

# HMWB Workshop, 12-13 March 2009, Brussels

## Member State Questionnaire

### 1. Context

A workshop on Heavily Modified Water Bodies (HMWB) will be organised on 12-13 March 2009 in Brussels by Germany, UK and the European Commission in cooperation with the WFD CIS-ECOSTAT-group and the CIS-HYMO-activity.

The workshop aims to allow information exchange on the following topics:

- **Designation of HMWB:**  
Exchange of experiences on practical application of HMWB designation processes in Member States.
- **Establishing good ecological potential (GEP):**  
Exchange information on the practical application of both methods for deriving GEP (HMWB Guidance No 4 approach based on biological quality elements and the “Prague” approach based on mitigation measures – *see Annex*) and collect examples of results.  
Compare results of methods and discuss, if they are comparable and what are reasons of differences.
- **Objective setting and measures:**  
Collect and discuss experiences of Member States on objective setting for HMWB (including related issues like application of exemptions) and exchange information about planned mitigation measures.

A discussion document will be prepared for the workshop. In order to collect background information for the workshop discussion document, Member States are kindly asked to fill in the present questionnaire on water uses and parameters included in HMWB designation, methods for classification of HMWB and ways of objective setting for HMWB in Member States.

Please fill in one questionnaire per Member State and return to [elftheria.kampa@ecologic.eu](mailto:elftheria.kampa@ecologic.eu) at the latest by **16 January 2009**. Please do not hesitate to answer, even if you can only provide information on national RBD level.

### 2. General information

**Q2.1:** Name of Member State.

United Kingdom

Information relating to **England & Wales** is shown in Green

Information relating to **Scotland** is shown in Blue and

Information relating to **Northern Ireland** is shown in Red

**Q2.2:** Name and contact details of person to be contacted if any clarifications on the reply to this questionnaire are needed.

### 3. HMWB designation

**Note:** For each answer below rounded figures would be appropriate.

**Q3.1:** Please tell us about the proportion of each water category you have identified for designation as heavily modified by completing the two Tables below

N.B. Total numbers include all WBs i.e. HMWB, non-HMWB and AWB, including canals; 'Number to be designated' refers to HMWB only, not AWB.)

#### Number of HMWB (includes AWB)

| River (Note: Excludes canals, Surface Water Transfers and SSSI ditches) |                         | Lake   |                         | Transitional water                                 |                         | Coastal water                                      |                         |
|---|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Total number of water bodies (including non-HMWBs)                      | Number to be designated | Total number of water bodies (including non-HMWBs) | Number to be designated | Total number of water bodies (including non-HMWBs) | Number to be designated | Total number of water bodies (including non-HMWBs) | Number to be designated |
| 5764  | 1869                    | 736  | 370                     | 135  | 93                      | 98   | 55                      |
| 2388  | 297                     | 334  | 109                     | 50   | 7                       | 457  | 6                       |
| 576   | 52                      | 24   | 16                      |  |                         |  |                         |

#### Length and area of HMWB (includes AWB)

| River (Note: Excludes canals, Surface Water Transfers and SSSI ditches) |                                 | Lake  |  | Transitional water  |  | Coastal water   |  |
|---|---------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| Total length of water bodies (including non-HMWBs) (Km)                 | Length of to be designated (Km) | Total area of water bodies (including non-HMWBs) (Km <sup>2</sup> ) | Area to be designated (Km <sup>2</sup> ) | Total area of water bodies (including non-HMWBs) (Km <sup>2</sup> ) | Area to be designated (Km <sup>2</sup> ) | Total area of water bodies (including non-HMWBs) (Km <sup>2</sup> ) | Area to be designated (Km <sup>2</sup> ) |
| 55103   | 20665                           | 329   | 263                                      | 2681  | 2473                                     | 14455   | 8204                                     |
| 25,117  | 3068                            | 992   | 381                                      | 992   | 55                                       | 47,709  | 136                                      |
|   |                                 | 570   | 530                                      |   |  |   |  |

**Q3.2:** Please tell us about the water uses for which you have identified water bodies as heavily modified by completing the three Tables below

