

UHI Research Database pdf download summary

Embedding ecosystem services into the Marine Strategy Framework Directive

O'higgins, Tim

Published in:
Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science

Publication date:
2013

The Document Version you have downloaded here is:
Early version, also known as pre-print

The final published version is available direct from the publisher website at:
[10.1016/j.ecss.2013.10.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2013.10.005)

[Link to author version on UHI Research Database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
O'higgins, T. (2013). Embedding ecosystem services into the Marine Strategy Framework Directive: Illustrated by eutrophication in the North Sea. *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science*, 1.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2013.10.005>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UHI Research Database are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights:

- 1) Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the UHI Research Database for the purpose of private study or research.
- 2) You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- 3) You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the UHI Research Database

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at RO@uhi.ac.uk providing details; we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Elsevier Editorial System(tm) for Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number:

Title: A technique for embedding ecosystem services into the Marine Strategy Framework Directive illustrated by eutrophication in the North Sea.

Article Type: SI: ECSA50#3

Keywords: Ecosystem Services; Marine Strategy Framework Directive; Eutrophication; North Sea; Valuation; Ecosystem Approach

Corresponding Author: Dr Tim O'Higgins,

Corresponding Author's Institution:

First Author: Tim O'Higgins

Order of Authors: Tim O'Higgins; Alison J Gilbert, PhD

Abstract: The introduction of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) with its focus on an Ecosystem Approach places an emphasis on the human dimensions of environmental problems. Eutrophication has long been recognised as a major problem in Europe's seas but the MSFD marks a shift from management towards specific environmental States toward management largely based on abating nutrient loads towards specifying good environmental status and the associated need to manage supply of and demand for marine environmental services. Taking the North Sea as a case study we used a Driver Pressure State Welfare Response (DPSWR) approach to examine the relationships between the eutrophication criteria of the MSFD and the final and intermediate ecosystem services they provide. We valued these ecosystem services where possible in monetary terms in order to examine trade-offs between the benefits derived from the socio-economic drivers that cause eutrophication and the losses of human welfare (economic externalities) the causes of eutrophication. We identify the implications of an ecosystem approach for management and for future environmental research. We conclude the MSFD has the potential to become a social force for sustainable use of the seas, but may also ensure continuation of the status quo.

Suggested Reviewers: Alice Newton

anewton.ualg@gmail.com

Knowledge of eutrophication and interest in ecosystem approach

Anna-Stiina Heiskanen

Anna-Stiina.heiskanen@ymparisto.fi

Knowledge of eutrophication policy MSFD and ecosystem approach

Jãoo Ferriera

joao@hoomi.com

Lead the MSFD eutrophication task group

Mike Elliott

mike.elliott@hull.ac.uk

Interest in DPSWR, ecosystem approach, and shelf seas

Opposed Reviewers:

Dear Sir or Madam,

Please find attached my article entitled. "A technique for embedding ecosystem services into the Marine Strategy Framework Directive illustrated by eutrophication in the North Sea.."

The purpose of the article is to highlight the new emphasis of the Ecosystem Approach in marine management as mandated by the Marine Strategy Framework Directive. The article demonstrates a method to link the environmental status criteria of the MSFD to ecosystem services and their values, as such it takes a multidisciplinary in its approach. The article also highlights that management for ecosystem services marks a major paradigm shift in marine management.

I hope it will be considered for publication.

Best Regards

Tim O'Higgins

1 A technique for embedding ecosystem services into the Marine Strategy Framework
2 Directive: illustrated by the eutrophication in the North Sea.

3 O'Higgins T.G. Alison Gilbert.
4

5 **Abstract**

6
7 The introduction of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) with its focus on an
8 Ecosystem Approach places an emphasis on the human dimensions of environmental
9 problems. Eutrophication has long been recognised as a major problem in Europe's seas but
10 the MSFD marks a shift from management towards specific environmental States toward
11 management largely based on abating nutrient loads towards specifying good environmental
12 status and the associated need to manage supply of and demand for marine environmental
13 services. Taking the North Sea as a case study we used a Driver Pressure State Welfare
14 Response (DPSWR) approach to examine the relationships between the eutrophication
15 criteria of the MSFD and the final and intermediate ecosystem services they provide. We
16 valued these ecosystem services where possible in monetary terms in order to examine trade-
17 offs between the benefits derived from the socio-economic drivers that cause eutrophication
18 and the losses of human welfare (economic externalities) the causes of eutrophication. We
19 identify the implications of an ecosystem approach for management and for future
20 environmental research. We conclude the MSFD has the potential to become a social force
21 for sustainable use of the seas, but may also ensure continuation of the status quo.
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Introduction.**

28 Growing realisation of the extent of human impacts on global ecosystems and the declining
29 capacity of these ecosystems to provide the services on which we depend (e.g. MEA, 2003;
30 Halpern et al., 2008) has led to the concept of an "Ecosystem Approach" (EA) which may be
31 defined as "*a resource planning and management approach that integrates the connections*
32 *between land air water, all living things, human beings their activities and institutions*"
33 (Farmer et al., 2012). The approach is based on the recognition of the total dependence of
34 human activities on the ecosystems in which they take place (Boumans et al., 2002). Three
35 main characteristics of an EA include a multisectoral focus; the inclusion of ecosystem
36 services in decision making and the recognition of the tight coupling between social and
37 ecological systems (Tallis et al., 2010). Ecosystem services are defined as "the aspects of
38 ecosystems utilized (actively or passively) to produce human well-being.", ecosystem
39 services "must be ecological phenomena" and "these function or process become services if
40 there are humans that benefit from them" (Fisher et al., 2009). Development of an effective
41 EA requires a multidisciplinary approach incorporating the complexity of ecological and
42 social systems and this multidisciplinary approach represents a relatively new field of
43 research in marine management.
44
45
46
47
48

49 The Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) (EU, 2008), the environmental pillar of
50 the EU Integrated Maritime Policy is a European Union directive with the aim of
51 "maintaining biodiversity and providing diverse and dynamic oceans and seas which are
52 clean healthy and productive". The directive mandates an Ecosystem Approach (EA) and
53 obliges EU nations to achieve GEnS within member states' EEZs on a regional seas basis by.
54 Introduction of the EA represents a major change in marine environmental management for
55 the EU marking a shift away from a "deconstructing structural" approach of previous
56 environmental legislation towards a more "holistic functional" approach with a focus on
57 marine goods and services (Borja et al., 2010). Eleven descriptors of Good Environmental
58 Status (GEnS) are specified for which targets must be set by each EU member state. The
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 descriptors cover a range of topics, from well-known problems such as those associated with
2 fisheries, invasive species, eutrophication and pollutants to emerging issues including marine
3 energy, noise and marine litter. While some of the GEnS descriptors are already relatively
4 well understood (being the subject of existing European environmental legislation) others are
5 new and have received less scientific attention. Existing regional seas agreements are to be
6 used where possible to harmonise implementation of the directive. The MSFD and
7 achievement of an EA present a major challenge to European scientists and decision makers,
8 in terms of their spatial scale, comprehensive environmental scope and expanded, social-
9 ecological focus (Mee et al., 2008; Atkins et al., 2011). In particular the MSFD presents a
10 challenge in linking traditional metrics of environmental status to the provision of ecosystem
11 services.
12

