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| CONTRACT: | Development of tools and services for the Water Information System Europe (WISE) and the Structured Information and Implementation Framework (SIIF)  070201/2014/689488/ENV.C.1 |  | |
| VENUE: | **EEA, Copenhaguen** | **DATE: 12-13 / 11 / 2015** | |
| DETAILS: | **Objective**:  Provide a forum to clarify and address questions on the IT  aspects and contents of the 2016 reporting of the Water  Framework Directive River Basin Management Plans.  **Target audience:**  MS experts directly involved in WFD reporting, both from the IT  and the content point of view. Members of the WG DIS group  and of the WISE Technical Group are welcome.  **Format:**  Plenary meeting with short introductory presentations and  Q&A/discussion.  **Workshop documents:**   * Agenda and presentations:   <http://forum.eionet.europa.eu/x_wise-reporting/library/water-framework-directive-library/2015.11.12-water-framework-directive-reporting-workshop/>  - WFD reporting resources: <http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/help/WFD/WFD_521_2016> |  |  |
| PARTICIPANTS: | Thomas Rosmann (AT)  Gabriele Vincze (AT)  Elise Beke (BE)  Katrien Bursens (BE)  Nicolas Fermin (BE)  Tomáš Fojtík (CZ)  Silvie Semeradova (CZ)  Mahdi Ghofrani (DE)  Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)  Kenneth Ibsen (DK)  Rain Elken (EE)  Lasse Järvenpää (FI)  Cécile Gözler (FR)  Elsa Ouvrard (FR)  George Melekis (GR)  Spyridon Neokosmidis (GR)  Konstantinos Papaspyropoulos (GR)  Sandra Šturlan Popović (HR)  Luka Vukmanic (HR)  Maria Szomolanyi Ritvayne (HU)  Tunde Toth (HU)  Francesca Piva (IT)  Gediminas Dudenas (LT)  Marina Cicendajeva (LV)  Marloes Schiereck (NL)  Dag Rosland (NO)  Lars Stalsberg (NO)  Piotr Piorkowski (PL)  Mihail Costache (RO)  Ramona Curelea (RO)  Ioana Nedelea (RO)  Dragos Ungureanu (RO)  Mans Denward (SE)  Niklas Holmgren (SE)  Jakob Nisell (SE)  Katarina Vartia (SE)  Ylva Westman (SE)  Maja Kregar (SI)  Tanja Mohorko (SI)  Martin Panak (SK)  Timothy Doran (UK)  Duncan Taylor (UK)  Mikel Santamaría (Bilbomática)  Alberto Telletxea (Bilbomática)  Olaf Büttner (ETC/ICM)  Enrique Soriano (Guadaltel)  Marisa Ruiz (Guadaltel)  Fernanda Néry (EEA)  Joaquim Capitāo (DG ENV)  Jorge Rodríguez-Romero (DG ENV) | | |