**Note.** If a water body has been designated for more than one use, please count each use.

| Water use [Art.4(3)(a)] | Number of water bodies |
|-------------------------|------------------------|
|-------------------------|------------------------|

|  |     |     |    |
|--|-----|-----|----|
| Wider environment<br>[Art.4(3)(a)(i)] *  | 271 | 53  | 8  |
| Navigation, including port<br>facilities, or recreation<br>[Art.4(3)(a)(ii)]   | 254 | 5   |    |
| - Navigation, including<br>port facilities   | 144 | 4   | 5  |
| - Recreation   | 110 | 3   |    |
| Activities for the purposes of<br>which water is stored<br>[Art.4(3)(a)(iii)] (Note: This<br>total includes where specified<br>water storage use was not<br>specified) | 635 | 334 |    |
| - Storage for drinking<br>water supply   | 111 | 108 | 31 |
| - Storage for power<br>generation  | 8   | 224 | 4  |
| - Storage for irrigation   | 39  | 0   |    |
| - Water Storage (Non-<br>specified)  | 516 | -   |    |

|   | Total | Total | Total | Urban land | Agricultural land |
|---|-------|-------|-------|------------|-------------------|
| Water regulation, flood protection, land drainage [Art.4(3)(a)(iv)] |       |       |       |            |                   |
| - Water regulation  | 43    | 0     |       | -          | -                 |
| - Flood protection  | 1088  | 25    | 24    | -          | -                 |
| - Land drainage   | 420   | 19    | 9     | -          | -                 |

δ) Please specify your definition of “wider environment”: ... The definition followed was based on the CIS guidance document no.4 (European Commission, 2003) considered the wider environment to include the natural environment and the human environment including archaeology, heritage, landscape and geomorphology.

When considering effects on the wider environment, this was taken to refer to water bodies that have an international or national conservation objective associated with them i.e. SAC, SPA, SSSI, NNR or areas designated for landscape or cultural heritage protection. Local conservation interests were also considered.

| Description of each ‘equally important sustainable human development activity’ for which HMWB are to be designated [Art.4(3)(a)(v)] | Number of water bodies |    |
|---|------------------------|----|
| Urbanisation  | 712                    |    |
| Coastal Protection  | 51                     |    |
| Marine Aggregate Extraction   | 0                      |    |
| Marine Shell/Fin Fisheries  | 37                     |    |
| Urban residential and commercial land use   |                        | 63 |

#### Multiple water uses of HMWB

| Number of water bodies designated for one use | Number of water bodies designated for two uses | Number of water bodies designated for three or more uses |
|---|--|--|
| 1611  | 526  | 241  |
| 365   | 48   | 0  |
| 50  | 18   |  |

Note: Reported numbers for River, Lake, Coastal, Transitional Water bodies. Excludes canals, Surface Water Transfers and SSSI ditches

**Q3.3: Please tell us about the criteria you used to decide if a water body was substantially changed in character for it to be considered for designation as heavily modified by completing the applicable Tables below**

| Did you use <u>impact-related criteria</u> (e.g. length or area expected to be worse than good status or substantially changed in | Did you use <u>pressure-related criteria</u> (e.g. volume of water stored; height of dam)? (yes/no) | Did you use <u>use-related criteria</u> (e.g. number of people provided with drinking water; protection against particular flood return period; daily number of vessels)? | Did you use <u>other types of criteria</u> ? (yes/no) |
|---|---|---|---|
|   |   |   |   |

|                                       |     |                 |                            |
|---------------------------------------|-----|-----------------|----------------------------|
| <b>hydromorphology)?<br/>(yes/no)</b> |     | <b>(yes/no)</b> |                            |
| NO                                    | YES | NO              | YES –<br>Expert<br>opinion |

If you used **impact-related criteria**, please complete the following Table

| <b>Water category</b> | <b>Description of impact-related criteria (e.g. length or area expected to be worse than good status)</b> |
|-----------------------|---|
| River                 | n.a.  |
| Lake                  | n.a.  |
| Transitional water    | n.a.  |
| Coastal water         | n.a.  |

If you used **pressure-related criteria**, please complete the following Table

Tables of the criteria used in Scotland to provisionally identify HMWBs are appended as an excerpt from a SNIFFER report (Scotland and Northern Ireland Forum for Environmental Research) on **Heavily Modified Water Bodies in Scotland - Identification of provisional HMWB** (October 2005). Provisional HMWBs were then fed through a screening tool for rapid assessment of whether:

(a) Making the hydromorphological improvements necessary to achieve good status would have a significant adverse effect on the wider environment or on a specified water use; and

(b) For reasons of technical feasibility or disproportionate cost, there is no significantly better environmental option to reasonably achieve the benefits provided by the modifications.

