





Introduction

I. Ecosystem & human uses in BA area

II. 'State of the Art' on sensitivity mapping



Ronny Schallier MUMM/RBINS (BE)



http://www.mumm.ac.be/







'Task F' in Brief

- Towards a common approach on sensitivity mapping
 - Establish common criteria & qualitative descriptions
 - Main focus on potential coastal impact (incl. seasonal variability)
 - Build on work already done \rightarrow **BA**, **BRISK**
 - Draw on a major socio-economic analysis in **OSPAR**
- Undertake a Workshop (early 2013) to agree on approach
- Result: Preliminary report on joint environmental & socioeconomic sensitivity mapping









I. Ecosystems & human uses in BA area

Introduction to:

- Environment & ecosystems
- Human uses (socio-economic charact.)









The BA area: 'Greater North Sea and its wider Approaches'





~OSPAR Regions II, III & (part of) V

http://www.mumm.ac.be/







Wide variety of depths in BA area













0

20

Bathymetry & catchment areas

(Region II)





200 1000

500

- 7. Kristiansandsfjord
- 8. Saudafjord

50

1. Skagerrak

100

2. Norwegian Trench

- 9. Bergensfjord
- 10. Sørfjord/Hardangerfjord
- 11. Kattegat
- 12. Elbe
- 13. Weser
- 14. Jade
- 15. Wadden Sea
- 16. Oyster Ground
- 17. Frisian Front
- 18. Dutch coastal zone
- 19. Scheldt estuary
- 20. Flemish Banks
- 21. Seine estuary
- 22. Rade de Brest
- 23. Thames estuary
- 24. Humber estuary
- 25. Firth of Forth







Mixed & stratified water / Fronts – Region II

Figure 2.9 Mean summer vertical temperature, salinity and density sections between Norway and Scotland along 57° 17' N.

Temperature (°C)













Water masses & Fronts – Region III & V













Variety of seabed sediment types – Region II & III





















Max. tidal stream amplitudes (knots)











BE-AWARE Sensitivity Mapping Workshop Brussels: 29-30 April 2013

Seasonal variability in North Sea – Region II

Sea-surface T distribution (°C)

(a) yearly cycle amplitude

(b) Mean

(c) Minima

(d) Maxima













BA area \rightarrow Wide variety of shorelines & coastal habitats – being reflection of strongly varying dynamics –











Diverse marine habitats/ecosystems and large variety of (often sensitive) organisms









With wide variety of human uses ... and appreciation High socio-economic importance of seas and shores !









OSPAR list of threatened/declining Species & Habitats



- Several <u>marine/deep-sea</u> habitats:
- Lophelia pertusa coldwater coral reefs
- Coral gardens
- Carbonate mounds
- Deep-sea Sponge aggregations
- Seapen and burrowing megafauna
- Maerl beds
- Oyster grounds







II. 'State of the Art' in sensitivity mapping

- BONN AGREEMENT (national systems / BA Workshop 2008)
- BRISK (HELCOM)
- BE-AWARE project \rightarrow Adaptation of BRISK?









Bonn Agreement

National systems of sensitivity mapping + BA Workshop (GE, 2008) conclusions

source: BA Compilation, 2005/08 BA Workshop PPTs , 2008









National systems of sensitivity mapping









GE – detailed, quantitative maps (Waddensea !)







[21]





FR – Coastal maps based on 3 indices (geomorphological, ecological, socio-economic)









NO (MOB-model) - Sensitivity maps, used as support tool in response, but also for <u>strategic</u> studies (risk assessments)



- Recommended in 'Safety@Sea'
- Used by DNV in ERAs for offshore industry and shipping



[22]







National systems of sensitivity mapping

- Level of detail and development varies significantly
- But several <u>STRIKING SIMILARITIES</u> in basic approach!