# Agenda

**Session 1 –** Overview of the reporting process

**Session 2** – Reporting of documents: RBMP, PoMs and background documents

**Session 3.a –** Reporting at national level of spatial data

**Session 3.b –** Reporting exercise on national spatial data: RBDs and SubUnits

**Session 4.a** – Reporting at national level of RBDSUCA

**Session 4.b** – Reporting exercise on national RBDSUCA

**Session 5.a –** Reporting at RBD level of structured data

**Session 5.b –** Reporting exercise on RBD data: SWB and GWB

**Session 6 –** Questions and AOB.

| **#** | **Item**  **Discussed** | **Minutes Item** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Session 1 Access to the environment to upload the data | The reporting environment is not still ready, so the development link is not available.  Anyway a sandbox area for MS will be prepared and will be made available to the MS to test their data. |
| 2. | Session 1 ANNEX 0. Deadline to provide Annex 0 | Deadline to provide Annex 0 is explained in Annex VI.  MS must provide Annex 0 one month in advance to the reporting date in order to be checked by the EC. |
| 3. | Session 1 ANNEX 0. Scope of the gaps reported in Annex 0 | Gaps reported in Annex 0 are referred only to the data reported by MS in the XML schemas.  It is clarified that:  - Non spatial information gaps can be reported in Annex 0  - Spatial information is not included in Annex 0 so no gaps are allowed  - Documentation deliveries are not included in Annex 0 |
| 4. | Session 1 Annex 0. Reporting process of Annex 0 | A summary of the reporting process of Annex 0 is made for the MS:  - MS send Annex 0 in advance at least one month earlier than the reporting.  - EC revises Annex 0 and notifies officially the MS about the acceptance of the provided Annex 0.  - MS upload and test the information with the QA/QC until all the remaining blockers are only related with Annex 0.  - MS release the envelope with blockers (only blockers coming from Annex 0).  - EC revises the submission against information provided in Annex 0 and, if appropriate, the submission is accepted. |
| 5. | Session 2 Links related with the reported information | When documents are provided through links (instead of as uploaded files), MS need to guarantee that the links will remain valid for at least 6 years. |
| 6. | Session 2 National coordinators clarification | National Reporting Coordinators will need to be confirmed/appointed by MS. They are then responsible for communicating the data of individual data reports to [wfd.helpdesk@eionet.europa.eu](mailto:wfd.helpdesk@eionet.europa.eu)  National Coordinators will keep the same username and password |
| 7. | Session 3.a Changes in geometry | Some changes do not affect the identity of a previously reported object, but create a new version of an existing object. This is the case, for example, if the location of a monitoring site can be reported with better accuracy than previously reported or if the delineation of a water body has changed only because a new survey is available with better geometric accuracy.  If an update is provided for the geometry of a previously reported object, then:   * The wiseEvolutionType element must have the value 'change'; * The beginLifespanVersion element must be filled with a valid DateTime; * The versionId element needs to be updated with regard to the value in the original version of the object.   If the update does not create a new version of an existing object (i.e. missing information available that was not previously reported) the wiseEvolutionType element must have the value 'noChange'.  For further information it is advised to consult the GIS Guidance |
| 8. | Session 3.a Deletion of a geometry | MS are not required to report objects which have been deleted.  However, if an object was deleted, MS may report it with the element wiseEvolutionType set to ‘deletion’. This is to avoid problems of interpretation of missing information and possible confusion between objects which were intentionally deleted and others which may have been omitted by mistake.  In any case, the code of a deleted object must never be re-used for a new object. |
| 9. | Session 3.a Two lines crossing in the real world | It is stated that in some cases in the real world, two SWB geometries can cross each other, which leads to failure in validation  EC asked about examples in which two lines cross without intersection to give an answer to this issue. |
| 10. | Session 3.a  Monitoring sites positional accuracy | Monitoring Sites are digitalised in a higher resolution than the associated WB, so they may fail some QC constraints related to their position or distance to the associated water body.  The QC checks based on topological or distance constraints will raise warnings (not blockers). MS must explain the resolution or scale of the digitalisation in the metadata information. |
| 11. | Session 3.a  Mismatches between 2010 and 2016 codes | In the 1st RBMP reporting cycle, a structure was set for the identifiers.  This specification changed in the current reporting. The reason for this change is that each identifier will be associated with a stable URL in the WISE system.  To avoid errors in the syntax of the identifiers and mismatches between descriptive data and spatial data reported, a source of vocabularies for all elements reported in 2010 will be available as soon as possible.  For further information it is advised to consult the GIS Guidance. |
| 12. | Session 3.a  GroundwaterBodyHorizon | The GroundwaterBodyHorizon data set is not mandatory. It has to be reported only when the Groundwater Body has multiple horizons. If all groundwater bodies have only one horizon, then only the GroundwaterBody data set is required. |
| 13. | Session 3.a SurfaceWaterBodyCentreline mandatory | SurfaceWaterBodyCentreline has to be reported. |
| 14. | Session 3.b Validation environment | Validations may be run in advance in the sandbox area for each country |
| 15. | Session 3.b Reporting order of XML and GML | Spatial information in GML format must be reported before the XML submission. The spatial data sets contain the identifiers of all the monitoring sites, SWB, GWB, SU and RBDs. These identifiers need to be known, in order for the remaining information to be validated. |
| 16. | Session 4.a Reporting Protected Areas | Protected Areas that are reported properly under other Directives do not need to be reported under the WFD. In other cases, they have to be reported.  In particular, it is not necessary to report the spatial data for Protected Areas reported under the Habitats Directive or the Birds Directive, since that information can be obtained via Natura2000 with sufficient reliability. |
