



NFP SEIS meeting

Doc: EEA/NFP (2007) 04-1

Item: 5.1

15 November 2007

Source: CCA 1

Subject: Summary of the NFPs/Eionet comments to the document: "Activities in 2007- 2008 with Eionet towards SEIS Implementation Plan."

For information

- The document summarizes the outcomes of the NFPs/Eionet consultation on the document "Activities in 2007-2008 with Eionet towards SEIS Implementation Plan." The consultation was organized from 26 October – 9 November 2007.

1. Background

The document "Activities in 2007-2008 with Eionet towards SEIS Implementation Plan" was shared with the NFP group on 26 October. The deadline for comments was 9 November 2007. The NFPs were asked to comment on the document and indicate which projects they would like to contribute to.

Before the deadline EEA received comments from **12 countries** (Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, The Netherlands, Norway and Sweden). A summary of the comments on the document in general and on specific projects is provided in section 3 and 4.

Moreover, several other countries expressed their interest in participating in the implementation of projects as defined in SEIS IP during and after the NFP/Eionet meeting in October. The consolidated table indicating countries' interests is attached in Annex 1.

Annex 2 lists the full, non-edited answers from countries.

2. Next steps

The document has been submitted (as an annex to AMP 2008) to the Management Board for approval at their meeting on 21 November 2007. Provided that the document is approved respective EEA project managers will be asked to incorporate any further comments on their projects and finalize the project documents by mid-December. This would make it possible to embed projects fully into the AMP 2008 and to record the necessary details in the Eionet Planner in order to start full implementation as of January 2008.

3. General comments

Most of the NFPs appreciated the improvements made since the last NFP meeting in October. Concrete comments/suggestions on content and the structure of SEIS IP projects are listed below:

Content

- NRCs need better and more detailed specification of projects in order to be able to get involved;
- The draft does not identify activities in the pilot/planning phase. There is no description of the input required from those countries which will volunteer to participate in the pilot/planning phase.
- Two important purposes of SEIS should be further developed (Section 1):
 - Better availability and quality of the information used for the implementation of community policies. This relates to having a common data policy regulating the accessing and sharing of data and information within SEIS.
 - To reduce the administrative burden for MS

- In table 1, the IP projects are at present categorised according to three main foci. It is tempting to argue that there is still another focus involved. This one could be termed 'Business process'. To us (Norway), IP project 16 (Water assessments – Nitrate), which is now categorised as a content focus project, might perhaps be considered to be as much a business process reengineering project. Perhaps the most important aspect of this project in the short term relates to the impact it may have on the way we (the EEA and Eionet) work together rather than on the longer-term benefits which we also, admittedly, expect will be significant in terms of better quality outputs. Indeed, in our opinion, this project typifies a very important aspect and potential of the SEIS concept which we time and again have underlined in previous interventions.
- The title could be shortened for increased clarity: SEIS activities plan 2007-2008 with EIONET
- If it is going to adopt the SEIS Implementation Plan as an annex to the Annual Work Programme 2008 it should be reasonable to change the period for the implementation plan from `2007 – 2008` to `2008 and beyond` .

Workload

- Several projects (3, 4, 5, and 15) would involve to a greater or lesser extent the NRC for State of Environmental Reporting (SoER) with a combined estimated resource requirement of 7 – 11 weeks (!) from EIONET / Member States. Germany's capacity for involvement in these projects will have to be carefully assessed. Perhaps there is a need for another back-to-back NFP / NRC SoER meeting in (early) 2008 to approach these projects and kick-off the work on the SOER 2010 in one block.
- We (Norway) find the EEA/EIONET SEIS IP 2008 to be a collection of activities each of which poised to contribute a pragmatic small step on the road to the realisation of SEIS, but all of which taken together constituting a bundle that could be a bit too ambitious unless the amount of internal staff resources designated by the EEA is adequate.

