Developing an efficient and sustainable way forward on the Eionet water data flows: Review of water data flows and data handling processes

Reports from the breakout sessions

2014 Freshwater Eionet Workshop 26-27 June 2014, Copenhagen

Group: [blue]

- Rapporteur: Sandra Richter, ETC
- Chair: Andrea Májovská, SK
- Participants: Slovakia, Austria, France, Iceland, Albania, Cyprus, Bosnia+Herzegovina, Kosovo, Sweden, Poland, Romania, Ireland, Bulgaria, Belgium, Croatia, Greece, UK, Germany

Link in between WFD and SoE data in assessments

Most important indicators

- Different indicators on national and European level, on European level more general indicators;
- Indicators are depending on type of product, report;
- To produce indicators on national level national databases are used, consisting of all monitoring stations (surveillance and operational), whereas SoE stations are subset of WFD stations;
- Water scarcity and drought: no problem e.g. in Austria, so no data availability – can lead to misinterpretation.

Recommendations:

 Provide problem oriented overviews on the European level; consider "country specific" issues



Link in between WFD and SoE data in assessments

Added value of SoE data

- Central data repository: SoE data should be used for sharing of data with e.g. COM, GEMS, international organizations/commissions;
- SoE data are of supplementary or complementary use; not much overlappings with WFD; but more detailed level of SoE is added value;
- WFD data sometimes are no "real" data, but expert judgement for water body; SoE = monitoring station level; but WFD covers "whole area of waterbody" with assessment.

Difficulties:

- Misinterpreting of SoE data possible without sufficient knowledge on methodologies; on "reason for monitoring"
- "Start with list of products" data may not be available; start with data – "maybe not used for assessments"



Link in between WFD and SoE data in assessments

Added value of SoE data:

Recommendations:

- To avoid misinterpretation of data, information on use of data and on products is important; dialogue between data provider and EEA/ETC;
- List of products should be defined, but also availability of data is important – start from both sides. If e.g. data on hydromorphology are not available, no product on hydromorphological state is possible);
- List of relevant parameters depending on product and on legally binding parameters (haz sub).
- Provide a common list of parameters.

Technical link in between WFD and SoE data

Linking of SoE stations with WFD water bodies

Recommendations:

- Provide EEA the information in which WFD water body the station is located;
- Idea: check this with country fiches: list of stations, information can be added;
- Reference list with all monitoring stations and codes for waterbody and information if station is used for surveillance or operational monitoring;
- Overview list of stations which are currently not linked with WFD would be helpful for countries to provide information.

Session 1:

Technical link in between WFD and SoE data

Report of monitoring stations

SoE is a subset of WFD monitoring stations (in lots of countries);

Difficulties:

- Operational stations: selection of stations could change due to possibility given WFD monitoring during 6 years period – no stable data set;
- Could improve representativity of stations, but needs correct interpretation;
- Enormous number of stations (operational stations) no stable data set, changes in time series,..;
- But EEA interest: more stable stations with time series; linkage between eco stat / chem stat - high number of stations would be of interest



Session 1:

Technical link in between WFD and SoE data

Report of monitoring stations

Recommendations:

- In general operational stations could be reported depending on criteria in SoE guidance and on use of data, but: Clear communication of use and methodology is necessary.
- Clear set of criteria in guidance which monitoring stations should be reported.



Good examples of QA/QC procedures in national WFD/SoE databases

- QA/QC very important step to provide good data;
- Tool to clean the data = country fact sheets; countries welcome this
- Slovakia: laboratory, data check, preparation of data according to DD using the validation rules, QA/QC in data repository
- Trend analyses tool (example Belgium) additional possibility
 criteria should be used by EEA/ETC
- One unified codelist (European level) would be beneficial;
- In CDR should be option to comment on outlier check

Country fiches:

- Could include data products; such as time series for self check;
- Instructions from EEA/ETC are needed how to correct, redeliver data; further follow up; letter together with CFS;
- How do countries see that data are corrected (after providing information requested in the country fact sheets)?
 Update of country fact sheets;
- In the future CDR: tools to give feedback (e.g. graphics) immediately after update.

Country fiches: time table

- Country fact sheets to be provided as soon as possible; (not later than October);
- Time table/schedules soon to be agreed; that countries are prepared, can organize process;
- Set short deadline after sending out country fact sheets for countries to give feedback if and when they could provide changes (one to two month);
- Further follow up like resubmission into CDR letter together with country fact sheets;
- "Next data request" in 2015: most countries didn`t have problem with new deadline; but some prefer to start 1. of August.

different issues:

Hazardous substances:

- Countries agree that disaggregated data are published; UK + SK have to check
- "Past and future" SoE data

Security of coordinates:

- Example France, drinking water stations would like to report two different data sets – one publication, one internal use
- Best way: report data in a way they can be published, no need for precise data at EEA;
- EEA use what has been reported; if something needs to be changed
 countries should inform EEA

SoE guidance needs updating for new data products,

