

Heavily Modified Water Bodies

Common Implementation Strategy Workshop
12 - 13 March 2009, Brussels

Working Group III

Agriculture & Flood Defence

Rapporteurs:

Rene Reisner, EE, Rebecca Fitton, Kiri Walker, UK

Chair:

Ursula Schmedtje, EC



Federal Ministry for the
Environment, Nature Conservation
and Nuclear Safety



SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE

defra

Department for Environment
Food and Rural Affairs



**eco
logic**

Key issues on HMWB designation

- Several MS reduce the amount of WB designated as HMWB compared to Art 5 assessment, some increase
- Reason for changes is new/better information and new criteria (2 phased process → first general criteria than more specific)
- However, designation is not finalised in many MS (less obvious, certain pressures, availability of monitoring data)
- Agricultural sector pushed for HMWB designation initially, because not fully understanding the concept.
- For the designation some MS developed criteria and thresholds of modification.

Key issues on HMWB designation

- For the definition of “significant adverse effects” in some MS criteria have been developed, but only a few thresholds are used (e.g. loss in agricultural production, increased risk of flooding)
- Generic criteria on EU-level might be useful, but the local approach is important
- “Better environmental options” are only limited available for agri. & flooding. → An issue to be further discussed on the RB level (e.g. Moving locations)

Key issues on GEP definition

- Some MS are still working on the classification.
- Most MS use a combined approach (Prague, CIS). Spain CIS only.
- Some MS are working on the def. of reference condition for HMWB.
- No linkage to Inter-calibration exercise on reservoirs
- No comparison between both approaches to define GEP available. → Do we get the same results?
- If the link between biology and the modification is not fully understood there are uncertainties on selecting mitigation measures

Key issues on GEP definition

- Prague approach can be insufficient if the link between biology and effect of the measure is not fully understood.
- Evidence based selection of mitigation measures are crucial, re-evaluate the evidence in the 2nd cycle.
- MS use less classes for HMWB classification (2-4).
- Involving stakeholder in the classification is an ongoing process but communication is difficult.
- The selection of mitigation measures to define GEP under the Prague approach should follow a transparent approach (e.g. Cat. Of Measures) in order to allow stakeholder participation.

Key issues on objective setting & measures

- The objective setting process is an prioritised approach considering ecological improvements, budget constraints, stakeholder/sectors opinions.
- MS provide different level of detail on the measures in the dRMBP:
 - Generic measures with limited details
 - Detailed measures with no quantification
 - Detailed measures with quantification and detailed costs

Key issues on objective setting & measures

- Most MS agreed to use extended deadlines instead of less stringent objectives in the first cycle.
- Generic measures could be useful as a starting point for defining ecologically effective measures.
- It is important to outline the process how the measures will be defined in the first place and implemented on order to:
 - Generate better understanding among the stakeholders
 - Show how they will be affected.