

Water Data flows: Quality – Structure – purpose

Reports from the breakout sessions

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



Thematic focus: water quantity

- Rapporteur: George Karavokiros
- Chair: Peter Frantar
- Participants: Piotr Piorkowski (PL), Anna Mikolajezyk (PL), Rozana Bimeri (AL), Szabina Pelyne (HG), Milorad Jovicic (RS), Esena Kupusovic (B&H), Rudy Vannevel (BE), Rasmus Kaspersson (SE), Manuela Pfeiffer (DE), Charles Demetriou (CY), Peter Frantar (SI), Juergen Foerster (EUROSTAT), Agnieszka Romanowicz (EEA), Beate Werber (EEA), Jacques Delsalle (DG), George Karavokiros (ETC/ICM)



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

Statements:

- Not always clear for what is the purpose/use of WQ data. This makes the data provision and processing at national level more difficult
- Smaller reporting burden may encourage MS to better reporting behavior



Statements (cont.):

- Communication and coordination of data collection and reporting at national level is often not good enough (e.g. Balkan countries, Belgium)
- Complex institutional framework for data collection/analysis
- Responsibilities are in some countries unclear
- In contrast, good examples: DK, CY

Open questions

- Can the GRDC data be used?
(EEA is currently negotiating with GRDC)



Recommendations

Towards national bodies

- Establish better coordination and communication lines between national agencies
- Identify data sources
- Build national cross domain databases

Towards EU bodies

- Help in establishing methodologies at national level
- The 2nd cycle of the WFD should focus more on water quantity
- Maybe one dataflow for WQ is a better solution



Session 2: Data quality and aggregation

Statements:

- The right scale of aggregation depends on the data use
- Reporting data in the lowest possible scale is preferable
- Long time series are needed to observe long term trends
- INSPIRE may provide a basis for a sustainable monitoring and reporting
- Significant differences between parameter values reported to different dataflows have been observed



Open questions

- How disaggregated data are used by EEA (methodologies, models)?
- To what extent do countries apply validation tools?
- Is it possible that different validation thresholds apply to different countries (water quality)?



Recommendations

Towards national bodies

- Maintain monitoring stations for long periods of time
- Data should be INSPIRE compliant
- Improve the communication between agencies within the countries



Session 3: WISE reporting process

Statements:

- Established standards should be used
- INSPIRE is able to support dynamic information throughout the lifespan of geographical objects
- Different levels of developments towards data integration under a WIS. Some countries (DE, AT) are progressing well, but:
- A legal basis is needed for reporting
- Changes in requirements discourage MS to move towards automatic tools and services



Open questions

- Which technical requirements are needed in order to comply with a decentralized reporting system?
(MS should be get involved in the drafting group for the new WFD)

Recommendations

- The data dictionaries should track changes
- MS should inform the EEA if changes in GIS reference datasets are significant



AOB