| 17. | Session 4.a Run QA/QC for a data subset | QA/QC for a subset of data can be run in the sandbox area.  However, MS must be aware that, in these cases, some of the validations from the QA/QC won't pass due to the fact that they are related with the whole country. |
| 18. | Session 4.a Elements hierarchy | It is necessary to follow the order of the element hierarchy in the development of the data in the Access database, to ensure that no inconsistences in the relationships are created |
| 19. | Session 4.b Access database | Access database is confirmed to be stable in the current version 6.0.2, so it can be used by MS as a stable and consolidated version. Any justified changes or error corrections will be listed in detail so changes between versions can be easily tracked by MS. |
| 20. | Session 4.b Character encoding | Some characters from different languages produce encoding errors. It is a known issue that will be solved in next versions |
| 21. | Session 4.b Territorial waters | Territorial waters have to be reported (geometry and chemical status) in the WFD2016 reporting exercise. |
| 22. | Session 5.a Lists of parameters | The lists of parameters can be found in the Common table and in the links to the vocabularies for each dataset.  Vocabularies can be exported by MS to other formats if needed  Lists of parameters will be available in the vocabularies and will be published in the data dictionary.  It was asked how to obtain the lists and how to export them in Excel format. Some approaches were discussed:  - Data dictionary, once the more complex lists will be published, they can be obtained and imported into Excel format - Open an XML file with Excel and, as it has a flat schema, there will be no problem - Export from Access database to Excel format by copying-pasting the tables into Excel sheets |
| 23. | Session 5.a Union lists | Some enumeration lists are empty in the model. It was clarified that these missing lists are union lists and they are produced by merging smaller lists |
| 24. | Session 5.a | For GWB Article 4(7) for chemicalExemptionType is missing. It will be discussed bilaterally if it will be included in a future version |
| 25. | Session 5.a GWB extended through different RBDs | Each GWB has to be associated to an RBD in a way that makes sense from the point of view of water management, although geographically it may extend beyond the borders of that RBD |
| 26. | Session 5a RBDs without GWB | Not all RBDs will have associated GWBs. For these cases, an empty XML will be provided to formally pass QA/QC processes |
| 27. | Session 5.a Insertion order in Excel file | The order of the tables to be filled in the Excel file provided is not properly sorted, so it will be corrected |
| 28. | Session 5.a Monitoring sites not associated with reported WB | It was stated there are monitoring sites associated to WB that are not reported. In these cases, there is no point in reporting the monitoring sites either |
| 29. | Session 5.a Monitoring sites associated to different WB | There are groups of monitoring sites associated to different waterbody categories, for example, evaluating lakes and rivers. In that case, the reporting should reflect the use/purpose of the monitoring station instead of the physical location, so the monitoring site can be reported twice, e.g. once for lakes and once for rivers, as if they were different entities and with different identifiers associated |
| 30. | Session 5.a Monitoring territorial waters | The monitoring program for the territorial waters can be reported.  As for the previous question, monitoring sites used for coastal and territorial waters have to be reported twice: once for each category and with different codes. |
| 31. | Session 5.a Program of measures | When the indicators provided might not be adequate (e.g. for wastewaters from single households in the countryside) additional indicators (otherIndicators) may be used. |
| 32. | Session 5.a Reporting of pressures at SubUnit level | When subunits were defined, the reporting of pressures must be done at subunit level as that was the purpose of defining them. |
| 33. | Session 5.b Typing error detected in common | A typing error for geologicalFormation (Aquifire) will be corrected in future versions |
| 34. | Session 5.b Short dash | Short dash must be used instead of long dash in the data files. |
| 35. | Session 5.b Tools to work with XML | Advice was requested on tools to deal with XML and its integrity. There is a wide range of tools in the market. Some examples were given: xmlspy, notepad++, sublime, eclipse... |
| 36. | Session 5.b Blocking errors | It was asked whether all errors are classified as blocking or if there are also non-blocking errors.  It was made clear that all the QA/QC rules are blocking errors. If the blocking errors are exclusively related to a previously accepted annex 0, reporting will still be possible.  The process to report was summarised as:  - prepare annex 0 and send it in advance for acceptance  - check until all the errors are exclusively related to the annex 0 that was previously accepted  - release the envelope  - the error report will be checked  - if the reported information is compliant with QA/QC rules and annex 0, the report will be accepted |
| 37. | Session 5.b SWB delineation | Regarding SurfaceWaterBody related data sets (SurfaceWaterBody, SurfaceWaterBodyLine, SurfaceWaterBodyCentreline):   * If the reference geometry of the surface water body is a polygon, then the surface water body must be reported in the SurfaceWaterBody data set. * If the reference geometry of the surface water body is linear, then the surface water body must be reported in the SurfaceWaterBodyLine data set. * SurfaceWaterBodyLine and SurfaceWaterBody cannot overlap each other. * To guarantee a connected network a representation of the centrelines of surface water bodies is requested. This hydrographic network must be reported in the SurfaceWaterBodyCentreline data set. |
| 38. | Session 5.b Information available | Information regarding the QA/QC processes and the XQUERY to implement the validations will be available to the MS. |
| 39. | Session 5.b Update List of Pollutants | Lists of River Basin Specific Pollutants and/or additional pollutants and indicators of pollution will be updated. Changes will be communicated in detail. |
| 40. | Session 5.b Key Type of Measure | It was requested to add more indicators for key types of measures (IndicatorKTM\_Enum). This should be done instead by selecting the ‘KO99 – Other indicator’ option from the enumeration list to report details of additional quantitative indicators of the KTMs developed by the Member State in the relevant schema elements. |
| 41. | Session 6  File naming convention | It was requested to incorporate the RBD code in the file naming convention so the reported files can be easily tracked outside the folder where they are placed. Unfortunately, it is too late now to make this change. |