMISSION,

BEING AWARE that pollution from shipping has negative impacts on the sensitive marine environment of the Baltic Sea,

ACKNOWLEDGING that, although there has been general substantial progress achieved in improving the protection of the marine environment of the Baltic Sea and in reducing the airborne emissions from shipping in particular, there is still a need for further emission reduction,

ACKNOWLEDGING the importance of a review of Annex VI to MARPOL 73/78 and other international measures to reduce emissions from ships,

STRESSING the need for introducing new and effective solutions to curb emissions from shipping,

RECOGNISING the need to evaluate and implement additional alternatives to the existing regulatory measures to reduce emissions from shipping,

RECALLING Annex II to the Helsinki Convention AND NOTING that the promotion and use of Best Environmental Practice and Best Available Technology can be triggered by the application of economic instruments to activities, products and emissions in the Baltic Sea Area and may constitute an effective means to reduce emissions from shipping,

NOTING FURTHER that economic incentives can serve as complements to regulatory measures and thereby may lead to a larger reduction of pollution compared to that achieved by traditional regulations and can stimulate technological improvements and innovations as well as achievement of environmental results at lower costs,

BEING CONVINCED that sub-regional co-operation is of crucial importance also when the desire is to effectively use economic instruments,

RECOMMENDS that the Contracting Parties investigate and, when appropriate, introduce feasible and effective economic instruments as a possible complement to existing regulations to further reduce air pollution from shipping,

RECOMMENDS FURTHER that the Contracting Parties take into consideration the attached Guidelines when introducing economic incentives schemes to reduce emissions from ships.
Guidelines for introducing economic incentive schemes as a possible complement to existing regulations to reduce emissions from ships in the Baltic Sea Area

These guidelines are intended to give advice to the Contracting Parties to the Helsinki Convention to introduce incentive schemes to reduce air pollution from ships calling upon Baltic Sea ports.

1. Introduction

The shipping sector is not regulated as extensively as land-based sources and, as a result, in contrast to the expected progress in reducing emissions from land-based sources, shipping emissions of NOx and SOx are expected to continue to increase. Due to the international nature of shipping, the measures adopted at the national or regional level can only have limited impact on emissions from shipping in the specific region. All Contracting States must therefore take active part in global actions initiated within the IMO to substantially reduce emissions from ships. These measures form the international baseline upon which there often is room for regions or nations to introduce non-discriminatory economic incentives to further reduce pollution from ships within their jurisdiction.

2. Definitions of Economic Incentives

Economic incentives defined broadly are instruments that use financial means to motivate actors to reduce health and environmental risks posed by their facilities, processes, or products. These incentives provide monetary rewards for those polluting less and impose costs of various types for those polluting more, thus supplying the necessary motivation of change to polluters. This approach provides an opportunity to address sources of pollution at an overall cost that is lower than traditional forms of regulation as well as providing a reason for polluters to improve in addition to existing regulatory requirements.

3. Existing financial instruments

Economic instruments to encourage environmentally friendly or quality shipping have been introduced in some countries and ports around the world to encourage ship owners to reduce their atmospheric emissions. These include differentiated port and fairway dues, differentiated taxation of marine fuels and differentiated tonnage taxes. However, those measures when taken only on a national level might have a limited effect on the overall emissions from shipping. To achieve a substantial emission reduction, a much broader incentive scheme, a common Baltic or European system of economic incentives, is needed. The system should be flexible in order to permit national and local differences to be catered for. However, it does not need to be necessarily restricted by the peculiarities of Contracting States’ national institutional arrangements concerning shipping dues. Environmentally differentiated fairway dues or other incentive schemes limited to ships calling at Baltic Sea ports can be introduced without conflict to the right of innocent passage provided by 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Seas (Article 26).

4. Proposed financial structure for introducing economic incentives

All countries around the Baltic Sea have some kind of financial system that enables provision of services to shipping, infrastructure investments, dredging, lighthouse and fairway maintenance, icebreaking, hydrological surveys, etc. Taking into consideration the diversity of financial systems applied in the Baltic Sea countries and to allow some flexibility in introducing economic incentives, this proposal allows the Contracting Parties to consider the introduction of economic incentives to reduce emissions from shipping in addition to local financial systems. There are three options for introducing economic incentives that Contracting Parties may choose between:
- to introduce a system of environmentally differentiated fairway dues;
- to modify an existing charging system to allow environmental differentiation of dues;
- to add an emission fee with subsequent differentiation on top of their present system.