Go4 cooperation

- The document would benefit from information about how this SEIS IP is connected to work in the Group of 4. The table on page 62 column "other" is a start. EEA should consider the need for a joint Group of 4 "SEIS IP". The exercise of producing such a plan might help conceptualize INSPIRE-SEIS-GMES, etc. linkages.

Link to SoER 2010

- Norway appreciated very much the linkage of the IP to the development of the SOER2010 report. However, time is moving fast and it will be a challenge to pull everything together by the time the 2010 report is to be published. An appropriate capacity for coordination is definitely required.

Link to EEA Signals

- As much as we like the idea of developing a new concept for the annual Signals publication, it may not be the best of ideas to push too hard ahead on this with a view to publishing a first report in line with the new concept in 2008 already. Also, we question the interest among the normal target audience for Signals in a SEIS performance analysis, given that what is meant by this is an analysis of country performance in contributing to the evolution of SEIS.
- SEIS is not primarily connected to SOER 2010. The two processes gain by being developed separately.

4. Comments to specific projects

This section contains original comments from NFPs to specific projects.

Project 1 – Country performance improvements priority data flows

- Country performance improvements priority data flows
The EEA should consider rewording the “operational objective” as follows: “to reach 100% reporting performance on the priority data flows for all countries in a system compliant to existing legal specifications and guidelines and SEIS” (or something like this). This wording would leave an opening for INSPIRE considering its implementation in the countries by 2020 would be advanced. INSPIRE may gain direct relevance for the priority data flows.
- In 2006, Eionet provided 62 % of the total amount of data to EEA as part of the annual priority dataflow. Since 2000, this performance increased from 45 % to 62 %; nevertheless the current reporting system still does not provide access to approximately 1/3 of the data. We also know that in a distributed system accessibility might be as important as reporting.’ - **Comment:** Are this % really referring to amount of data or to the overall scoring. The scoring refers to my understanding to a mixture of data, metadata, timeliness and possibly other criteria.
- Input needed from EIONET/MS: Data’ **Comment:** Same as above: Data or Data, Metadata, Timeliness, Quality, ...
- Links/Connections to other projects: **Comment:** Missing are certainly links to 2, 3 and perhaps other projects related to data flow
- Norway will not participate in its implementation as they believe that they have already identified the main culprits nationally and believe that our most appropriate contribution would be to address these.

Project 2 – Reportnet enhancement

- Links/Connections to other projects: **Comment:** Also link to 3 (IMS) and 4 (SERIS e.g. for first bullet point task descriptions)

Project 3 – Developing a common information base for indicators (IMS+ & CSI)

- It is a bit unclear what is meant by the operational objective of project 3. Does this mean that IMS+ will provide an information base and indicator management system regarding the indicator definitions or will IMS+ provide the actual indicator assessments as well? And, are we talking about a centralised or a distributed,

decentralised system in this instance? The relationship between project 15 and 3 needs to be clarified.

- Background (last sentence) 'How to best expand this system in a step-wise systematic way to include other indicator sets being used by EEA and Eionet, also at country level, maintaining and improving quality and making them available for the SOER 2010 and Signals reports?' **Comment:** replace by 'to include or link to', 'to include' gives impression that national indicators would become fully part of IMS. Same remark in operational objective.
- Task descriptions: 1) - the suitability for incorporating CSI in the member countries; **Comment:** Why should CSI be 'incorporated' in MS? CSI is a Set of indicators for the International level. MS should decide for themselves which indicators are relevant.
- Task descriptions: 2) - The EEA will make a feasibility study on the links between Reportnet and the IMS. **Comment:** IMS is already part of REPORTNET, at least from the organisational perspective. What has to be done is to make links between the technical & IT-aspects of IMS and the rest of the REPORTNET tools.
- The projects still need to be further developed/detailed.

Project 4 – SERIS upgrade (v 2.0)

- Are we talking about a SERIS site containing URLs linking to national web-sites or a site importing relevant national web-site information to provide, by itself, actual content? It's important that the ambition regarding SERIS is clarified in the project description. The relationship between project 15 and 4 needs to be clarified.
- Background: 'National state of the environment reports are currently held and disseminated by the EEA (SERIS)14'. **Comment:** 'Information about National state of the environment ... ' EEA is not disseminating national reports as such.
- The project still needs to be detailed.