| <b>Pressure</b>                      | <b>Description of pressure-related criteria (e.g. volume of water stored; height of dam)?</b>  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Impoundment                          | The extent of modification within a water body was assessed in semi-quantitative manner as present, extensive, absent or unknown. For point modifications such as weirs, dams sluices and impoundments the number of modifications within the water body was used to determine whether the structures are present or extensive within the water body. If the feature was approximately $\leq 33\%$ of the total water body length/area then it is recorded as present, if the feature is approximately $\geq 33\%$ of the total water body length/area then it was recorded as extensive.  |
| Other hydromorphological alterations |  |
| - Rivers                             | The extent of modification within a water body was assessed in semi-quantitative manner as present, extensive, absent or unknown. For linear features such as embankments and reinforcement to banks the extent was measured as a percent of the water body length. If the feature was approximately $\leq 33\%$ of the total water body length/area then it is recorded as present, if the feature is approximately $\geq 33\%$ of the total water body length/area then it was recorded as extensive. In order to designate a pA/HMWB following pragmatic rule has been developed which if met allowed the water body to be designated. If a combination of any four or more of the modifications below were recorded as |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>extensive in the provisional heavily modified water body then the water body was designated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culverts</li> <li>• Weirs</li> <li>• Dams and Impoundments</li> <li>• Channel Realignment</li> <li>• Bed resectioned /deepened</li> <li>• Bed material removal</li> <li>• Bank reinforcement</li> <li>• Embankments</li> <li>• Flood defence structures</li> <li>• Buildings/Bridges/ Roads/Railways</li> <li>• Land Drainage</li> </ul>   |
| <p>- Lakes</p>               | <p>As above for Rivers</p>  |
| <p>- Transitional waters</p> | <p>The pressure related criteria for Transitional and Coastal waters (TraC) was based on the extent of hydromorphological modifications associated with a specified uses/pressures. The uses and associated hydromorphological modification considered in TraC waters A/HMWB designation were</p> <p><u>a)Flood Protection Use:</u></p> <p>The assessment was based on three separate elements relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The extent of reclaimed land protected by shoreline flood protection assets;</li> <li>▪ Barrages and barriers across the width of the main water body or forming a boundary with another water body which provide flood protection benefits; and</li> <li>▪ Sluices across the width of the main water body or forming a boundary with another water body which provide flood protection benefits.</li> </ul> <p><u>b) Navigation, Ports, Harbour Use :</u></p> <p>The key criteria that were used for the assessment are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The extent of navigation dredging in the water body – maintenance of navigable depth in previously deepened areas is critical to maintenance of the navigation use;</li> <li>▪ The extent and intensity of dredge material disposal in the water body – disposal of dredge material is critical to the maintenance of the navigation use; and</li> <li>▪ The extent of reclaimed areas behind quay lines – loss of quay line will directly affect specified use (unless there is significant long-term spare capacity).</li> </ul> |

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
|                  | <p><u>c) Coastal Protection Use:</u><br/>The key criteria that have been used for the assessment are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The extent of influence of manipulators of sediment transport on inshore waters within the water body; and</li> <li>▪ The extent of infrastructure development afforded protection by coast protection structures.</li> </ul> <p><u>d) Marine Aggregate extraction use:</u><br/>The key criteria that have been used for the assessment are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The extent of water body area licensed for marine aggregate extraction; and</li> <li>▪ The extent of water body area subject to active extraction or sediment disturbance in the past decade.</li> </ul> <p><u>e)Fin/Shellfisheries</u><br/>The criteria that have been used for the assessment are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The extent of shellfishing beds within designated shellfish waters within the water body.</li> <li>▪ The extent of fin fishing activities including Otter and Beam trawling known to cause significant seabed disturbance</li> </ul> |
| - Coastal waters | See above for Transitional waters   |

If you used **use-related criteria**, please complete the following Table

| <b>Water use</b>  | <b>Description of use-related criteria (e.g. number of people provided with drinking water; protection against particular flood return period; daily number of vessels)</b> |
|---|---|
| Wider environment [Art.4(3)(a)(i)]                                      | -   |
| Navigation, including port facilities, or recreation [Art.4(3)(a)(ii)]  | -   |
| - Navigation, including port facilities                                 | -   |
| - Recreation  | -   |
| Activities for the purposes of which water is stored [Art.4(3)(a)(iii)] | -   |
| - Storage for drinking water supply                                     | -   |
| - Storage for power generation  | -   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| - Storage for irrigation   | - |
| Water regulation, flood protection, land drainage [Art.4(3)(a)(iv)]        | - |
| - Water regulation   | - |
| - Flood protection   | - |
| - Land drainage  | - |
| Equally important sustainable human development activity' [Art.4(3)(a)(v)] | - |