There are, however, some requirements that should be followed regardless of which incentive scheme is considered or subject to be implemented. An incentive scheme should have the following prerequisites:
- It should offer the best possible protection of the environment;
- It should cover all important aspects (management, design/equipment, ship operation);
- Emission charges are suitable for ships of all flags, 400 GT and above, visiting Baltic ports;
- The system should be reliable and easy to implement;
- Evidence of compliance should be simple;
- Expenses for the operators of the system should be low.

It is important that the level of charge is accurately set. This would create a zero-sum game for the industry as a whole. Since ferry traffic is responsible for mainstream emissions in ports these ships would need to be actively involved in the incentives schemes. The dues levied per unit of the vessel's gross tonnage might be differentiated with the introduction of lower levels for passenger vessels and cruise liners if so desired.

When introducing an incentive scheme, the following measures should be considered:
- to establish levels for NOx and SOx emissions (or to lower the existing ones) based on which rebate schemes for NOx and SOx will be developed;
- to decide a minimum fee based on gross tonnage or installed engine power (might differ for different categories of ships);
- to decide on number of calls subject to dues (for instance, five calls per calendar month for Ro/Pax and passenger ferries and two calls for other vessels);
- to consider a revenue-neutrality resulting in higher dues for more polluting ships and rebates for ships that invest in emission abatement technologies depending on achieved results.

The following rebate schemes for reducing NOx and SOx emissions might be used.

**Nitrogen oxide discount**

The Contracting Parties might consider an entrance reduction limit for discounts as 10 g per kWh. The scale extends below 0.5 g/kWh. The lowest limit set up to 0.5 g/kWh would provide a stronger incentive to include auxiliary engines in measures to cut NOx emissions. The table below constitutes an example of how the dues after discount per unit of the vessel’s gross tonnage could be applied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission level, gram NOx/kWh</th>
<th>Ro-Pax and passenger vessels, €</th>
<th>Cruise vessels, C</th>
<th>Oil tankers, C</th>
<th>Other vessels, €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 0.50</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51 – 1.00</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01 – 2.00</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01 – 3.00</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01 – 4.00</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01 – 5.00</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01 – 6.00</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01 – 7.00</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.01 – 8.00</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ferry and Ro-Ro traffic is responsible for about 75 % of energy consumption of ships calling upon Swedish ports*
Monitoring, reporting and control

Currently it is not possible to continuously measure the exact amount of different pollutants being emitted from individual ships. Until the monitoring technologies are developed and available, emissions will have to be estimated. The calculation can make use of data on the amount of NOx and SOx that is released by vessel’s main engines for each kilowatt-hour at 75% of utilised engine capacity.

MARPOL Annex VI sets limits on emissions of NOx from diesel engines. The NOx Technical Code stipulates how this shall be done. The method in the Code can also be used to establish emission levels below the mandatory value.

Measurements of the emission levels from individual vessels shall be conducted by an accredited control laboratory (authorised authority) according to ISO 8178 and the provisions of the NOx Technical Code. The laboratory issues a survey report and a NOx attestation. The Maritime Administration or the recognised organisation (classification society) acting on behalf of that Administration issues the NOx Certificate. Certificates issued by the Administration of a Contracting State shall be recognised by another Contracting State.

The survey report shall specify which measures are taken onboard the ship to continuously reduce NOx emissions as well as information on how the monitoring and verification shall proceed.

NOx certificate

Based on the conducted survey report that shows that the abatement technology is installed and that the calculated weighted emission of NOx is less that 10 g/kWh, the accredited laboratory may issue a NOx reduction attestation. This attestation shall demonstrate the NOx emission level measured and adjusted for ambient factors and recalculated to nitrogen dioxide (NO₂/kWh) in grams with two decimals at 75% power output and steady-state running conditions for main engines (ME) and 50% for auxiliary engines (AE).

