



---

# **DE-UK Workshop „From Monitoring to Programmes of Measures“**

**- 24/25 October 2007, Brussels -**

---

**Conclusions to be presented at Water Directors' meeting, 29.-30. November 2007**

## General Information

---

- The workshop “From Monitoring to Programmes of Measures” continued the long-standing tradition of joint Anglo-German seminars on water resources management.
- Organised by German and UK Authorities (LAWA, BMU, Defra, the Scottish Government, DOENI; Welsh Assembly Government, UKTAG).
- Approx. 90 delegates from different EU MS and COM.
- Three working groups:
  - **Biological and environmental standards**
  - **Setting environmental objectives**
  - **Programmes of Measures**

## Outcome of the Workshop

---

- **Issue paper** was distributed to workshop participants as background document outlining approaches in UK and DE and guiding questions for discussion.
- **Workshop presentations and summary report** are available online at:  
<http://www.ecologic-events.de/wfd2007/en/index>
- **Conclusions** were drafted based on reporting back from working groups and agreed between the co-organisers.
- The workshop was **welcomed by participants** as a timely event that helped to clarify and further refine concepts and approaches at a crucial stage in WFD implementation.

# Conclusions

## - General issues -

---

- A **long-term vision** (for 2027 and beyond) for river basin districts is needed, in particular for transboundary catchments.
- At many sites, it will not be possible to reach Good Ecological Status by 2015.
- **Uncertainty** at different stages of the management process is an important issue. However, absolute certainty is neither possible nor required for the WFD River Basin management.
- **Stakeholder involvement** is crucial. Dialogues within the CIS process need to be continued.
- **Water is at the heart of public interest.** Ensure public support through communication on the benefits of WFD.

# Conclusions

## - Biological and environmental standards -

---

- **Biological methods** and data for status assessment will not be fully operational or still in the testing phase by 2008. In the interim, **environmental standards** and guide values will be used as a proxy.
- **Uncertainty** is most important at the border of good and moderate status. There are different ways of reducing uncertainty and presenting confidence levels (eg. plausibility checking, adaptive monitoring).
- The development status of biological assessment methods is relatively advanced with respect to rivers in general, and some elements have long been used for water quality assessment. However, with respect to some other elements such as fish, problems still exist.
- **Intercalibration** is important as a basis for ensuring comparability of classification results across Europe. Current results are already a good basis for planning; however, further development will be necessary.

# Conclusions

## - Setting objectives under uncertainty -

- **Uncertainty:** low confidence that Good Status could be reached by 2015. Approaches to deal with uncertainty may look different, but have similar outcomes.
- **Extended deadlines** allow for longer timescales and maintain ambition. Stepwise approach: implement “right-direction” measures and monitor their effects. Application of less stringent objectives should be restricted to cases where reaching Good Status by 2027 is highly unlikely.
- **Interim targets** are necessary when deadlines are extended. They can serve as a basis for checking progress, and can facilitate public information & participation and planning at lower administrative levels.
- Interim targets should not be confused with compliance objectives (legal concern). They will be **set domestically** at national or regional level, but **may not be reported** in the RBMPs.

# Conclusions

## - Setting objectives under uncertainty -

Implement ,right-direction‘ measures



Monitor effects



If still a gap, implement further ,right-direction‘ measures



## Conclusions

### - Setting objectives under uncertainty: Options -

- **Example:** poor status water body. Achievement of good status is considered possible within the timeframe of the WFD but unlikely during the first management cycle. The table shows different approaches to setting and communicating objectives.

	2009	2015	2021	2027
Option 1	<b>Poor</b>			<b>Good</b>
Option 2	<b>Poor</b>	Moderate	Moderate	<b>Good</b>
Option 3	<b>Poor</b>	Good (L)	Good (L)	<b>Good (H*)</b>

\* L = low confidence; H = high confidence

# Conclusions

## - Programmes of Measures -

---

- The first RBMPs will include many measures that are already existing and/or decided.
- **Prioritisation** is an important part of planning the PoMs. UK and DE use a mix of top down and bottom up prioritisation approaches.
- **Uncertainty** regarding the success of measures is one aspect used to prioritise action. Where confidence levels are too low, further investigations and clear follow-up activities to reduce uncertainty should be a priority.
- **Other aspects** in the prioritisation include cost-effectiveness, dependence of other measures in the catchment, legal opportunities (e.g. renewal of licences) and availability of funding resources.

# Conclusions

## - Programmes of Measures -

---

- **Local knowledge** is an important factor to design successful measures, especially when dealing with projects to improve hydromorphology. The public participation process is a key instrument to ensure its integration in the management process.
- **Co-ordination of measures** between different parts of river basins is crucial, since the effectiveness of local measures may depend on measures taken elsewhere in the basin. Measures to address basin-scale problems need to be agreed at basin level and to be included in the programmes.

## **Weblink**

---

**The conclusions and all workshop documents  
are available at:**

**<http://www.ecologic-events.de/wfd2007/en/index>**