A comparison of the degree of implementation of marine biodiversity indicators by European countries in relation to the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD)

herman hummel[1], matt frost[2], josé a. juanes[3], judith kochmann[4], carlos f. castellanos perez bolde[5], fernando aneiros[6], françois vandenbosch[7,8], joão n. franco[9], beatriz echavarri[3], xabier guinda[3], araceli puente[3], camino fernández[3], cristina galván[3], maria merino[3], elvira ramos[3], paloma fernández[3], valentina pitacco[10], madara alberte[11], dagmara wojcik[12], monika grabowska[13], marlene jahnke[14], fabio crocetta[14], laura carugati[15], simonetta scorrano[16], simonetta fraschetti[16], patricia pérez garcía[17], josé antonio sanabria fernández[17,18], artem poromov[19], anna iurchenko[19], artem isachenko[19], alexandra chava[19], christina pavloudi[20], françois bordeyne[7,8], simone fie andersen[21], elizabeth grace tunka eronat[22], taylan cakmak[23], paraskevi louizidou[24], josé rico[25], stela ruci[26], david corta diego[27], sara mendez[28], maria rousou[29], laurence de clippele[30], annukka eriksson[31], winnie van zanten[32], anna diamant[33] and valentina kirienko fernandes de matos[34]

[1]Monitor Taskforce, Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research (NIOZ), Yerseke, the Netherlands, [2]Marine Biological Association, Plymouth, UK, [3]Environmental Hydraulics Institute (IH Cantabria), Universidad de Cantabria, Santander, Spain, [4]Senckenberg Gesellschaft für Naturforschung, Biodiversity and Climate Research Centre, Frankfurt am Main, Germany, [5]University of Bologna, Polo di Ravenna, Italy, [6]Department of Ecology and Animal Biology, University of Vigo, Vigo, Spain, [7]Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 6, Station Biologique de Roscoff, Roscoff, France, [8]CNRS, UMR7144 AD2M, Station Biologique de Roscoff, Roscoff, France, [9]CIIMAR, Centro Interdisciplinar de Investigação Marinha e Ambiental, Porto, Portugal, [10]NIB, Marine Biology Station, Piran, Slovenia, [11]Latvian Institute of Aquatic Ecology, Riga, Latvia, [12]Department of Experimental Ecology of Marine Organisms, Institute of Oceanography, University of Gdańsk, Gdynia, Poland, [13]Institute of Oceanology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Sopot, Poland, [14]Stazione Zoologica Anton Dohrn, Naples, Italy, [15]Department of Life and Environmental Sciences, Università Politecnica delle Marche, Ancona, Italy, [16]University of Salento, Lecce, Italy, [17]Faculty of Marine and Environmental Sciences, University of Cádiz, Cádiz, Spain, [18]The BITES lab, Center for Advanced Studies of Blanes (CEAB-CSIC), Blanes, Spain, [19]Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia, [20]Institute of Marine Biology, Biotechnology and Aquaculture, Hellenic Centre for Marine Research, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, [21]University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark, [22]Faculty of Fisheries, Ege University, Izmir, Turkey, [23]Department of Nematology, Faculty of Biology, University of Ghent, Belgium, [24]Hydrobiological Station of Rhodes, Hellenic Centre for Marine Research, Rhodes, Greece, [25]Departamento de Biología de Organismos y Sistemas, Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain, [26]Department of Biology, Faculty of Natural Science, University of Tirana, Tirana, Albania, [27]Ecohydros S.L., Santander, Spain, [28]University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, UK, [29]Marine & Environmental Research Lab Ltd, Nicosia, Cyprus, [30]Centre for Marine Biodiversity & Biotechnology, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK, [31]Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE), Marine Centre, Helsinki, Finland, [32]University of Utrecht, Utrecht, the Netherlands, [33]Institute of Hydrobiology, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine, [34]Departamento de Oceanografia e Pescas, Marine and Environmental Sciences Centre, Universidade dos Açores, Horta, Azores, Portugal

The degree of development and operability of the indicators for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) using Descriptor 1 (D1) Biological Diversity was assessed. To this end, an overview of the relevance and degree of operability of the underlying parameters across 20 European countries was compiled by analysing national directives, legislation, regulations, and publicly available reports. Marked differences were found between countries in the degree of ecological relevance as well as in the degree of implementation and operability of the parameters chosen to indicate biological diversity. The best scoring EU countries were France, Germany, Greece and Spain, while the worst scoring countries were Italy and Slovenia. No country achieved maximum scores for the implementation of MSFD D1. The non-EU countries Norway and Turkey score as highly as the top-scoring EU countries. On the positive side, the chosen parameters for D1 indicators were generally identified

Corresponding author:
H. Hummel
Email: herman.hummel@nioz.nl