Sulphur-related dues and discount

According to Directive 1999/32/EG relating to a reduction in the sulphur content of certain liquid fuels or marine gas oil (MGO) may not be used in EU territorial waters if their sulphur content exceeds 0.2%. Directive 2005/33/EC amending the Directive 1999/32/EG requires from 1 January 2010 a maximum limit of 0.1% sulphur by weight for marine fuels used by inland waterways vessels and ships at berth in Community ports. The directive does not cover heavy fuel oil (HFO) or the fuel in the bunker tanks of ships passing the border between EU and non-EU countries. The economic incentives (environmental differentiation of fairway or other dues aimed at providing an incentive for vessels to use low-sulphur bunker fuel oil) must now be adjusted to prevailing rules. Although most vessels that utilise marine fuel covered by the directive are obliged to use bunker fuel oil with a sulphur content less than 0.2 percent by weight, these vessels should be given a certain discount, as there might otherwise be a risk for their switch to HFO. Moreover, a certain stimulus should be given to vessels not covered by the directive.

The table below shows an example of the sulphur-related dues calculated per unit of the vessel’s gross tonnage that might be introduced for all types of ships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sulphur content, percent by weight</th>
<th>Ro-Pax and passenger</th>
<th>Other vessels, C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.01 - 9.00</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.01- 10.00</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01 -</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Läänemere Tegevuskava/ Merelised tegevused

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vessels, C</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.21 – 0.5</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51 – 1.0</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01 -</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance of passenger vessels in curbing sulphur emissions to the atmosphere corresponds to the difference in the incentive structure vis-à-vis other vessels, as shown in the table.

**SOx emissions, Sulphur attestations and certificates for abatement technology**

The emission of sulphur from ships is proportional to the sulphur content of the bunker fuel oil if no abatement technologies are applied. According to MARPOL Annex VI, ships have to carry a Bunker Delivery Note (BDN), which provides information on the sulphur content of the fuel. In order to be qualified for deduction, the ship owner has to fill in a sulphur attestation stating the continuous operation on low-sulphur fuel verified by BDN and samples.

If an abatement technology to reduce emissions of SOx is applied, the Maritime Administration or recognised organisation acting on behalf of that Administration shall conduct a survey report specifying which measures are taken onboard the ship to continuously reduce SOx emissions. The survey report shall also contain information on how the monitoring, control and verification shall proceed. If the installation is approved, the Maritime Administration will issue a certificate. Certificates issued by the Administration of a Contracting State shall be recognised by another Contracting State.
Indicators and targets for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of the Baltic Sea Action Plan

Maritime Activities
Management objectives for maritime activities will be measured by the following initial indicators and targets:

Enforcement of international regulations - No illegal pollution
- Number of surveyed/inspected ships found to use organotin compounds actively in their antifouling systems in relation to the total number of surveyed ships calling at Baltic Sea ports,
- Pollution per Flight Hour (PF) Index (ratio of total no. of detected oil spills to total no. of flight hours) per year,
- Number of detected/confirmed illegal oil discharges per year,
- Number of regular flight hours, including Co-ordinated Extended Pollution Control Operation (CEPCO) flights, per year,
- Number of satellite imageries per year per sub-region,
- Number of ships caught red-handed per year,
- Amount of ship-generated waste delivered to port reception facilities in the Baltic ports in relation to the total number of calls at ports,
- Number of notifications on inadequacy of port reception facilities received by the Contracting States.

Safe maritime traffic without accidental pollution*
- Number of shipping accidents, including in ice conditions, per year in relation to yearly traffic (number of ships crossing pre-defined AIS lines),
- Number of accidents with pollution in relation to the total number of accidents per year,
- Number of collisions/groundings in relation to the total number of accidents per year.

Efficient emergency and response capability
General evaluation of implementation by HELCOM RESPONSE
- Rate of oil recovery and the amount of oily wastes at sea and on the shoreline during response operations to oil accidents,
- Number of accidents where dispersants were used.