Project 5 – Land-Water-Biodiversity

- We (Germany) would find work in this project useful but are not able to actively contribute at this stage.

Project 6 – Ozone web extension

- Germany has been and would like to continue its involvement in this project.

Projects 7, 9 – GHG emissions and projections (7) and GHG data service (9)

- NFPs are interested in how these projects are connected to the ongoing update of the EU greenhouse gas monitoring system.

Project 10 – WISE data service

- Norway will not implement the project as an EEA Agreement signatory state, Norway is not subject to the Bathing Water Directive. As such they do not have in place the mechanism required regarding monitoring etc. which they assume will be

central to, and a prerequisite for, a productive contribution to this project.

Project 11 - Air quality data service

- We (Germany) welcome the EEA's plan to provide a platform for data delivery and would hope also however that country constraint are taken into consideration. By way of example, the data exchange module has been problematic to work with in Germany as the sheer amount of their data seems to overload the DEM's scope. We also welcome tools for quality assurance but would encourage the project to focus first on ensuring a comfortable technical transfer of data before the facultative services. We would like to support this project within our capacities.
- Links/Connections to other projects: **Comment:** clear link to Project 1

Project 14 – SEIS – INSPIRE – GMES

- The EEA should consider involving the NRCs Spatial Analysis and Land Cover, many who were introduced to SEIS at the GMES Land User Meeting (23 – 24 October 2007). They should be consulted regarding work on a potential Commission communication on GMES.
- The project could very well take onboard and include also objectives and goals from the "old" project 14. Merge old and new project 14.
- Operational objective: Identify ways of exploiting emerging new systems to promote the data flows required to meet priority needs. **Comment:** not very clear and elaborated description of the operational objective
- EIONET ... involved: NRC Communication. **Comment:** NRCs on Communication do not have a role in this project. Monitoring and Geographical experts do.
- The project still needs more details.

Project 15 - EEA/EIONET Signals

- General Comment: Most of our (Belgian) interest goes towards an information product containing information like the traditional Signals.
- The project still needs more details.

5. Annex 1

Country's indications for involvement to projects defined in the document Activities in 2007-2008 with Eionet towards SEIS Implementation Plan

Based on the consultation of the 2nd draft of the document

Project	1 Country performance improvement priority data flows	2 Report net Enhancements	3 Developing a common information base for indicators (IMS+ & CSI)	4 - SERIS upgrade	5 Land- water- biodiversity integrated assessment	6 Ozone web extension	7 Indicators and assessment greenhouse gas emission pilot	8 Land cover data service	9 Greenhouse gases data service	10 WISE data service	11 Air quality data service	12 Effectiveness of waste policies related to the landfill and other waste directives	13 SEIS country visits	14 SEIS data policy /Link SESI INSPIRE GEMS	15 SEIS communication	16 Water assessments
Country																
Albania													1			
Austria	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	
Belgium		1	1	1		1					1	1		1		1
Bosnia - Herzegovina																
Bulgaria				1	1			1				1				
Croatia								1			1	1				
Cyprus																
Czech Republic		1			1									1	1	
Denmark					1	1		1		1						
Estonia																
Finland			1			1	1		1		1			1		
France			1	1	0.5					1			1			1
Germany						1				1	1			1	1	
Greece																
Hungary								1		1				1		