$\underline{\mathsf{EXAMPLES}} \rightarrow \rightarrow$









<u>Ex.1:</u>

Some CPs: only 'mapping' of sensitive sites - UK, IRL -

Most CPs: RANKING of sensitivity based on pre-defined criteria

- NO, SE, GE, NL, FR, BE, DK -
- ~UK: MEHRAs studies
 - Qualitative: 'Low' \rightarrow 'Medium' \rightarrow 'High'
 - Quantitative: using classification scales (e.g. 0-9)











Most, if not all CPs take into account:

- SHORELINE TYPE sensitivity based on geomorphology (cf. ESI (G.&H.) - with local adaptations in FR,GE)
- CONSERVATION VALUE of a resource

(Protected Areas)









ESI	Shoreline type
1	Exposed rocky shore, solid structures, rocky cliffs
2	Exposed wave-cut platforms in bedrock, mud or clay; exposed scarps and steep slopes in clay
3	Fine- to medium-grained sand <u>beaches</u> Scarps and steep slopes in sand
4	Coarse-grained sand beaches
5	Mixed sand and gravel beaches
6	Gravel beaches (granules & pebbles) Riprap structures and gravel beaches (cobbles & boulders)
7	Exposed tidal flats
8	<u>Sheltered</u> rocky shore and scarps in bedrock, mud or clay; Sheltered solid structures, riprap, rocky rubble shores, peat shorelines
9	Sheltered tidal flats, vegetated low banks
10	Salt & brackish water <u>marshes</u> , freshwater marshes, swamps, mangroves
10	Salt & brackish water <u>marshes</u> , freshwater marshes, swamps, mangroves







Ex.3:

Many CPs focus on COASTAL sensitivity

- UK, SE, IRL, FR, (GE-North Sea) -

Many other CPs however also consider OFFSHORE sensitivity

- BE, NL, NO, DK, (GE-Baltic), (UK for seabird vuln.index) -

e.g. also sensitive marine habitats, seabird areas, fisheries resources, ...









Ex.4:

Some CPs focus on ECOLOGICAL sensitivity (ENV. S. in '<u>strict</u>' sense) (BE, NL, GE)

<u>Most CPs</u>: also SOCIO-ECONOMIC sensitivity (ENV. S. in 'broad' sense) (UK, NO, FR, IRL, SE, DK)

Socio-economic criteria vary considerably, but interesting approaches used (FR, NO)









BA Workshop on Sensitivity Mapping (Cuxhaven/GE, 2008)

General conclusions (1):

Level of detail/development of CP maps varies significantly

- → Hesitation towards BA-wide harmonization
- → However, there was perceived benefit to produce a generic, simplified sensitivity map in the BA area









BA Workshop on Sensitivity Mapping (2008)

General conclusions (2):

The sensitivity info was, in some cases, seen as <u>too detailed</u> ("Keep it simple")

→ It should be clear which environmental info is needed, as a <u>MINIMUM STANDARD</u>, to support response









Workshop on Sensitivity Mapping (2008)

- General conclusions (3):
- \rightarrow To be taken into account:
- <u>Geomorphologic</u> characteristics Shoreline type
- Sensitive <u>natural</u> and <u>socio-economic</u> resources (ENV in <u>broad</u> sense)
- <u>Protected Areas</u> or other areas of ecological importance









BRISK (DK/ HELCOM)

Source: BRISK Environm. Vulnerability Report, COWI, Jan.'12



http://www.mumm.ac.be/







BRISK – Environmental <u>Vulnerability</u> work

- <u>According to MUMM, the BRISK method & work is</u>:
 - Simple and effective
 - <u>Systematic</u> (step-by-step) approach
 - Well-documented & underpinned by <u>literature, + expert input</u>
 - Principles in line with previous BA findings & conclusions
 - = Example of 'BEST PRACTICE'

$\underline{\mathsf{WHY}/\mathsf{HOW}} \mathbin{?\!?} \mathbin{\rightarrow} \mathbin{\rightarrow}$









BRISK Methodology

<u>RANKING</u> performed (strategic Risk Assessments)

Risk of damage = probability x <u>vulnerability</u>

- QUALITATIVE ranking
- <u>COASTAL & MARINE</u> vulnerability
- <u>SHORELINE TYPE</u> considered
- PROTECTED AREAS considered
- Ranking of <u>ECOLOGICAL</u> & (some) <u>HUMAN USE</u> features









'Vulnerability vs. sensitivity'

- <u>Vulnerability</u> of organism, community, habitat or area is determined by:
 - Exposure to oil
 - Intrinsic sensitivity to oil (impact of oil on organisms & habitats)
 - Recovery potential of habitat, population, ...

