





FIGURE 5.2 Geographical distribution of status and temporal trends in contamination from cadmium, mercury, lead, PAHs and PCBs in biota (fish and shellfish) and sediments based on the OSPAR Coordinated Environmental Monitoring Programme. Status is indicated for the last year of monitoring in the period 2003–2007. Higher concentrations of heavy metals in biota around Iceland are due to natural factors. Geographic coverage of the assessment is limited, especially for sediments, as a result of lack of data reporting or the design of national monitoring programmes accounting for local conditions. No OSPAR monitoring data have been reported for Region V. Data coverage and assessment methodologies are explained in detail in the assessment reports ‘Trends and Concentrations in Marine Sediments and Biota’.

Spatial data are classified according to **assessment criteria** developed by OSPAR and ICES as follows:

- Status is unacceptable: concentrations are at levels such that there is an unacceptable risk of chronic effects occurring in marine species, including the most sensitive species (PAHs and PCBs in biota; PAHs, PCBs, and metals in sediment), or are greater than EU dietary limits for fish or shellfish but the extent of risks of pollution effects is uncertain (metals in biota).
- Status is uncertain: concentrations of metals in biota are lower than EU dietary limits for fish and shellfish and above background but the extent of risks of pollution effects is uncertain.
- Status is acceptable: concentrations of contaminants are at levels where it can be assumed that little or no risks are posed to the environment and its living resources at the population or community level.
- Status is acceptable: concentrations are near background for naturally occurring substances (cadmium, mercury, lead, PAHs) or close to zero for man-made substances (PCBs), i.e. the ultimate aim of the OSPAR Strategy for Hazardous Substances has been achieved.

Results of trend analysis of time series with data for five years or more in the period 1998–2007 are shown in the tables in each map. These present the percentage of ‘downward trends’ (↓), ‘no trends’ (↔) and ‘upward trends’ (↑) in assessed time series. ‘No trends’ means that trend analysis did not detect a statistically significant trend over time. ‘No trend data’ means that available time series were not sufficient for trend analysis.

- No trend data
- 0–20%
- 20–40%
- 40–60%
- 60–80%
- 80–100%