Project	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Iceland				1	1								1			
Ireland				0.5	1			1								
Italy		1			1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1			
Latvia						1	1		1		1	1		1		
Liechtenstein																
Lithuania			1	1				1			1		1			
Luxembourg	1	1	1	1		1	1		1				1	1	1	
FYR Macedonia																
Malta													1			
Monaco																
Montenegro																
The Netherlands	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	
Norway		1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1
Poland																
Portugal								1					1			
Romania		1	1			1	1				1	1		1		
Serbia								1		1	1		1			
Slovakia													1			
Slovenia																
Spain																
Sweden	1	1				1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		
Switzerland																
Turkey						1		1	1	1		1	1			
UK		1		1									1	1		
Total	4	9	9	10.5	9	13	8	14	9	9.5	13	10	16	12	6	3
<i>1 – Country is planning to participate in implementation</i>					<i>0.5 - country is considering to participate</i>					<i>empty cell - country will not participate</i>						

6. Annex 2

Full response from the countries

Belgium

General: the specific interest of Belgium for some of the projects can be confirmed.

1. Country performance improvements priority data flows

Background:

'In 2006, Eionet provided 62 % of the total amount of data to EEA as part of the annual priority dataflow. Since 2000, this performance increased from 45 % to 62 %; nevertheless the current reporting system still does not provide access to approximately 1/3 of the data. We also know that in a distributed system accessibility might be as important as reporting.'

Input needed from EIONET/MS:

'Data'

Comment: Same as above: Data or Data, Metadata, Timeliness, Quality, ...

Links/Connections to other projects:

Comment: Missing are certainly links to 2, 3 and perhaps other projects related to data flow

2. Reportnet enhancements

Links/Connections to other projects:

Comment: Also link to 3 (IMS) and 4 (SERIS e.g. for first bullet point task descriptions)

3. Developing a common information base for indicators (IMS+ & CSI)

Background (last sentence)

'How to best expand this system in a step-wise systematic way to include other indicator sets being used by EEA and Eionet, also at country level, maintaining and improving quality and making them available for the SOER 2010 and Signals reports?'

Comment: replace by 'to include or link to', 'to include' gives impression that national indicators would become fully part of IMS. Same remark in operational objective.

Task descriptions:

1) - the suitability for incorporating CSI in the member countries;

Comment: Why should CSI be 'incorporated' in MS? CSI is a Set of indicators for the International level. MS should decide for themselves which indicators are relevant.

Task descriptions:

2) - The EEA will make a feasibility study on the links between Reportnet and the IMS.

Comment: IMS is already part of REPORTNET, at least from the organisational perspective. What has to be done is to make links between the technical & IT-aspects of IMS and the rest of the REPORTNET tools.

4. SERIS upgrade

Background:

'National state of the environment reports are currently held and disseminated by the EEA (SERIS)14'.

Comment: 'Information about National state of the environment ... ' EEA is not disseminating national reports as such.

11. Air quality Data Service

Links/Connections to other projects:

Comment: clear link to Project 1

14. Interlinkages SEIS INSPIRE GMES

Operational objective:

Identify ways of exploiting emerging new systems to promote the data flows required to meet priority needs.

Comment: not very clear and elaborated description of the operational objective

EIONET ... involved:

NRC Communication

Comment: NRCs on Communication do not have a role in this project. Monitoring and Geographical experts do.

15.EEA/EIONET Signals

General Comment: Most of our interest goes towards an information product containing information like the traditional Signals.

Bulgaria

Pls. be aware that Bulgaria would like to take part in the following projects under the SEIS IP 2007-2008:

- 4. SERIS upgrade (V2.0)
 - 5. Land-water-biodiversity integrated assessment
 - 8. Land cover data service
 - 12. Effectiveness of waste policies related to the landfill and other waste directives
-

Czech Republic

With reference to your email "Activities in 2007-2008 with Eionet towards SEIS Implementation Plan", we would like to indicate that the Czech Republic is interested to contribute to the following projects (excluding the ones already mentioned in the document). Some NRCs indicated interest in participation, but they would need better and more detailed specification of the projects. We hope that they will be able to join the project when the projects will be better described. In case you have a question or need some complement, please do not hesitate to contact me.