13
14 The task group for the eutrophication descriptor under the MSFD defined eutrophication as
15 “*a process driven by enrichment of water by nutrients, especially compounds of nitrogen*
16 *and/or phosphorus, leading to: increased growth, primary production and biomass of algae;*
17 *changes in the balance of organisms; and water quality degradation. The consequences of*
18 *eutrophication are undesirable if they appreciably **degrade ecosystem health and/or the***
19 ***sustainable provision of goods and services**”*(Ferriera et al., 2010). Marine eutrophication
20 has been recognised in Europe’s coastal waters for over a century (Adeney, 1908) and has
21 been viewed as a significant problem in Europe since the mid-1980s (Rosenberg, 1985)
22 affecting each of its regional seas, Baltic, Black, North Sea and Mediterranean (Hydes et al.,
23 1999; Gordina et al., 2001, Monecheva et al., 2001 Mee et al, 2005; Pätsch et al., 2010
24 Savchuk, 2005). The causes of eutrophication, anthropogenic nutrient loading, are linked
25 with the fundamental biological processes of consumption, and excretion and the release of
26 nutrient wastes from either human or from agricultural or industrial sources are its main
27 drivers. The expression of eutrophication varies depending of the physical, chemical and
28 biological conditions in a specific location (Cloern, 2001).
29
30
31
32

33 Decades of experience with the monitoring and assessment of eutrophication in the North Sea
34 have highlighted several important challenges for the measurement, monitoring and future
35 management of eutrophication (Hering et al., 2010, Ferriera et al., 2010; 2011) but have also
36 yielded considerable insight into the problem and mean that the ecological characteristics of
37 eutrophication in the area are reasonably well constrained. In the context of the MSFD
38 eutrophication is therefore a well-known and well understood marine management problem
39 and represents an excellent test case for assessment of the implications of an Ecosystem
40 Approach with its expanded social- ecological focus for environmental management and
41 assessment strategies.
42
43
44

45 The aim of this paper is to develop a framework for the inclusion of ecosystem services into
46 the assessment of environmental status under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive.
47 First we illustrate the framework with respect to a single, well understood descriptor,
48 eutrophication, we then apply the framework to a case study of the North Sea.
49
50

51 **Materials and Methods**

52 **Study Area**

53 The large human population (~160 million) and intensive agricultural practices in the North
54 Sea’s catchment mean that anthropogenic loads to the North Sea are high (EEA, 2005).
55 However oceanic exchange means that anthropogenic contributions to the overall nutrient
56 budget are quite modest. In the relatively poorly-flushed, shallower, coastal and southern
57 North Sea, these sources account for 52% (N) and 41% (P) of all external sources (Vermaat
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 et. al 2008). These areas are susceptible to eutrophication. Anoxic sediments and algal
2 blooms have been observed in the German Bight and parts of the Wadden Sea (Van Es and
3 Ruardij, 1982; Brockmann et al., 1988; Hickel, 1998; Druon et al., 2004; Van Beusekom,
4 2005); the shallow unstratified southern part of the North Sea is prone to high phytoplankton
5 biomass, hypoxia and nuisance blooms of the foam forming alga *Phaeocystis globosa*
6 (Lancelot et al. 2005; Lancelot et al, 2011). The problem of eutrophication in the North Sea
7 has received extensive academic attention, in terms of modelling of nutrient loading (Skogen
8 et al., 2004; OSPAR, 2008, Lenhart et al., 2010; Los and Blas, 2010); the ecological effects
9 of these loads (Riegman et al., 1990) and the economic costs of remediation (Hoffmann et al,
10 2005; Nunneri et al., 2007). There have also been considerable management efforts to
11 counteract the effects of eutrophication. Figure 1 provides a visually summary of the spatial
12 distribution of eutrophication in the North Sea.
13
14
15

16 In the following section we describe a series of three steps designed to allow incorporation of
17 ecosystem services into decision making based on the environmental status criteria of the
18 MSFD. We apply this technique with respect to a single MSFD descriptor eutrophication
19 (descriptor 5) and test its applicability using the North Sea as a case study.
20
21

22 The first step was to characterise the criteria described in the commission decision on
23 descriptors (EU, 2010), this characterisation was based on the Driver, Pressures State Welfare
24 Response (DPSWR) approach, based on Cooper (2012). DPSWR is a systematic framework
25 for addressing environmental problems. The DPSWR components encompass both the
26 human and ecological parts of social-ecological systems and is summarised in Figure 2.
27 Drivers are the economic and social forces that result from government policies, markets and
28 the activities of private industry. Pressures are the ways these drivers place demands upon
29 ecosystems (whether or not these demands can be met in a sustainable manner). State
30 changes are the changes in the ecosystem resulting from the Pressures and these in turn can
31 result in changes to human Welfare through changes in ecosystem service supply. The
32 Response to a particular problem may be directed towards any of the other elements (D,P,S
33 or W) to achieve a balance between the benefits of economic and social development and the
34 ecosystem costs. Each of the individual subcriteria for a given descriptor were assigned to an
35 information category of the DPSWR according to the definitions given in Figure 2.
36
37
38
39

40 Having categorised the criteria the next step was to link these criteria to ecosystem services.
41 Ecosystem services are defined as “the aspect of nature used (actively or passively) to
42 produce human well-being (Fisher et al., 2008. Ecosystem services were classified as either
43 intermediate or final based on Fisher et al. (2009). The ecosystem services related to the
44 MSFD criteria and subcriteria were listed by considering the major chemical physical and
45 biological processes associated with the criteria and their direct and indirect relations to
46 human well-being, the identification of services also relied on reference to existing list of
47 ecosystem services including O’Higgins and Roth (2010) and Saunders et al. (2010).
48
49
50

51 The third step was to provide a means of evaluating and intercomparing ecosystem services.
52 In this study we chose economic valuation of ecosystem services based market values where
53 available. Where ecosystem services did not have market values, non-market values
54 estimated based on benefits transfer, a technique whereby economic values for a particular
55 good or service from one study site are transferred to those of another study site. In order to
56 avoid double counting final ecosystem services only were valued.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 We tested the framework described above by application to the eutrophication descriptor of
2 the MSFD taking the North Sea as a case study.

