



Conclusion on assessment criteria (1/4)

State of play (1)

- The most important **driving forces** for the hydromorphological water quality are hydropower, flood protection, agriculture and navigation on a European scale; in addition urbanisation and irrigation on a regional level are of high importance.
- The most important **pressures** identified are: dams & weirs causing disruption of continuity and impoundments; changing of profiles; maintenance including sediment management; straightening; water level fluctuations and bank fixation. Some MS have used pressure criteria for assessment purposes.



Conclusion on assessment criteria (2/4)

State of play (2)

- The **assessment criteria** used are sometimes comparable (e.g. impoundments, disruption of continuity), sometimes not (e.g. dykes). Where the criteria are comparable, the used **thresholds** are not (e.g. length of impoundments). This is also evident for the scale of the assessment.
- Some MS have used the **“at risk” criteria** also as **criteria for provisional HMWB designation**, other MS have distinguished both. There are no indications that provisional identified water bodies are not assessed as water bodies at risk.



Conclusion on assessment criteria (3/4)

Follow up (1)

- It is emphasized that not only the **criteria used** for the risk assessment, but also those used for provisional HMWB designation should be **biological validated** using the best available information.
- **Restoration and mitigation measures** should be prepared for the programmes of measures based on the best current knowledge on ecological effectiveness.



Conclusion on assessment criteria (4/4)

Follow up (2)

- In the **CIS mandate** a specific task on the relationship between hydromorphological criteria and biological quality elements should be introduced on the basis of current knowledge. Further good practice examples for specific uses should be prepared.
- The presented interim results on the **evaluation of the Art. 5 reports** indicate a lack of submitted data and a difficulty in interpreting data. Therefore the final version of the evaluation should be checked and updated by MS if necessary.



Conclusion on assessment criteria (4/4)

Follow up (3)

- **Information exchange** on current work of WFD implementation are recommended, e.g. on assessment methods related to hydromorphological parameters and biological response
- This information exchange should be facilitated by developing a synthesis of current work