If you used **other criteria**, please complete the following Table

|  |
|--|
| <b>Description of other criteria used to decide if water bodies are substantially changed in character to consider designation</b> |
|  |

**Q3.4: Please tell us about the criteria you used to decide if implementing a measure (e.g. a restoration measure to achieve good status or a mitigation measure aimed at improving the ecological potential of a water body) would have a significant adverse effect on use by completing the two Tables below**

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Have you developed specific criteria on significant adverse effects on use to help prepare the draft river basin management plans?</b> |           |
| <u>Yes</u>  | <u>No</u> |
|   | NO        |

| <b>Have you identified <u>pressure-specific criteria</u> to help screen out measures which would have a significant adverse effect on use (e.g. reducing abstraction by &gt; 50 %)? (yes/no)</b> | <b>Have you identified <u>measure-specific criteria</u> to help screen out measures which would have a significant adverse effect on use (e.g. dismantling major dams)? (yes/no)</b> | <b>Have you identified <u>use-specific numeric criteria</u> (e.g. % loss of energy generation) to help screen out measures which would have a significant adverse effect on use? (yes/no)</b> | <b>Have you identified <u>other types of criteria</u> to help decide what constitutes a significant adverse effect on use? (yes/no)</b> |
|--|--|---|---|
| NO   | NO   | NO  | NO – Expert Judgement was used  |

| <b>Water use</b>   | <b>Examples of the principal criteria you used to decide if a measure or combination of measures would have a significant adverse effect on use</b> |
|--|---|
| Wider environment [Art.4(3)(a)(i)]                                     | n.a   |
| Navigation, including port facilities, or recreation [Art.4(3)(a)(ii)] | n.a   |
| - Navigation, including port facilities                                | n.a   |
| - Recreation   | n.a   |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Activities for the purposes of which water is stored [Art.4(3)(a)(iii)]    | n.a |
| - Storage for drinking water supply  | n.a |
| - Storage for power generation   | n.a |
| - Storage for irrigation   | n.a |
| Water regulation, flood protection, land drainage [Art.4(3)(a)(iv)]        | n.a |
| - Water regulation   | n.a |
| - Flood protection   | n.a |
| - Land drainage  | n.a |
| Equally important sustainable human development activity' [Art.4(3)(a)(v)] | n.a |

**Q3.5: Please tell us about the other environmental options you considered to decide if the benefits of the use could be provided by a significantly better environmental option [Art. 4(3)(b)] by completing the Table below**

| Water use   | Other environmental options considered   |
|---|--|
| Wider environment [Art.4(3)(a)(i)]                                      | If the conservation interest(s) made up a significant part of the water body, then it was considered there was no significantly better environmental option for achieving an international or national conservation objective other than by maintaining the modified hydromorphological characteristics on which the conservation interests depend.  |
| Navigation, including port facilities, or recreation [Art.4(3)(a)(ii)]  |  |
| - Navigation, including port facilities                                 | Displacement of the specified use to another water body or replacement of the existing specified use with a better alternative.<br>The availability of an alternative port/harbour nearby with spare capacity was considered if the transfer of functions would not cause deterioration in status or prevent achievement of good status in another water body. (Other options for the transport of goods and passengers by rail, road or air were not considered to be significantly better environmental options due to the energy consumption and the air emissions produced.) |
| - Recreation  | Displacement of the specified use to another water body provided it does not affect ecological status of that water body or others.  |
| Activities for the purposes of which water is stored [Art.4(3)(a)(iii)] |  |
| - Storage for drinking water supply                                     | Presence of obvious alternative drinking water supply source that is capable of providing the drinking water supply with less impact.  |
| - Storage for power generation  | Alternative comparable energy schemes that is significantly better environmental option.<br>Due to the Government policy objective of  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | increasing renewable energy generation capacity in Scotland, it was not normally considered that the closure of an existing hydropower scheme and its replacement with an alternative comparable renewable energy scheme would be a significantly better environmental option unless the adverse impacts of the hydropower scheme were substantial and obviously much greater than those of hydropower schemes of a comparable scale. |
| - Storage for irrigation   | -   |
| Water regulation, flood protection, land drainage [Art.4(3)(a)(iv)]        |   |
| - Water regulation   | Obvious alternative schemes that can be used for purposes of water regulation   |
| - Flood protection   | Displacement of the specified use to another water body or replacement of the existing specified use with a better alternative. E.g. Development of wash land that would provide at least the equivalent level of flood protection.   |
| - Land drainage  | -   |
| Equally important sustainable human development activity' [Art.4(3)(a)(v)] | Displacement of the specified use to another water body or replacement of the existing specified use with a better alternative  |