3
4 Estimates of current values of selected ecosystem services were calculated and converted to
5 values in €(2010) using the Consumer Price Index. The economic value of carbon burial by
6 the North Sea ecosystem was based on estimates of carbon export to deep waters by the shelf
7 sea pump in Bozec et al. (2006). Estimates of the value of carbon storage were based on
8 European Union allowance of €16.80/tC/yr (www.pointcarbon.com).
9

10 Values for Willingness to Pay for recreation in European nations (reported in
11 WTP/individual/yr) were taken from a global meta-analysis of recreational values,
12 Ghermandi et al. (2011) for the UK a mean of European WTP values was used. WTP values
13 for visitors to coastal sites were multiplied by the number of visitors in North Sea coastal area
14 hotels and campsites in 2010 based on Nomenclature of Territorial Units for statistics
15 (NUTS) level 2 data (Eurostat, 2012). These data were further disaggregated to immediate
16 coastal areas at the NUTS level 3 data level assuming that number of visitors at proportional
17 to the number of hotel beds in each territorial unit. WTP for residents at the NUTS2 level was
18 obtained by multiplying the national WTP from Ghermandi et al. (2011) by the NUTS level 2
19 population data for 2010 (Eurostat, 2012).
20
21

22 The data for price for each fish species was taken from
23 <<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/fisheries/data/database>>. The main source
24 of data is the obligatory reporting from national authorities and gathered through collections
25 of fishing log-books, landing declarations and sales notes. Catch data were taken from ICES
26 FishStat database and included ICES areas IIIa, Iva, IVB,IVc,IV,d,IVe (the Greater North
27 Sea, from the English Channel to the Northern North Sea). Data for three years (2007-2009)
28 were averaged to give a mean annual catch and price.
29
30
31
32

33 | **RESULTS**

34
35 Table 1 summarises the eutrophication criteria from the commission decision on descriptors
36 and relates them to the qualitative assessment parameters of the OSPAR comprehensive
37 procedure (OSPAR, 2005). Figure 3 shows a conceptual model of eutrophication (based on
38 Ferriera et al., 2012) but contained within the DPSWR framework. The model highlights the
39 social as well as ecological aspects of the system and illustrates the location of the MSFD
40 eutrophication criteria within that framework. All the eutrophication criteria in the
41 Commission Decision on descriptors (EU, 2010) measure specific aspects of ecosystem
42 disturbance or integrity. Taken in combination the criteria for eutrophication provide a
43 comprehensive overview of marine flora. They encompass the changes in the chemical
44 environment causing eutrophication (criteria 5.1.1. and 5.1.2) as well as the abundance and
45 composition of marine microflora (criteria 5.2.1, 5.2.4) and macroflora, both algae and
46 macrophytes (criteria 5.2.3, 5.3.1) and their consequences for light transmission (5.2.2) and
47 oxygen concentrations in the water column (5.3.2). All eight eutrophication indicators are
48 measurements of ecosystem state and therefore are readily linked to ecosystem services.
49 However the links between environmental states and ecosystem services are not explicit in
50 the criteria themselves.
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Figure 4 illustrates the links between the eutrophication criteria and some intermediate
58 services; final services and benefits. The relationships between individual eutrophication
59 criteria and the supply of ecosystem services vary in complexity. There are reasonably direct
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 links between some criteria; the final services they provide and benefits. For example the
2 abundance of opportunistic and perennial seaweeds (criteria 5.2.1 and 5.3.1) is a final service
3 where there is a commercial harvest of species (e.g. for alginates, fertiliser or as an input to
4 biomass digestion processes) and there are clear resulting marketed benefits. There is also a
5 relatively simple link between increasing chlorophyll concentrations (5.2.1), decreased water
6 transparency (5.2.2) the quality of bathing waters and the benefits these provide to humans.
7 In the North Sea, shifts in species composition of phytoplankton (5.2.4) may also be related
8 to the provision of bathing water, since there are annual outbreaks of the nuisance algal
9 species *Phaeocystis globosa* which form foam.
10

11 The criteria also affect human welfare in indirect ways, acting as intermediate services. For
12 example seaweeds (5.2.3, 5.3.1), seagrasses (5.3.1) and dissolved oxygen concentration
13 (5.3.2) all play roles in the provision of habitat an intermediate service which contributes to
14 the final service of fish and shellfish production (which in turn have commercial as well as
15 recreational benefits). There are also well known feedbacks between chlorophyll
16 concentrations, transparency and macroflora which further complicate the relationship
17 between the ecosystem and the final services it supplies. Chlorophyll concentration (5.2.1) is
18 a proxy for marine primary production which plays a vital role in the biogeochemical cycling
19 of atmospheric gases, the production of oxygen and the fixation and burial of carbon these
20 fluxes of elements to and from the atmosphere represent an essential final service providing
21 life support for terrestrial animals (including humans), both in terms of generating an
22 oxygenated atmosphere (by production of oxygen through photosynthesis) and in regulation
23 of climate (through burial of carbon) as such these services may be said to have primary
24 values. Primary production also forms the basis of marine food webs, and can be viewed as
25 an intermediate service contributing to the final services of *any aspect* of a particular marine
26 food web which is valued by humans for its use or for its existence.
27
28
29
30
31

32 The intermediate and final services related to the eutrophication descriptor result in four
33 distinct benefits, the regulation of oxygen in the atmosphere, recreational uses, commercial
34 harvest of species and maintenance of a habitable planet through climate regulation (Figure
35 X). For supply of breathable air the benefits are currently plentiful and free and therefore
36 their marginal values will be infinitesimally small (Sagoff, 2009).
37
38
39

40 Values of Willingness to Pay for coastal recreation by visitors and residents of coastal areas
41 in the Greater North Sea are summarised in Table 2. The estimated aggregated total for all
42 north Sea coastal areas was €23,346m
43
44

45 The mean annual tonnage of commercially landed fish 2007-2009 was 5,436,679t with a
46 mean value of €1,977.5m. Over 50% of the commercial value was due to the catch of just
47 seven species. Figure 5 shows the mean annual value of commercial catch in each of the
48 ICES subdivision. Table 3 shows the value of the main commercial species of the greater
49 North Sea by ICES division.
50
51

52 Based on Bozec et al. (2006) the annual export to the deep Atlantic of carbon from the North
53 Sea is 1.83×10^6 tonnes $C\ y^{-1}$ with a nominal market value of €30.8m annually.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Discussion