	NFP	NRC
2. Reportnet enhancements	x	
14. Interlinkages SEIS INSPIRE GMES	x	x
15. EEA SEIS Signals		x

Finland

Please find below the Finnish reply on the draft document "Activities in 2007-2008 with EIONET towards SEIS Implementation Plan 2007-2008". The reply is compiled by the NFP Finland on the basis of the comments from experts.

COMMENTS

In general the draft document gives a good overview of the planned projects with reasonable level of detail; i.a. the objectives, tasks, deliverables as well as the required input regarding the implementation of the projects are described well. However, the draft does not identify the activities in the pilot/planning phase. There is, for example, no description

of the input required from those countries which will volunteer to participate in the pilot/planning phase.

Finland has no detailed comments on the draft.

INDICATIONS OF CONTRIBUTIONS

As stated above, the draft does not explain what is expected from the countries contributing to the pilot/planning phase. Therefore the indications of contributions from Finland are only preliminary.

Depending on the final definition of the tasks to be performed, Finland may contribute to the pilot/planning phase of the following projects:

- 3. Developing a common information base for indicators
- 6. Ozone web extension
- 7. Indicators and assessments GHG emissions pilot
- 9. GHG data service
- 11. Air quality data service
- 14. Interlinkages SEIS INSPIRE GMES

In addition, it could be mentioned that we are interested in hearing how the projects 7 and 9 are connected to the ongoing update of the EU greenhouse gas monitoring system.

France

After discussing with our Eionet France partners we selected any projects from the SEIS Implementation plan in which we would like to participate. We prefer to concentrate our efforts on the water related projects and the indicators and reporting projects as well (our next national reporting will be in 2010):

Please consider (referring to the Oct. 26th document) France will be engaged in the projects n° 16, 10, (5), 4 and 3. Project 5 is not a very high priority project for the Ifen's direction but, we have a special engagement of the ONEMA (Water Management Public Office).

We are now looking for other possible partners able to sign for any other projects (like project 7 Indicators and assessments GHG emissions pilot or 6 Ozone project) I saw that France was no long in list of the "SEIS country visits". I had a short meeting with J. MacGlade and Ronan on Oct. the 3rd we decide to postpone the visit in January or February 2008, because of the re-organization of the Ministry in charge of the environment in France. Please add France to the list.

Germany

Comments on the draft "Activities in 2007-2008 with EIONET towards SEIS Implementation Plan 2007-2008" (SEIS IP)

These comments are provided by various experts from the Federal Environment Agency (*Umweltbundesamt*) and German Nature Conservation Agency (Bundesamt für Naturschutz).

Additional comments may also follow at the 49th MB meeting because the SEIS IP was distributed for consultation in BMU and to the *Länder* with feedback expected in the 46th calendar week.

General comments:

- The document is a good piece of work and way forward that uniformly defines the slew of quick-win projects to be developed. The document should periodically be updated because it could also serve as a handy reference document and tool to benchmark progress.
- Section 3 more clearly places SEIS in context with key policy initiatives improving the document over the first draft.
- The document would benefit from information about how this SEIS IP is connected to work in the Group of 4. The table on page 62 column "other" is a start. EEA should consider the need for a joint Group of 4 "SEIS IP". The exercise of producing such a plan might help conceptualize INSPIRE-SEIS-GMES, etc. linkages.
- Many of the newer projects (3, 4, 14 and 15) still need detail. We would welcome additional information as it becomes available.
- The projects 10 and 11 both mention as benefits the streamlining of data flows though "streamlining" is not marked for these projects in the table on page 9. "Content" or "access" may be the main focus of these projects however the entire plan is somewhat compromised considering there are only three of sixteen projects focussing on streamlining. The SEIS objective to streamline reporting requirements should not be lost in the technological modernisation of reporting. It would be informative for NFPs to be updated perhaps at the next NFP/EIONET meeting about the specific developments toward updating of the standardised reporting directive.
- Several projects (3, 4, 5, and 15) would involve to a greater or lesser extent the NRC for State of Environmental Reporting (SoER) with a combined estimated resource requirement of 7 – 11 weeks (!) from EIONET / member states. Germany's capacity for involvement in these projects will have to be carefully assessed. Eric Debrabenter's mail from 17 October also refers to the heightened importance of the NRC SoER in 2008 – 9 (section "3c" of Eric's mail). Perhaps there is a need for another back-to-back NFP / NRC SoER meeting in (early) 2008 to approach these projects and kick-off the work on the SOER 2010 in one block.