(Schematically)

VULNERABILITY = EXPOSURE x SENSITIVITY / RECOVERY









BRISK Methodology

Ranking & mapping process in 3 steps:

- STEP 1: Identification of sensitive features
- STEP 2 : Vulnerability ranking of identified features
- STEP 3 : Total (seasonal) vulnerability mapping









<u>STEP 1</u> : Selection of sensitive Features (BRISK)

- Open waters
- Coastal habitats
 - Rocky shores & stone reefs
 - Sandy beaches
 - Underwater sandbanks
 - Shallow inlets & bays
 - Coastal lagoons
 - Estuaries
- Flora
 - Seagrass meadows (Zostera)

- Fish
 - Spawning areas in shallow water (demersal eggs)
 - Offshore spawning areas (pelagic eggs)
 - Nursery areas in shallow water
 - Birds

- Wintering areas (sea & shore birds)
- Staging areas (migrating sea & shore birds)
- Breeding areas (sea & shore birds)
- Moulting areas (sea birds)
- Marine mammals
 - Breeding, moulting and haul-out sites for seals
- Protected Areas
- Fish farms









STEP 2: BRISK Vulnerability Ranking

- Vulnerability scores:
 Seasons:
 - Score 4 = VERY HIGH
 - Score 3 = HIGH
 - Score 2 = MODERATE
 - Score 1 = LOW

- Winter: Dec., Jan., Feb.
- Spring: Mar., Apr., May
- Summer: Jun., Jul., Aug.
- <u>Autumn</u>: Sept., Oct., Nov.









Step 2 – Ranking process for <u>each</u> feature

- **1**. Ecol. characteristics, significance & location
- 2. (Qualitative) assessment of vulnerability
 - Based on 2 criteria:
 - 1. FATE OF OIL
 - 2. IMPACT OF OIL on organisms
- **3.** Assign vulnerability ranking (per season)









Step 2 – Criteria considered when ranking <u>each</u> feature

(1) FATE of oil

- In terms of oil degradation and removal
- Varies considerably
- Main factors:
 - Wave/tidal energy exposure
 - Shoreline slope
 - Substrate type

(~ Exposure & chemical recovery)

(2) IMPACT of oil on organisms/habitats

- Effects of oil on organisms
 - Smothering, toxicity, tainting
- Population & life-cycle considerations
 - Densely populated (small) areas
 - Spawning & nursery areas (~fish)
 - Sensitive stages/locations (~birds)
 - Threatened species & habitats, ...
 - (~ oil-sensitivity & biological recovery)





[41]





BRISK – Assigned Vulnerability Ranking of selected features

Environmental feature		SP	SU	AU
Rocky shores and stone reefs (sheltered)		4	4	4
Sandy beaches		1	2	1
Underwater sand banks (water < 10 m)		3	3	3
Estuaries		4	4	3
Coastal lagoons		4	4	3
Shallow inlets and bays		4	4	3
Seagrass meadows		4	4	3
Fish – shallow spawning areas		4	4	3
Fish – shallow nursery areas		4	4	3
Fish – offshore spawning areas		1	2	1
Protected areas		4	4	4
Aquaculture facilities		4	4	4
(Birds, marine mammals, etc.)				

m.ac.be/







Step 3 – Total (seasonal) vulnerability mapping

- After having mapped & ranked all features
- <u>Total vulnerability of an area</u> = <u>SUM of all individual Scores</u> of features in that area
- With reclassification of 'area' Score in

5 'total' Vulnerability Classes





BRISK End Result –

4 vulnerability maps (1 per season)











BRISK as basis for BE-AWARE approach

BRISK approach ('best practice') is applicable in BE-AWARE if adapted to <u>'North Sea' / 'BONN' context</u>

How?

- **1.** \neq Region \rightarrow \neq List of SENSITIVE FEATURES
- 2. Higher risk of "3D" impact
 - Severe storms
 - Dispersants important response option in BA
 - Option of subsurface dispersant use (blowout-scenarios)

3. Expand SOCIO-ECONOMIC PART - Incl. ranking & mapping approach









Workshop Agenda: "Stepwise" approach

AIM of Workshop ~

To agree upon an 'adapted' BRISK approach with adapted features & steps

MUMM drafted Working Documents taking also into account:

- BA CPs 'Best Practice'
- International 'Best Practice' & key Ref.documents (OSPAR, IMO, EC..)

→ Step-by-step presentations, for discussion & agreement









Workshop Agenda: "Stepwise" approach

 STEP 1 - Proposed selection of sensitive features (Ecological & socio-economic)

STEP 2 - Proposal for a BE-AWARE ranking method

STEP 3 - Suggestions for Total Vulnerability Mapping