1
2
3 Our estimates of economic values of the benefits of the selected ecosystem services range by
4 three orders of magnitude, from tens of billions for recreation to tens of millions for carbon
5 burial. Despite the overwhelming value of the recreational benefits when compared to the
6 other services evaluated, our understanding of how these benefits are related to levels of
7 eutrophication and other ecosystem processes is incomplete. We aggregated WTP values
8 based on numbers of individuals living in or staying in hotels and campsites in coastal
9 “Territorial Units” adjacent to the North Sea. In reality WTP values are likely to decline
10 gradually with distance from the resource and availability of alternatives (Schaafsma et al.,
11 2012). Philippart et al. (2007) have suggested positive relationships between nutrient loads
12 and food web components in the North Sea including estuarine birds which could increased
13 recreational values with increasing nutrient loads. The amount of recreational bathing
14 occurring in the North Sea either by visitors or residents is likely to be lower than in other
15 European seas due to the temperature of the sea itself, a factor which may not be represented
16 in the annual values we have used based on the meta-analysis of Ghermandi et al. (2011). The
17 shallow, well mixed nature of the southern north sea results in a degree of natural turbidity
18 such that high water clarity might not play as a large a role in coastal recreation values as it
19 does in other systems, such as the Baltic or Mediterranean which are naturally less turbid and
20 changes in recreational values for the North Sea may therefore be less sensitive to water
21 transparency and eutrophication than other areas.
22
23
24
25
26

27 More reliable estimates of economic value are presented for commercial fisheries. However
28 separating the effects of anthropogenic pressures on the state of fisheries is challenging, given
29 that multiple pressures such as fishing and nutrient loading have increased concurrently
30 (Caddy, 2000) and that other climatological and ecological processes also play a role in
31 determining species biomass and composition and distribution (Colijn et al., 2002; Engelhard
32 et al., 2011). Changes in primary productivity affect the productivity of higher trophic level
33 species, and can alter the ratio of pelagic to demersal fisheries increased primary production
34 can have a positive effect on fisheries landings (Hondorp et al., 2010). Sole is the major
35 commercial species of value in the Southern North sea (Table 2) and decreases in
36 productivity of flat fishes, sole and plaice have been associated with reduced nutrient loads
37 (Rijnsdorp et al. 2004). The long term value of the fisheries relies on the effective
38 management of the stocks. Under the MSFD, fisheries are to be managed under Maximum
39 Sustainable Yeild (EU, 2010) but this maximum yield may be increased with increasing
40 productivity.
41
42
43
44

45 Our estimate of the value of carbon burial from the north sea is based on single snapshot in
46 time based on a multi-annual dataset combined to produce a box model of carbon flux (Bozec
47 et al., 2006). The OSPAR target reductions in nutrients supply of 50% are predicted to
48 reduce primary production by between 25% - 45% in some locations (Lenhart et al., 2010).
49 The current levels of carbon exported for burial to the deep North Atlantic from the North
50 Sea ($1.8 \times 10^6 \text{t.y}^{-1}$) is approximately equal to the 2.7% of the amount of carbon extracted
51 annually as crude oil (IEA, 2011). At this rate it would take the North Sea shelf sea pump 37
52 years to mitigate the carbon produced by current annual oil extraction. Assuming a constant
53 proportion of Net Primary Productivity is exported under different levels of eutrophication.
54 A reduction in net primary productivity by 40% an upper bound for predictions through
55 achievement of the OSPAR nitrogen reduction targets (Lenhart et al., 2010) would result in
56 an increase of this timescale for mitigation of annual extraction to 61 years However the time
57 taken to mitigate the carbon added to the atmosphere through extraction and use of crude oil
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 from the North Sea over the last 40 years is in the order of millennia which indicates that the
2 natural process of carbon burial in the North Sea (even if augmented by eutrophication) does
3 not have a practical role to play in mitigation of climate change.

4
5 Considered together these estimates of ecosystem service values for the North Sea might help
6 focus management priorities. For example our estimates suggest that managing ecosystem
7 services to safe-guard recreational activities while maintaining fisheries could be a sensible
8 management option whereas management toward carbon burial with the aim of mitigating
9 climate change would clearly not be a sensible choice. These value estimates also highlight
10 major knowledge gaps in particular with respect to human recreational uses of the North Sea
11 and how these uses might change with nutrient loading but also regarding the effects of
12 increased primary production on the sustainable yield of fisheries within the North Sea.
13
14

15
16 In order to support decision making an understanding of marginal changes in ecosystem
17 service values is required. Figure 4 illustrates idealised trajectories for bathing water supply,
18 fish production and primary production with increasing nutrient supply, the order of
19 magnitude of the services is based on our analysis of the North Sea. The idealised trajectories
20 shown for supply of each service with increasing eutrophication differ in their direction.
21 Primary production (and correspondingly carbon burial) increase with increasing primary
22 production and at high levels of nutrient loading this may become light limited. Fish
23 production also increases to a certain extent with nutrient loading as plant biomass and thus
24 the availability of food to higher trophic levels increases. By contrast bathing water supply is
25 likely to decrease as primary production and nutrient load increase. Identifying the point
26 where the benefits of the abatement, for recreation, commercial fisheries and carbon burial of
27 equal the costs of abatement can in theory therefore identify the best strategies for the
28 management of multiple ecosystem services. Despite the number of criteria for eutrophication
29 under the MSFD and the complexity of interactions between them they relate either directly
30 or indirectly to a relatively small number of final ecosystem services and benefits. Balancing
31 the anthropogenic pressures and the state changes they cause to maximize ecosystem service
32 production is central to an ecosystem approach. For eutrophication at least, this management
33 paradigm is at odds with previous management approaches (such as that of the WFD) which
34 sought to manage towards reference states.
35
36
37
38
39

40 The framework we have developed to facilitate the inclusion of ecosystem services into the
41 MSFD criteria for decision making has allowed us to identify and categorise the ecosystem
42 services associated with a single descriptor in the MSFD and to link these services to
43 benefits. In our worked example, the valuation of the ecosystem services was the least robust
44 part of the process entailing many uncertainties and lacking the dynamism on which real
45 world decision might be made this lack of non-market valuation data to support coastal and
46 marine decisions, has been recognised by many others (Pendleton, 2008; O'Higgins et al.,
47 2010; Raheem et al., 2012). When assessing non-marketed values, it may be the case that the
48 specific value for a given for an individual's WTP for a given marginal change in ecosystem
49 service is less important than the number of individuals making up the "economic
50 jurisdiction" of given service (Bateman, 2012; Jordan et al., 2012); the development of
51 reliable, accurate and transferable distance decay models for WTP is a prerequisite for
52 application of non-market valuation studies to real-world management. Understanding the
53 mixture of recreational activities and their relation to environmental quality is a more
54 fundamental challenge.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Though monetary valuation is a useful tool for communication with decision makers, monetary valuation of services is not the only, or necessarily the best, way of quantifying the values humans hold for the environment, and it is not always possible appropriate or useful to place monetary values on ecosystem services. Practical alternatives to monetary valuation of ecosystem services do exist, Multi-Criteria-Analysis (MCA) allows multiple ecosystem services to be considered in tandem and relative weights to be assigned without the requirement for economic valuation, and its potential in gathering spatially explicit location-specific value data in the marine environment is beginning to emerge (Alexander et al., 2012).