#### 4. Establishing Good Ecological Potential (GEP)

**Q4.1: Please tell us about the method you used to classify the ecological potential of heavily modified water bodies by completing the applicable Tables below**

| Are you satisfied that your draft classification results reflect the effect of hydromorphological alterations on ecological potential ? (yes/no) | Have you classified the effect of hydromorphological alterations on ecological potential using <u>biological assessment methods</u> (according to CIS Guidance No. 4 – See Annex)? (yes/no) | Have you classified the effect of hydromorphological alterations on ecological potential by assessing whether <u>all practicable mitigation measures</u> have been taken (according to the Prague approach - See Annex)? (yes/no) | Have you developed <u>another method</u> of classifying the effect of hydromorphological alterations on ecological potential? (yes/no) |
|--|---|---|--|
| Yes (a satisfactory classification process has been developed although this still has to be applied to HMWBs within some water use categories)   | No  | Yes (for water storage and inland navigation; still to be carried out for flood protection, land drainage and urban use)  | No   |

**Have you adapted your existing biological assessment methods for application to heavily modified water bodies?**

**Results from biological assessment methods are considered when determining if a water body should be reported as A/HMWB.**

**Have you developed specific biological assessment methods for classifying HMWBs?**

**Not specifically but some newly developed biological assessment methods can be applied in A/HMWB's. It should be noted that further tools developed would be required to rely solely on biological results.**

Please complete the Table below if you have classified the effect on ecological potential of hydromorphological alterations using **biological assessment methods** (according to CIS Guidance No. 4 – See Annex)

| Water category      | Were you able to derive biological references for maximum ecological potential? (yes/no) | What biological quality element (or elements) have you used to make these assessments? |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Rivers              | No   | n.a.   |
| Lakes               | No   | n.a.   |
| Transitional waters | No   | n.a.   |
| Coastal waters      | No   | n.a.   |

Please complete the Table below if you have classified the effect on ecological potential of hydromorphological alterations using the **mitigation measures approach** (according to the Prague approach - See Annex)

| Water use                             | Did you develop use-specific generic checklists of mitigation measures? (yes/no) | Did you identify water body-specific mitigation measures rather than generic checklists? (yes/no) | If applicable, did you modify the generic list to take account of the specific characteristics and use of each HMWB? (yes/no) | Did you involve the water users in applying the method? (yes/no) |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Navigation, including port facilities | <b>YES</b><br>Yes  | <b>NO</b><br>No   | <b>NO</b><br>No   | <b>YES</b><br>Yes for inland waterways, pending for ports        |
| Storage for drinking water supply     | <b>YES</b>   | <b>NO</b>   | <b>NO</b>   | <b>YES</b>   |
| Storage for power generation          | <b>YES</b>   | <b>NO</b>   | <b>NO</b>   | <b>YES</b>   |
| Storage for                           | <b>NO</b>  | <b>NO</b>   | <b>NO</b>   | <b>NO</b>  |

|   |  |           |           |            |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|------------|
| irrigation  |  |           |           |            |
| Water regulation  | <b>YES</b>   | <b>NO</b> | <b>NO</b> | <b>NO</b>  |
| Flood protection  | <b>YES</b>   | <b>NO</b> | <b>NO</b> | <b>YES</b> |
| Land drainage   | <b>YES</b>   | <b>NO</b> | <b>NO</b> | <b>YES</b> |
| Equally important sustainable human development activity' | <b>YES (URBANISATION &amp; RECREATION ONLY)<br/>Yes – for intensive urban land use</b> | <b>NO</b> | <b>NO</b> | <b>YES</b> |

**NOTE: WATER BODY SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED IN A LIMITED NUMBER OF WATER BODIES WHICH DO NOT FIT INTO THE GENERIC CHECKLISTS. THIS IS FOR SURFACE WATER TRANSFER ARTIFICIAL WATER BODIES; WATER BODIES WHICH ARE A/HMWB AND THE USE IS ONLY “WIDER ENVIRONMENT” OR “OTHER (NON SPECIFIC USE)”.**

**If you have developed generic checklists of measures, please describe these**

Generic checklists have been devised to help assess the ecological potential of water bodies designated as heavily modified or artificial. These checklists are based on an approach of assessing whether more could be done to increase the ecological potential of the water body.