Minimum sewage pollution from ships
- Number of ferry and passenger terminals equipped with adequate sewage reception facilities per number of all ferry and passenger terminals in a country per year,
- Number of ferries and passenger ships delivering sewage to port reception facilities.

No introductions of alien species from ships
General evaluation of implementation by HELCOM MARITIME in co-operation with HELCOM MONAS and HELCOM HABITAT
- Number of new introductions observed per year,
- Number of established alien species per year,
- Amount of sediments delivered to port reception facilities.

Minimum air pollution from ships
- NOx emissions from shipping in the Baltic per year,

* applicable for tankers over 150 GT and other ships over 400 GT according to the agreed HELCOM reporting form
- Number of ships that use NOx abatement technology and specified by technology, such as SCR (selective catalytic reduction), HAM (Humid Air Motor Technique), water injection, etc.,
- Number of non-compliant ships in relation to the total number of ships inspected in the Baltic Sea ports to control compliance with fuel oil requirements of Annex VI to MARPOL 73/78,
- Average content of sulphur in fuel delivered to ships from fuel oil suppliers in the Baltic Sea per year.

**Zero discharges from offshore platforms**

General evaluation by HELCOM MARITIME.

**Minimum threats from offshore installations**

General evaluation by HELCOM MARITIME.
Road map towards harmonised implementation and ratification of the 2004 International Convention for Control and Management of Ships’ Ballast Water and Sediments

We agree to ratify the 2004 International Convention for Control and Management of Ships’ Ballast Water and Sediments (BWM Convention) as soon as possible, but in all cases not later than 2013. To this end WE AGREE:

1. To designate/identify clear national responsibilities for coordinating the national implementation of the BWM Convention.

2. To request HELCOM HABITAT and HELCOM MONAS to compile, from the existing data sources, by the end of 2008 a HELCOM list of non-indigenous, cryptogenic and/or harmful native species in the Baltic Sea, including available information on their characteristics, distribution, abundance and ecological impact, and to keep the list updated as new knowledge becomes available.

3. To establish co-operation with other relevant regions for continuous exchange of information on non-indigenous, cryptogenic and harmful native species in other aquatic environments, including high risk invaders, and to make this information available for risk assessments.

4. Based on the HELCOM list and available information on potentially harmful and invasive species in other aquatic ecosystems, to select and agree by the end of 2008 on the HELCOM Target Species, i.e. species that may impair or damage the environment, human health, property or resources in the Baltic Sea region, relevant for risk assessments according to the IMO Guidelines G7.

5. To conduct by the end of 2008 baseline surveys of prevailing environmental conditions in major ports and to outline the major long-distance high risk voyages in order to gather data necessary to conduct and/or evaluate and consult risk assessments according to the IMO Guidelines G7.

6. To specify and agree as soon as possible but not later than 2009 on criteria to distinguish between unacceptable high risk scenarios and acceptable low risk scenarios for regional voyages, i.e. voyages within the Baltic Sea biogeographical region, taking into account the relevant IMO Guidelines and data gathered under points 2-5, in order to support transparent and consistent risk assessments and to arrive at a unified Baltic Sea exemption system according to Regulation A-4 of the Annex to the BWM Convention.

7. For regional voyages connecting specified ports or locations assessed as posing an unacceptable high risk (regional high risk voyages), and therefore for which the exemption could not be granted according to the BWM Convention, to arrange in advance for suitable management options, which may include designation of ballast water exchange (BWE) zones, and if the case, agree on the general recommendations for such exchange in BWE zones. BWE zones, if at all, would only be of use for regional voyages/ships identified to represent a high risk. The possible management options should only be valid until the D-2 Performance Standard of the BWM Convention becomes obligatory.

8. Similarly, for voyages connecting the Baltic Sea and the North Sea where no areas exist that meet the Ballast Water Exchange criteria according to the BWM Convention, to consider jointly with OSPAR adequate management measures, including possibilities for ballast water exchange. Ballast water exchange areas, if designated, should only be in use until the D-2 Performance Standard of the BWM Convention becomes obligatory and for vessels/voyages posing an unacceptable high risk.