CONCLUSIONS

For an EA, understanding the links between the natural and social systems is essential, and the MSFD will fail as an instrument of EA if these considerations are not incorporated. We have presented a simple framework to facilitate the inclusion of ecosystem services into the management of the MSFD environmental status criteria. We have identified links between the environmental status criteria for eutrophication and the ecosystem services they provide in the North Sea.

Identifying the effects of eutrophication on ecosystem services represents a scientific challenge. The North Sea example highlights a number of areas where data are insufficient to support an ecosystem approach based on the valuation of ecosystem services. There is lack of ecological knowledge about the effects of eutrophication on the dynamics of the shelf-sea pump and carbon burial. The relationships between environmental state of the North Sea and patterns of human recreation are not understood, while our analysis suggests there are extremely high values for recreation, it is currently not known how these values might change with changing environmental state. Similar complex linkages will be present for each of the eleven descriptors contained within the MSFD and identifying these linkages and how they relate to human welfare is a useful first step toward an ecosystem approach. Understanding the complexity of the linkages between ecological processes will require new measurements of the social aspects and novel approaches to modelling which incorporate both natural and social sciences (see Tett et al. 2011).

The MSFD represents more than simple shift in the spatial jurisdiction and ecological scope of the WFD and the OSPAR common procedure, it demands an Ecosystem Approach which must incorporate social as well as ecological dimensions into decision making. The experience of eutrophication measuring and monitoring gained through the legislative processes of the WFD and OSPAR has resulted in an improved understanding of eutrophication in the North Sea. The philosophical approach to management under the MSFD marks a major change in direction, recognising human and ecological processes as an integrated system and seeks to manage ecosystem services provided by the environment sustainably for the benefit of mankind.

In the Anthropocene (Zalsiewicz et al.,2008) where human driven processes dominate the planet and a time when humans are exceeding planetary boundaries for sustainability (Rockström et al., 2009) return to pristine conditions is not a realistic option. The MSFD and EA represent an opportunity to extend the environmental management focus beyond the existing ecological quality objectives of the WFD, the return to a pristine status toward the recognition of the integral role of humans in the environment and the role of environmental management in the construction of sustainable societies. Within the European Union, which

1 contributes disproportionately to exploitation of the global environment, decision makers,
2 society, and researchers have an obligation to extend their vision beyond academic and
3 sectoral boundaries and to engage with the solutions to the problems of a rapidly changing
4 planet. Identifying threatened forms of natural capital which limit economic development or
5 exceed the carrying capacity of the earth is the essential role of the ecosystem approach
6 (Sagoff, 1995). In the case of the eutrophication descriptor of the MSFD this would mean
7 quantifying the capacity of Europe's regional seas to absorb our wastes and the ecological
8 and social costs and benefits of these processes. The study of ecosystem services is not
9 about assigning economic values to nature, though this can be a useful means of identifying
10 trade-offs, it is about understanding how our activities affect the capacity of the environment
11 to sustain our lifestyles.
12

14 Acknowledgements

15 The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Community's
16 Seventh Framework Programme [FP7/2007-2013] under grant agreement number 226675.
17 The KnowSeas project is affiliated with LOICZ and LWEC.
18
19
20
21
22

23 References

24
25 Adeney, 1908. Effect of the new drainage on Dublin Harbour. *Handbook to the Dublin*
26 *district British Association*. 378pp
27

28 Alexander, K, Janssen,R., Arciniegas, G., O'Higgins, T., Eikelboom, T., and Wilding, T.
29 2012. Interactive Marine Spatial Planning: Siting tidal energy arrays around the Mull of
30 Kintyre. *PloS One* 7
31
32
33

34
35 Atkins, J.P., Burdon, D., Elliott,M.and Gregory, A.J.. 2011. Management of the marine
36 environment: integrating ecosystem services and societal benefits with the DPSIR framework
37 in a systems approach. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 62:215-226
38

39 Bateman, I., Binner, A., Coombes, E., Day, B., Ferrubu, S. Fezzi, C., Hutchins, M. and
40 Posen, P. Integrated and spatially explicit modelling of the economic value of complex
41 environmental change and its indirect effects. CSERGE Working papers ISSN 0967-8875
42
43

44 Borja, A., Elliott, M., Cartensen, J., Heiskannen, A-S., van de Bund, W. 2010. Marine
45 management- towards an integrated implementation of the European Marine Strategy
46 Framework and the Water Framework Directives. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 60 2175-2186
47
48

49 Boumans, R., Costanza, R., Farley, J., Wilson, M.A., Portela, R., Rotmans, J., Villa, F.
50 and Grasso, M. 2002. Modeling the dynamics of the integrated earth system and the value of
51 global ecosystem services using the GUMBO model. *Ecological Economics* 41:529-560.
52

53 Bozec, Y., Thomas, H., Cchiettecatte, L.S., Borges, A.V. Elkalay, K. and debar, J,W. 2006.
54 Assessment of the processes controlling seasonal variation of dissolved inorganic carbon in
55 the North Sea. *Limnology and Oceanography* 51 2746-2762
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Brockmann, U., Billen, G., Gieskes, W.W.C., 1988. North Sea nutrients and eutrophication.
2 In: Salomons, W., Bayne, B.L., Duursma, E.K., Foerstner, U. (Eds.), Pollution of the North
3 Sea, An Assessment. Springer, Berlin, pp. 348–389.

4
5 Caddy, J.F. 2000. Marine catchment basin effects versus impacts of fisheries on semi-
6 enclosed seas. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 57 628-640

7
8 Cloern, J.E. 2001. Our evolving conceptual model of the coastal eutrophication problem.
9 *Marine. Ecology Progress Series* 210 223-253.

10
11 Colijn, F., Hesse, K.J., Ladwig, N., Tillmann, U., Vadstein, O. and Olsen, Y. Effects of the
12 largescale uncontrolled fertilization process along the continental coastal North Sea.
13 *Hydrobiologia*. 2002 484 133–148

14
15
16 Cooper, P. 2012. The DPSWR Social-Ecological Accounting Framework: Notes on its
17 Definition and Application. EU FP7 KNOWSEAS Project. ISBN 0-9529089-5-6.