Specific comments:

Project 1 – Country performance improvements priority data flows

The EEA should consider rewording the "operational objective" as follows: "to reach 100% reporting performance on the priority data flows for all countries in a system compliant to existing legal specifications and guidelines and SEIS" (or something like this). This wording would leave an opening for INSPIRE considering its implementation in the countries by

2020 would be advanced. INSPIRE may gain direct relevance for the priority data flows.

Project 5 – Land-Water-Biodiversity

We would find work in this project useful but are not able to actively contribute at this stage.

Project 6 – Ozone web extension

Germany has been and would like to continue its involvement in this project.

Project 10 – WISE data service

We would like to participate in this project. Dr. Regine Szewzyk, from the Federal Environment Agency (UBA), Head of Section Microbiology and Parasitology, will be the responsible contact person:

Regine.Szewzyk@uba.de.

Project 11 - Air quality data service

We welcome the EEA's plan to provide a platform for data delivery and would hope also however that country constraints are taken into consideration. By way of example, the data exchange module has been problematic to work with in Germany as the sheer amount of our data seems to overload the DEM's scope. We also welcome tools for quality assurance but would encourage the project to focus first on ensuring a comfortable technical transfer of data before the facultative services. We would like to support this project within our capacities.

Project 14 – SEIS – INSPIRE – GMES

The EEA should consider involving the NRCs Spatial Analysis and Land Cover, many who were introduced to SEIS at the GMES Land User Meeting (23 – 24 October 2007). They should be consulted regarding work on a potential Commission communication on GMES.

Iceland

I do not have any comments to the proposal. I have discussed it with the Iceland NRCs and the conclusion is that we will do our best to contribute to the projects we are listed on in the plan proposal.

Ireland

I can confirm the Irish NFP will have a formal involvement in a number of the proposed SEIS projects as outlined in the revised SEIS implementation plan. These are as follows:

1. Project 5: Land-water-Biodiversity Integrated Assessment
2. Project 8: Land cover data service

depending on the availability of internal resource availability we will also contribute to Project 4: "SERIS upgrade", insofar as it is possible.

As regards the content of the implementation plan - I have no further comments or observations to make.

Latvia

Due to the fact that, unfortunately, I will not participate in the NFP meeting on SEIS on 19 November let me express satisfaction of the draft of SEIS Implementation Plan. Just small remark – if it is going to adopt SEIS Implementation Plan as annex of Annual Work Programme 2008 it should be reasonable to change the time of implementation plan from `2007 – 2008` to `2008 and beyond`.

As I informed earlier our experts are concerned to participate in the following projects:

6. Ozone web extension
7. Indicators and assessments of GHG emissions (it is missing in the draft)
9. GHG data service
11. Air quality data service
12. Effectiveness of waste policies and
14. SEIS – INSPIRE – GMES

Looking forward to successful SEIS implementation

Lithuania

Lithuania has no special comments to SEIS Implementation Plan.

We confirm our participation in these projects:

- "Developing a common information base for indicators" (project No.3);
- "SERIS upgrade" (project No.4);
- "Land cover data service" (project No.8);
- "Air quality data service" (project No.11);
- "SEIS country visits" (project No.13); Also we would like to ask to delete Lithuania from project "Effectiveness of waste policies" (project No.12).

Additional, please be notified that April, 2008 is the most expedient month for the SEIS country visit to Lithuania.