9. To join the OSPAR initiative to request vessels transiting the Atlantic or entering the North-East Atlantic from routes passing the West African Coast to conduct on a voluntary basis ballast water exchange before arriving at the OSPAR area or
passing through the OSPAR area and heading to the Baltic Sea and to notify jointly with OSPAR the IMO of this action.

10. To undertake a similar initiative for vessels leaving the Baltic and transiting through the OSPAR region to other destinations so the ballast water would not be exchanged until the vessel was 200 nm off the coast of North West Europe in waters greater than 200 m deep.

11. To cooperate with OSPAR on any other relevant topics for the benefit of both regions and as necessary for harmonised implementation of the BWM Convention.

12. To cooperate for the development and exchange of experience concerning Ballast Water Treatment Technology.

13. To adjust/extend by 2010 the HELCOM monitoring programmes to obtain reliable data on non-indigenous species in the Baltic Sea, including port areas, in order to gather the necessary data to conduct and/or evaluate and consult risk assessments according to the relevant IMO Guidelines. As a first step, species that pose the major ecological harm and those that can be easily identified and monitored should be covered. The evaluation of any adverse ecological impacts caused by non-indigenous species should form an inherent and mandatory part of the HELCOM monitoring system.

14. To link by 2010 the port surveys and monitoring to Navigation Telex System (NAVTEX) or the equivalent, whereby ships can be alerted not to take up ballast water during outbreaks of harmful species and other high risk conditions.

15. To cooperate in order to establish by 2010, but in all cases not later than 2013 the regional information system for the relevant data obtained during port surveys, monitoring (including early warning system) and risk assessments to facilitate the implementation of the BWM Convention.

16. To provide by 2010, but in all cases before the latest target ratification date which is 2013 adequate reception facilities for sediments in ports and terminals where cleaning and repair of ballast tanks occurs based on IMO Guidelines G1.

17. To establish a correspondence group that regularly updates the current status in implementing the road map and that offers a forum to discuss relevant developments.
Input paper by the Baltic Sea States to IMO on a need to further address SOx emissions from shipping

With this document the Coastal States of the Baltic Sea want to provide relevant information concerning implementation of the requirements of Regulations 14(4) of Annex VI to MARPOL 73/78 in the Baltic Sea SOx Emission Control Area as an input to the current discussion on further reduction of SOx emissions from ships.

The Baltic Sea riparian countries discussed under the umbrella of the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission, also known as HELCOM, possible actions with regard to further reduction of the sulphur content limit of fuel oil used by ships in the Baltic Sea as well as globally.

MARPOL Annex VI entered into force on 19 May 2005 with the Baltic Sea area as an SOx Emission Control Area (SECA). Regulation 14(4) concerning the limit of sulphur content of fuel oil used on board ships in the Baltic Sea entered into force on 19 May 2006.

Before the regulation came into force there were several concerns regarding availability of low sulphur fuel oil and possible consequences for the enforcement of the regulations and economic impacts.

However, the experiences gained with the implementation and enforcement of relevant regulations in the HELCOM area were mostly positive. The information gathered to assess the enforcement of the regulation shows that the countries did not face any major difficulties in implementing Annex VI to MARPOL 73/78 as far as fuel oil quality was concerned.

Fuel oil with a maximum content of sulphur of 1.5% was available in the Baltic Sea ports as well as in European ports outside the Baltic. The availability of the fuel seemed to diminish with the distance from the Baltic Sea SECA where the requirements were less stringent on fuel oil quality. However, the Baltic Sea countries expect this to change with the North Sea becoming an SOx Emission Control Area and the entry into force of the relevant EU regulations.

From 17 May 2006 until 31 December 2006 as many as 1,879 ships were inspected in the Baltic Sea ports to control compliance with fuel oil requirements of Annex VI. The percentage of ships controlled out of the total number of ships calling into the Baltic Coastal State ports during the reported period ranged from 33% to less than 2%.

Only in 28 cases was non-compliance with the requirements of Regulation 18 “Fuel oil quality” of Annex VI detected, which is 1.5% of the all ships inspected. This indicates successful implementation of the relevant requirements in the Baltic Sea SECA.