18
19 Druon, J.N., Schrimpf, W., Dobricic, S., Stips, A., 2004. Comparative assessment of large-
20 scale marine eutrophication: North Sea area and Adriatic as case studies. *Marine Ecology*
21 *Progress Series* 272, 1–23.

22
23
24 EEA. 2005. Source apportionment of nitrogen and phosphorus inputs into the aquatic
25 environment., European Environment Agency (EEA), Copenhagen, Report No 7/2005.

26
27
28 Engelhard, G.H., Ellis, J.R., Payne, M.R., ter Hofstede ,R. and Pinnegar, J.K. 2011 Ecotypes
29 as a concept for exploring responses to climate change in fish assemblages. *ICES Journal of*
30 *Marine Science* 68 580–591

31
32 Eurostat 2012.

33
34 [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Tourism_statistics_at_regional](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Tourism_statistics_at_regional_level)
35 [_level](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Tourism_statistics_at_regional_level) (accessed 2/11/2012)

36
37
38 EU, 2000. Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23
39 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water
40 policy *Official Journal L* 327, 22/12/2000 1-73

41
42
43 EU. 2008 Directive number 56 of 2008, Official Journal of 17 June 2008

44
45 EU 2010. Decision number 477 of 2010, Official Journal of 2nd of September 2010

46
47
48 Farmer, A., Mee. L., Langmead, O., Cooper, P., Kannen, A., Kershaw, P. and Cherrier, V.
49 2012. The Ecosystem Approach in Marine Management. EU FP7 KNOWSEAS Project. ISBN
50 0-9529089-5-6

51
52
53 Ferreira, J.G., Andersen, J.H., Borja, A., Bricker, S.B., Camp, J., Cardoso da Silva,
54 M., Garcés, E., Heiskanen, A.S., Humborg, C., Ignatiades, L., Lancelot, C., Menesguen, A.,
55 Tett, P., Hoepffner, N., Claussen, U., 2010. Marine Strategy Framework Directive e Task
56 Group 5 Report Eutrophication. EUR 24338 EN e Joint Research Centre. Office for Official
57 Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, pp. 49.

1 Ferreira, J.G., Andersen, J.H., Borja, A., Bricker, S.B., Camp, J., da Silva, M.C., Garcés, E.,
2 Heiskanen, A.S. Humborg, C., Ignatiades, L., Lancelot, Menesguen, C.A., Tett, P.,
3 Hoepffner, N. and Claussen, U. Overview of eutrophication indicators to assess environmental
4 status within the European Marine Strategy Framework Directive, Estuarine, Coastal and
5 Shelf Science, 93 2.

6
7 Fisher, B. & Turner, K. 2008. Ecosystem services: classification for valuation. Biological
8 Conservation 141: 1167-1169

9
10 Fisher, B, K. Turner & P. Morling. 2009. Defining and classifying ecosystem services for
11 decision making. Ecological Economics 68 643-653.

12
13 Ghermandi, A., Nunes P.A.L.D. Porela, R. Rao, N. Teeluxksingh, D.S. 2011. Recreational,
14 cultural and aesthetic services from estuarine and coastal ecosystems. In Ecological
15 economics of estuaries and coasts. Van Der Belt Ed. Pp 217-237

16
17
18 Gordina A. D., Pavlova E. V., Ovsyany E. I., Wilson J. G., Kemp R. B., and Romanov A. S.
19 2001. Long-term changes in Sevastopol Bay (the Black Sea) with particular reference to the
20 ichthyoplankton and zooplankton. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 2001 52 1-13.

21
22
23 Halpern, B.S., Walbridge, S., Selkoe, K.A., Kappel, C.V., Micheli, F., D'Agrosa, C., Bruno,
24 J.F., Casey, K.S., Ebert, C., Fox, H.E., Fujita, R., Heinemann, D., Lenihan, H.S., Madin,
25 E.M.P., Perry, M.T., Selig, E.R., Spalding, M., Steneck, R. and Watson, R. 2008 A global
26 map of human impact on marine ecosystems. Science 319:948-952.

27
28
29
30 Hering, D. Borja, A. Cartensen, J., Carvalho, L. Elliott, M., Feld, K.C., Hesikanen, A-S.
31 Johnson, R.K., Moe, J., Pont, D., Solheim, AL., va de Bund, W. 2001. The European water
32 framework directive at the age of 10: A critical review of the achievements with
33 recommendation for the future. Science of the Total Environment 408. 4007-4019

34
35
36 Hickel, W., 1998. Temporal variability of micro- and nanoplankton in the German Bight in
37 relation to hydrographic structure and nutrient changes. ICES Journal of Marine Science 55,
38 600-609.

39
40
41 Hoffman, J., Behrendt, H., Gilbert, A., Janssen, R., Kannen, A., Kappenberg, J., Lenhart, H.,
42 Lise, W., Nunneri, C. and Winhorst, W. 2005 Catchment-coastal zone interaction based upon
43 scenario model analysis: Elbe and the German Bight case study. Regional Environmental
44 Change 5 54-81

45
46
47 Hondorp, D.W. Breitbug, D.L. and Davias, L.A. 2010. Eutrophication and fisheries:
48 Separating the effects of nitrogen loads and hypoxia on the pelagic to demersal ratio and
49 other measures of landings composition. Marine and coastal fisheries: Dynamics,
50 Management and Ecosystem Science. 2 339-361

51
52
53 Hydes, D.J., Kelly-Gerreyn, B.A., Le Gall, A.C., and Proctor, R. 1999. The balance of
54 nutrients and demands of biological production and denitrification in a temperate latitude
55 shelf sea – a treatment of the southern North Sea as an extended estuary. *Marine Chemistry*,
56 **68** 117-131

57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 IEA. 2011. International Energy Agency World Energy Statistics (Edition: 2011), ESDS International,
2 University of Manchester. DOI: 10.5257/iea/wes/2011

3 Jordan, S. J., O'Higgins, T., & Dittmar, J. A. 2012. Ecosystem Services of Coastal Habitats
4 and Fisheries: Multiscale Ecological and Economic Models in Support of Ecosystem-Based
5 Management. *Marine and Coastal Fisheries* 4 573-586.
6

7
8
9 Lancelot C., Spitz Y., Gypens N., Ruddick K., Becquevort S., Rousseau V., Lacroix G. and
10 Billen, G.. 2005. Modelling diatom and *Phaeocystis* blooms and nutrient cycles in the
11 Southern Bight of the North Sea: the MIRO model. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 289: 63-
12 78
13