Norway

Referring to your invitation for comments to, and for expression of interest in participating in, the projects described in the draft EEA/Eionet SEIS IP 2008, please find below the respons of Norwegian Eionet institutions compiled and summarised by the Norwegian NFP:

1. Overall comments

We find the EEA/EIONET SEIS IP 2008 to be a collection of activities each of which poised to contribute a pragmatic small step on the road to the realisation of SEIS, but all of which taken together constituting a bundle that could be a bit too ambitious unless the amount of internal staff resources designated by the EEA is adequate.

We appreciate very much the linkage of the IP to the development of the SOER2010 report. This may help to assimilate the outputs of the efforts invested and the progress made in terms of new content, streamlining, better access to data and information and new ways of working together into actual and lasting gains. However, time runs fast and it will be a challenge to pull everything together by the time the 2010 report is to be published. An appropriate capacity for coordination is definitely called for.

As much as we like the idea of developing a new concept for the annual Signals publication, it may not be the best of ideas to push too hard ahead on this with a view of publishing a first report in line with the new concept in 2008 already. Also, we question the interest among the normal target audience of Signals in a SEIS performance analysis given that what is meant by this is an analysis of country performance in contributing to the evolution of SEIS.

In table 1, the IP projects are at present categorised according to three main foci. It is tempting to argue that there is still another focus involved. This one could be termed 'Business process'. To us, IP project 16 (Water assessments – Nitrate), which is now categorised as a content focus project, might perhaps be considered to be as much a business process reengineering project. To us, perhaps the most important aspect of this project in the short term relates to the impact it may have on the way we (the EEA and Eionet) are working together rather than on the longer run benefits which we also, admittedly, expect will be significant in terms of better quality outputs. Indeed, in our opinion, this project typifies a very important aspect and potential of the SEIS concept which we time and again have underlined in previous interventions.

2. More specific comments

Moving on to still more project specific comments and questions, it is a bit unclear to us what is meant by the operational objective of project 3. Does this mean that IMS+ will provide an information base and indicator management system regarding the indicator definitions or will IMS+ provide the actual indicator assessments as well? And, are we talking about a centralised or a distributed, decentralised system in this instance?

As for project 4, are we talking about a SERIS site containing URLs linking to national web-sites or a site importing relevant national web-site information to provide, by itself, actual content? It's important that the ambition regarding SERIS is clarified in the project description.

Lastly, the relationship between, on the one hand, project 15 and, on the other hand, projects 3 and 4 needs to be clarified.

We appreciate, of course, the difficulty in detailing the projects in all respects up head so some of the clarifications have to be left for the project phase to be dealt with. However, this does not make the need for an overall philosophy about the contribution of the individual projects to the overall design of SEIS less important.

3. Intentions regarding participation

Given final approval, as part of relevant administrative planning processes for 2008, Norwegian Eionet institutions already stand ready to participate in projects 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 15.

Projects 5, 12 and 16 are still under consideration. A preliminary verdict regarding the participation in these is expected to be ready early next week.

As of now, our preliminary conclusion is that we will not participate in projects 1 and 10.

As for project 1, we believe that we have already identified the main culprits nationally and believe that our most appropriate contribution would be to address these.

As for project 10, Norway, as an EEA Agreement signatory state, is not subject to the Bathing Water Directive. As such we do not have in place the mechanisms required regarding monitoring etc. which we assume will be central to, and a prerequisite for, a productive contribution to this project.

Sweden

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to add comments on your second draft of the SEIS activities plan.

A few comments:

- 1) The title could be shortened for increased clarity: SEIS activities plan 2007-2008 with EIONET
- 2) Sweden will in addition participate also in projects 7,8 and 9.
- 3) The SEIS is not primarily connected to SOER 2010. The two processes gain by being developed separately.
- 4) Two important purposes of SEIS should be further developed (section1):

- Better availability and quality on information that is used for the implementation of community policies. This implies to have a common data policy regulating the accessing and sharing data and information within SEIS.
 - To reduce the administrative burden for MS
- 5) The "new" project 14 could very well take onboard and include also objectives and goals from the "old" project 14. Merge old and new project 14.
-