The collection of information regarding implementation of MARPOL Annex VI in the Baltic Sea area will be continued to give more detailed information. No data are yet available for evaluation of the impact of implementation of Baltic SECA on air quality.

From the encouraging experience gained so far it can be concluded that even more ambitious aims concerning fuel oil quality are achievable globally as well as regionally within the next years.

The Committee is invited to take note of the information provided and to take action as deemed appropriate.
Action Plan for the protection of the environment from offshore platforms

The objective of this Action Plan is to ensure that environmental impacts from production and the preceding exploration for oil and natural gas remain within the limits set out in international and national regulations and correspond to principles of Best Available Technique (BAT) and Best Environmental Practice (BEP). Taking into account that most parts of the Baltic Sea Area have been declared by IMO as a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area and based upon BAT and BEP the “zero-discharge” principle has already been implemented at a Russian offshore platform in the Baltic Sea, these principles shall be applied within forthcoming years to all existing, planned and under-construction offshore platforms (drilling rigs and production platforms) in the Baltic Sea Area.

The Action Plan covers the following elements and requirements:

Chemicals
All operators shall apply “zero-discharge” principle not later than 1 January 2010:
- by 23 April 2008 all operators must have ceased discharges of all “black” chemicals**;
- operators must continue the process of substituting chemicals so that discharges of “red” chemicals cease no later than 1 January 2010.

Discharges of oil
All operators shall apply the “zero-discharge” principle for polluted substances and materials not later than 1 January 2010, which means that:
- from 1 January 2008 operators must comply with a limit value for dispersed oil of 15 mg/l, in production water discharged into the sea, measured as volume-weighted monthly average;
- from 1 January 2010 any discharge of oil-containing water shall be prohibited.

Air emissions
All operators shall apply “zero-discharge” principle as soon as possible, which means that:
- emissions of NO\textsubscript{x} and SO\textsubscript{x} to air shall comply with requirements of Annex VI to MARPOL 73/78 from 1 January 2008;
- emissions of VOCs, CO\textsubscript{2} and other greenhouse gases should correspond to BAT (e.g. elimination of flaring, use of low sulphur fuel, introduction of NO\textsubscript{x}-abatement techniques for combustion exhausts, introduction of CO\textsubscript{2} emission reduction methods and techniques).

Solid wastes
All operators shall apply “zero-discharge” principle not later than by 1 January 2008, which means that all solid wastes shall be disposed on land and treated in an environmentally good manner.

Decommissioning
All operators shall apply "zero-discharge" principle while decommissioning offshore installations at the end of their exploitation. The installations shall be removed, dismantled and subsequently treated in an environmentally friendly manner.

Environmental impact assessment, management, monitoring and reporting
- Any new plan for offshore activities shall undergo a thorough Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) procedure, including, if needed, assessment in a

---

* The “zero-discharge” principle means a general approach to ensure the proper treatment of all kinds of offshore platform-generated wastes, including processing and consumption wastes, on land or on the offshore platforms according to Best Available Techniques and Best Environmental Practices and MARPOL 73/78, with the aim of avoiding discharges to the marine environment.

** The lists of “black” and “red” chemicals are to be adopted at the HELCOM 29/2008 meeting, taking into account the OSPAR Recommendation 2000/4.
transboundary context under the 1991 Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (in case of potential adverse impacts on neighbouring states). Upon launching of a new installation, respective post-project analysis of its environmental performance against provisions of the initial EIA shall be undertaken in accordance with the afore-mentioned Convention.

- By no later than 2008, operators must introduce environmental management under a system ready for certification or other similar scheme. If another scheme is chosen, an independent third party must verify compliance with the legislative requirements on environmental reporting and measurement methods.

- All existing facilities shall undergo a regular survey (monitoring) of their actual pollution load and impacts. Guidelines shall be adopted on the matter.

- The environmental performance of offshore activities shall be handled in accordance with HELCOM Guidelines (HELCOM Recommendation 18/2).

- For 2008 and thereafter, each operator must prepare an annual environmental report and make it available to the public. The report must describe the environmental impacts of the oil and gas production, including emissions and discharges of substances to the atmosphere and the sea.