14
15 Lancelot, C., Thieu, V. Polard,A., Garnier,J., Billen, G.,Hecq,W. and Gypens,N. 2011. Cost
16 assessment and ecological effectiveness of nutrient reduction options for mitigating
17 *Phaeocystis* colony blooms in the Southern North Sea: an integrated modeling approach.
18 *STOTEN* 409 2179–2191
19

20
21 Lenhart, H.J., Mills, D.K., Baretta-Bekker, H., van Leeuwen, S.M., van der Molen, J.,Baretta,
22 J.W., Blaas, M., Desmit, X., Kühn, W., Lacroix, G., Los, H.J., Ménesguen, A.,
23 Neves, R., Proctor, R., Ruardij, P., Skogen, M.D., Vanhoutte-Brunier, A., Villars, M.T.,
24 Wakelin, S.L., 2010. Predicting the consequences of nutrient reduction on the
25 eutrophication status of the North Sea. *Journal of Marine Systems* 81 148–170.
26

27
28 Los, F.J., and Blaas, M., 2010. Complexity, accuracy and practical applicability of different
29 biogeochemical model versions. *Journal of Marine Systems* 81 44–74.
30

31
32 Mee, L.D., J. Friedrich. and M.T. Gomoiu. 2005. Restoring the Black Sea in times of
33 uncertainty. *Oceanography* 18 100-111
34

35
36 Mee, L.D., Jefferson, R.L., Laffoley, D.d'A., & Elliott, M. 2008. How good is good? Human
37 values and Europe's proposed Marine Strategy Directive. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, vol. 56,
38 no2, pp. 187-204.
39

40
41 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA). 2003. Ecosystems and human well-being: a
42 framework for assessment. Island Press, Washington, D.C., USA.
43

44
45 Moncheva, O. Gotsis-Skretas, K. Pagou, A. Krastev. 2001 Phytoplankton Blooms in Black
46 Sea and Mediterranean Coastal Ecosystems Subjected to Anthropogenic Eutrophication:
47 Similarities and Differences, *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 53 3 281-295,
48

49
50 Nunneri, C., Winhorst, W., Turner, R.K. and Lenhart, H. 2007. Nutrient reduction scenarios
51 in the North Sea: An abatement cost and ecosystem integrity analysis. *Ecological Indicators*.
52 7 776-792
53

54
55 O'Higgins, T. G., Ferraro, S.P., Dantin, D.D., Jordan S.J. and Chintala, M. 2010. Habitat
56 Scale Mapping of Fisheries Ecosystem Service Values in Estuaries. *Ecology and Society* 15
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 O'Higgins, T. & E. Roth . 2011 Integrating the Common Fisheries Policy and the Marine
2 Strategy for the Baltic. Discussion of Spatial and Temporal Scales in the management and
3 adaptation to Climate Change. In Climate Change and Baltic Coasts G Schernewski ed,
4 Springer Verlag, 2011

5 OSPAR, 2008. Second Integrated Report on the Eutrophication Status of the OSPAR
6 Maritime Area. ISBN 978-1-906840-13-6

7
8
9 Pättsch, J. Lorkowski, I. Kühn, W., Moll, A. and Serna, A. 2010. 150 years of ecosystem
10 evolution in the North Sea-from pristine conditions to acidification. Geophysical Research
11 Abstracts. 12

12
13
14 Pendleton, L., Atiyah, P. and Moorthy, A.. 2007. Is the non-market literature adequate to
15 support coastal and marine management? *Ocean and Coastal Management* 50:363–378.

16
17
18 Philippart, C.J.M., Beukema, J.J., and Cadée, G.C., Dekker, R., Goedhart, P.W., Iperen van,
19 J.M., Leopold, M.F. and Herman, P.M.J. 2007 Impacts of nutrient reduction on coastal
20 communities. *Ecosystems*, 10, 96-119.

21
22
23
24
25 Raheem, N., Colt, S., E. Fleishman, J. Talberth, P. Swedeen, K.J. Boyle, M. Rudd, R.D.
26 Lopez, D. Crocker, D. Bohan, T. O'Higgins C. Willer and R.M. Boumans 2012.
27 Application of non-market valuation to California's coastal policy decisions. *Marine Policy*
28 *36 1166-1171*.

29
30
31 Riegman, R., Colijn, F., Malschaert, J.F.P. Kloosteruis, H.T. and Cadée. 1990. Assessment of
32 growth rate limiting nutrients in the north seab by Use of Nutrient Uptake Kinetics.
33 *Netherlands Journal of Sea Research*. 26 53-60

34
35
36 Rijnsdorp, A.D., Van Keeken, O.A, and Bolle, L.J. 2004. Changes in the productivity of the
37 southeastern North Sea as reflected in the growth of plaice and sole. *International Council*
38 *for the Exploration of the Sea* 2004(K:13). ICES

39
40
41 Rockström, J., W. Steffen, K. Noone, Å. Persson, F.S. Chapin, III, E.F. Lambin, T.M.
42 Lenton, M. Scheffer, C. Folke, H.J. Schellnhuber, B. Nykvist, C.A. de Wit, T. Hughes, S. van
43 der Leeuw, H. Rodhe, S. Sörlin, P.K. Snyder, R. Costanza, U. Svedin, M. Falkenmark, L.
44 Karlberg, R.W. Corell, V.J. Fabry, J. Hansen, B. Walker, D. Liverman, K. Richardson, P.
45 Crutzen, and J.A. Foley, 2009: A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature*, 461, 472-475,
46 doi:10.1038/461472a.

47
48
49 Rosenberg, R. 1985. Eutrophication-The future marine coastal nuisance. *Marine Pollution*
50 *Bulletin* 16 227-231

51
52
53 Savchuk, O.P. 2005. Resolving the Baltic Sea into seven subbasins: N and P budgets for 1991-1999.
54 *Journal of Marine Systems*. 56 1-15.

55
56 Sagoff, M. 1995. Carrying capacity and ecological economics. *BioScience* 45 610-620

57
58 Sagoff, M. 2009. The economic value of ecosystem services. *Biosciences* 59 461

59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Saunders. J., Tinch, R. and Hull, S. (2010) Valuing the Marine Estate and UK Seas: An
2 Ecosystem Services Framework, The Crown Estate, London.