Checklists have been developed based on the steps identified in the Alternative Approach to enable large numbers of heavily modified and artificial water bodies to be assessed consistently and across sectors.

The process of classifying ecological potential is based on an assessment of whether measures included in the checklists have been taken to mitigate the modified or artificial hydromorphological characteristics of the water body.

The hydromorphological characteristics of a water body will support the achievement of Good Ecological Potential or better where all mitigation measures on the relevant checklists relevant to the identified impacts have been taken excepting those which:

- (i) are not practicable given the characteristics of the water body;
- (ii) have a significant adverse impact upon the use; or
- (iii) have a significant adverse impact upon the wider environment.

Where all measures are in place, the water body will be defined as achieving Good Ecological Potential or better, and where measures are not in place then the water body will be defined as Moderate Ecological Potential or worse.

The checklist approach is tailored (through the input provided by the sector groups) to the water use or uses for which the water body has been designated.

The method used to classify water bodies and the checklists themselves (if the Alternative Approach continues to be used) will be reviewed and updated for each river basin planning cycle as methods and understanding improve. The reviews will take account of experience of applying the guidance, information from environmental monitoring programmes, and

research projects on the impacts resulting from physical modifications, and information on the effectiveness and practicability of different mitigation measures.

To support the decision-making process, forms have been devised to allow Good Ecological Potential or better to be identified. The forms will require completion for each water body which has been designated as a HMWB or AWB. The forms facilitate identification of:

- the pressures and impacts present at a given site;
- the mitigation measures already in place at a site and whether they adequately mitigate the identified impacts;
- mitigation measures which, if implemented, would have a significant adverse effect on the water use (for example navigation or flood risk management), or the wider environment;
- mitigation measures which would only deliver a slight ecological benefit; and
- mitigation measures which could be put in place taking into account all of the above.

Where there are multiple uses affecting a water body, then the full range of potential measures for each sector should be assessed.

The decision making process on whether potential measures have already been taken is based on a step-wise process which is contained in a single form.

Each water use sector identifies the:

- Hydromorphological modifications or artificial characteristics (pressures) associated with the water use or uses concerned, and
- The adverse ecological effects (impacts) which are or may be associated with the modification or artificial characteristic occurring in the water body in question.

Mitigation measures are associated to the impacts in the checklists and are assessed against the questions in the next step.

A series of checkboxes are set out to test whether each mitigation measure for the identified impact(s) is in place and, where it is not in place, test the applicability of each listed measure.

Where all applicable mitigation measures on the checklist have already been taken or screened out, the water body is classified as Good Ecological Potential or better. Where one or more applicable mitigation measure(s) remain to be taken, the water body is classified as Moderate Ecological Potential or worse. This will then be combined with the outcomes from other assessments to give an overall classification.

**Please specify if you have a special methodology for the definition of Maximum Ecological Potential (MEP), which differs from your GEP methodology**

The assessment of ecological potential has identified two classes:

Good Ecological Potential and better  
Moderate Ecological Potential or worse

There has been no method developed or used to define Maximum Ecological Potential or to differentiate it from Good Ecological Potential

For Member States that have used both approaches of GEP establishment (Guidance No. 4 approach & “Prague” approach):

**Q4.3:** How do the results of using the two approaches compare? Are the mitigation measures needed to achieve good ecological potential comparable? Are there any examples to combine both methods?

N/A

## 5. Exemptions for HMWB

**Q5.1:** Do you intend to apply Art. 4(4) exemptions (time derogation) to HMWB?

|            |           |
|------------|-----------|
| <u>yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
| YES        |           |

Do you intend to apply Art. 4(5) exemptions (less stringent objectives) to HMWB?

|            |           |
|------------|-----------|
| <u>yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|            | NO        |

How did you combine this with HMWB designation according to Art. 4 (3) and CIS guidance No 4?

(free text)

## 6. Suggestions for the workshop

**Q6.1:** Do you have any suggestions for the upcoming workshop on Heavily Modified Water Bodies (12-13 March 2009, Brussels)? E.g.

- Any questions proposed for discussion?
- Public participation ideas concerning HMWB?
- Any pilot projects, methods for presentations at the workshop?

The incorporation of information from stakeholders (in addition to operators and responsible authorities) into the process of classification of ecological potential.

How 'significant' adverse effects are defined for specific sectors, taking into consideration resistance from operators.