Water Data flows:
Quality – Structure – purpose

Reports from the breakout sessions

2013 Freshwater Eionet Workshop
19/20 September 2013, Copenhagen

Thematic focus: Biological elements

- Rapporteur: Jannicke Moe,
  Anne Lyche Solheim (ETC-ICM / NIVA)
- Chair: Hege Sangolt (NO)
- Participants:
  - Session 1: UK(NI), PT, SE, IS, NL, DE, BG, ME, TK, PL, LT, LV,
  - Session 2-3: + DK, EC-JRC

Session 1: Use of the data, integration and DPSIR assessment

Statements:

SoE biology vs. WFD reporting:

- ☺ Same person often responsible for both reportings
- ☺ SoE & WFD Data often stored in same database
- ☹ Reporting to WFD + SoE in different formats requires much additional work
- ☹ Most MS report only a subset of WFD stations to SoE
  - ☺ But some MS now report all WFD stations to SoE (PL, ...)

Open questions

- Should SoE reporting include both operational and surveillance monitoring?
- How can data providers get an overview of what they have reported in previous years?

Recommendations

- Build confidence: Data providers want to know what happens with their data
  - maps, assessments
- Reduce burden of reporting for MS caused by data formatting

Session 2: Data quality and aggregation

Statements - quantity & representativity:

- Some countries have no biological monitoring (yet)
- Monitoring frequency: Some stations every year, most stations every 3 or 6 years
- Assessment (national): extrapolation of results for 3 years
- Older biology data (<25 years) available, but reporting is too costly
- WFD has caused changes in monitoring and therefore broken time series of SoE stations

Session 2: Data quality and aggregation

Statements - quality :

- Difficult for ETC to check quality of reported EQR values
- Some countries have biology data, but cannot calculate EQR values (lacking WFD-compliant classification system)
- "Additional biology data" (Chl-a, cyanobacteria) are reported by many MS

Open questions

- Non-matching station codes (within SoE): different codes or different locations?
- How often should biology data be reported, if most stations are sampled every 3/6 years?
- Number of samples: exclude records with <3 samples from assessment?

Recommendations

- Station codes: for assessment by ETC, data should be combined at waterbody level. Should be checked by MS.
- EQR: To simplify reporting, MS can calculate and report only normalised EQR values instead of (national) EQR values and the classifications system

Session 3: WISE reporting process

Statements:

- pdf version of the different DD are inconvenient to use

- Reporting in 2 different formats requires much additional work
  - Changing DD format causes much extra work
  - Data deliveries from different regions / states, coordinated nationally (DE, PL)

- Decentralised reporting system will not necessarily simplify the reporting for MS

Open questions

- DD: can changes be highlighted more clearly?
- Can code lists be integrated in excel templates?
- HazSub: Use code instead of parameter names?

Recommendations

- DD: Provide worked example of correctly filled-in template

AOB

- ETC document on assessment of biology data (9 Sep 2013): shows potential use of reported biology data
- MS wish to give more comments in writing after the meeting