3
4 Schaafsma, M. Brouwer, R. and Rose, J. 2012. Directional heterogeneity in WTP models for
5 environmental valuation. *Ecological Economics* 79 21-31
6

7 Skogen, M. D., Soiland, H. & Svendsen, E. 2004. Effects of changing nutrient loads to the
8 North Sea. *Journal of Marine Systems* 46 23-38.
9

10 Tallis, H., Levin, S.P., Ruckelshaus, M., Lester, S.E., McLeod, K.L. Fluharty, DD.L. &
11 Halpern B.S. 2010. The many faces of ecosystem-based management: Making the process
12 work in real places. *Marine Policy* 34 340-348
13
14

15 Tett, P. Sandberg, A. nad Mette, A. 2011. Sustaining Coastal Zone Systems. Dunedin
16 Academic Press. pp 173.
17

18 Van Es, F.B., Ruardij, P., 1982. The use of a model to assess factors affecting the oxygen
19 balance in the water of the Dollard. *Netherlands Journal of Sea Research* 15, 313–330.
20
21

22 Van Beusekom, J.E.E., 2005. A historic perspective on Wadden Sea eutrophication.
23 *Helgoland Marine Research* 59, 45–54.
24

25 Vermaat, J. E., McQuatters-Gollop, A., Eleveld, M. A., and Gilbert, A. J 2008: Past, present
26 and future nutrient loads of the North Sea: Causes and consequences, *Estuarine Coastal Shelf*
27 *Sciences* 80 53–59
28
29
30

31 Zalasiewicz, M.W. Smith, A. Barry, T.L., Coe, A.L., Brown, P.R., Brechley, P., Cantrill, D.,
32 Gale, A., Gibbard, P., Gregory, F.J., Hounslow, M.W., Kerr, A.C., Pearson, P., Knox, R.,
33 Powell, J., Waters, C., Marshall, J., oAtes, M., Rawson, P., and Stone, P. 2008. Are we now
34 living in the Anthropocene. *GSA Toady* 18 4-8
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1: Comparison of MSFD eutrophication criteria and relevant WFD biological and physico-chemical quality elements.

MSFD Criteria	WFD Biological/ Physico- chemical quality	OSPAR qualitative assessment parameters
5.1 Nutrient levels		Category I the causative factors:
5.1.1 Nutrient concentration in the water column	Nutrient concentrations	the degree of nutrient enrichment with regard to inorganic/organic nitrogen· with regard to inorganic/organic phosphorus· with regard to silicate
5.1.2 Nutrient ratios (silica, nitrogen and phosphorus), where appropriate		
5.2 Direct effects of nutrient enrichment		Category II. the direct effects of nutrient enrichment:
5.2.1 Chlorophyll concentration in the water column	Phytoplankton biomass	i.phytoplankton:· increased biomass (e.g. chlorophyll a, organic carbon and cell numbers)· increased frequency and duration of blooms · increased annual primary production
5.2.2 Water transparency regulated to increase is suspended algae where relevant	Transparency	ii. macrophytes, including macroalgae: • increased biomass • shifts in species composition (from long-lived species to short-lived species, some of which are nuisance species) • reduced depth distribution
5.2.3 Abundance of opportunistic macroalgae	Composition of macroalgal taxa	iii. microphytobenthos:
5.2.4 Shift in floristic composition such as diatom to flagellate ratio, benthic to pelagic shifts as well as blooms events of nuisance/toxic algal blooms (eg cyanobacteria) caused by human activities	Composition and abundance of phytoplankton, frequency and intensity of blooms	
5.3 Indirect effects of nutrient enrichment		Category III. the indirect effects of nutrient enrichment
5.3.1 Abundance of perennial seaweeds and seagrasses (e.g. fucoids, eelgrass and Neptune grass) adversely impacted by decreasing in water transparency	Taxonomic composition of angiosperms	i.organic carbon/organic matter· increased dissolved/particulate organic carbon concentrations· occurrence of foam and/or slime· increased concentration of organic carbon in sediments (due to increased sedimentation rate)
5.3.2 Dissolved oxygen i.e, changes due to increased organic matter decomposition and size of the area concerned	oxygen balance	ii.oxygen:· decreased concentrations and saturation percentage· increased frequency of low oxygen concentrations· increased consumption rate· occurrence of anoxic zones at the sediment surface (“black spots”) iii.zoobenthos and fish:· mortalities resulting from low oxygen concentrations iv.benthic community structure:· changes in abundance· changes in species composition· changes in biomass v.ecosystem structure: structural changes

Table 2: Main North Sea commercial fisheries species, mean annual value of the fishery (€) by ICES areas. The main species for each ICES area is shown in bold.

	IIIa	IVa	IVb	IVc	Ivd	Ive
Atlantic mackerel - <i>Scomber scombrus</i>	1,389,589	223,320,585	556,142	262,678	3,755,673	528,518
Common sole - <i>Solea solea</i>	5,721,067	25,250	41,423,724	92,093,281	48,188,891	8,233,441
Norway lobster - <i>Nephrops norvegicus</i>	40,385,307	81,828,438	47,678,312	108,066	13,618	133,980
Atlantic herring - <i>Clupea harengus</i>	14,675,505	70,566,486	20,295,766	1,544,725	13,603,157	145,161
Common shrimp - <i>Crangon crangon</i>	0	0	78,327,811	35,953,541	1,965,966	38,448
European plaice - <i>Pleuronectes platessa</i>	13,827,645	1,802,201	58,627,940	20,614,196	5,478,884	1,495,263
Saithe(=Pollock) - <i>Pollachius virens</i>	6,079,398	77,779,738	2,852,495	18,454	29,870	5,885
Great Atlantic scallop - <i>Pecten maximus</i>	0	6,842,393	6,415,514	158,918	30,267,833	35,466,835

Table 3: Value of coastal recreation in the North Sea based on Willingness to Pay values from the meta-analysis of Ghermandi et al. (2011), visitor and resident data from Eurostat.

Country	WTP (€2010)	Visitors (m)	Residents (m)	Value(€2010)
Belgium	148.09	2.42	1.16	503,560,394
Denmark	152.20	3.14	5.55	1,187,332,591
France	169.09	15.94	12.46	4,465,107,012
Germany	106.29	4.59	7.66	1,172,198,257
Netherlands	148.34	11.69	8.29	2,768,214,035
Norway	206.42	2.51	3.29	1,087,641,657
Sweden	110.01	8.45	3.26	1,231,203,483
UK	175.49	44.56	21.09	10,930,801,361
Total		44.56	62.77	23,346,058,791

Figure_1

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 1: Map of the North Sea showing chlorophyll growing season mean annual chlorophyll (2008) derived from MERIS using the case 2 algorithm. Areas which have experienced oxygen deficiency (OSPAR, 1992); OSPAR potential problem and problem areas; national EEZs and urban areas.

Figure_2

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 2: The DPSWR framework indicating social (blue) and ecological (green) elements of the system and the link between changes in environmental state and human welfare through ecosystem services.

Figure_3

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 3: Conceptual diagram of eutrophication (after Ferreira et al., 2012) within the DPSWR framework, indicating social and ecological elements of the system. The numbered symbols indicate the MSFD criteria for eutrophication as see table 1.


Figure_4

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure_5

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure_6

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

