

Water Data flows: Quality – Structure – purpose

Reports from the breakout sessions

**2013 Freshwater Eionet Workshop
19/20 September 2013, Copenhagen**



Thematic focus: water quality and nutrients

- Rapporteur: Lidija Globevnik and Kari Austnes
- Chair: Jan-Hendrik Voet
- Participants: Deborah Bamford (UK), Laurence Lacouture (FR), Matias Gustafsson (SE), Gabriela Vinze (AT), Rikke Bjerring (DK), Peter Webster (IE), Merita Mehmeti (XK), Snježana Dominković Alavanja (HR); Jan Hendrik Voet (BE), Andrea Majovska (SK), ETC, EEA



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

Statements:

- Streamlining between institutions within the same country is important
- The benefit of annual data is to do trend analysis (but the trends are not necessarily linear)
- Changes in the reporting happen too often (should especially avoid re-changing recent changes)
- Too many different and difficult reporting streams



Open questions

- What is really meant by streamlining?
- Countries report only selected monitoring data to SoE – do the assessments then tell the true story? (stations should be representative geographically and across pressure gradients)



Recommendations

- More clear rules for reporting would help institutions within countries to cooperate (especially important for countries that have started reporting recently)
- EEA should use/get the information on what stations are used for
- Streamlining of directives reporting cycles (legal issue)
- The countries should be informed/involved in assessments at an earlier stage (outline, data analysis approaches etc) – could also assist in clarifications



Session 2: Data quality and aggregation

Statements:

- Monitoring and reporting has declined due to reduced or relocated (to WFD) resources – or sometimes the problem does not exist anymore
- Long time series are useful
- Countries are willing to report national threshold values for groundwater



Open questions

- What is the added value of linking SoE and WFD data?
- What is the most relevant spatial aggregation level? Aggregate on catchment level? Which size?
- Are old data with old methodology (high detection limits) comparable to newer data?
- Can reporting of disaggregated data lead to biased assessments?



Recommendations

- Countries should inform the EEA about changes in stations that represent the same location/environmental conditions – can be regarded as one times series (new field in data dictionary). If available for new stations, historical data should be reported
- Split time series in two periods to include more stations. The later, shorter time series are also more interesting for the effect of recent measures
- Info should be supplied to know which water body the SoE stations lie within (geographically) (add the EUSurfaceWaterBodyCode as it is in the WFD reporting to the the WaterBodyID field in the SoE reporting)



Recommendations

- Make the information on the system of data workflow and assessment more visible (who does what etc)
- FAQ page? Webinar on technical issues?
- Publish only aggregated data, but make disaggregated data available in Eionet for country review (hazardous substances)



Session 3: WISE reporting process

Statements:

- One multipurpose database is not feasible in the near future
- Data should be relevant also from a policy perspective
- Implementation of a WISE decentralised system depends on how far the INSPIRE implementation has come in the countries
- Most countries have GIS portals for downloading spatial data as lines/polygons



Open questions

- How to report changes in spatial information on water bodies and other objects?

Recommendations

- The EEA should inform the WISE technical group about INSPIRE development
- The WISE technical group should develop WISE data models in compliance with INSPIRE
- EEA/ETC to do a scoping study on the availability of GIS and other environmental data in the countries



AOB

