Preliminary Programme of the informal workshop 'Sharing ideas on WFD monitoring: practicalities and common challenges'

Reason for the workshop

- Policy servants responsible for WFD monitoring from Austria, England and The Netherlands recently met during a SWIFT meeting in France. From their discussions it became clear that these Member States are coping with similar problems in designing WFD compliant monitoring. The idea came up to organise a workshop on the issue of WFD monitoring and to invite selected representatives.

Scope of the workshop

- To exchange views and discuss a selection of challenging topics in WFD monitoring
- To generate feedback on the concept-monitoring strategy of Member States if deemed appropriate by that Member State
- To raise awareness of common challenges for all MS to foster joint approaches
- To discuss technical methodological limitations and potentially contradictory regulatory issues

Outline

- Timing: 21-22 September 2005
- Duration: Lunch-lunch meeting
  21 September: 12:00 to 18:00, 22 September: 9:00 to 13:00.
- Possible Participants:
  Austria, England, Denmark, Bavaria, North Rhine Westphalia, Flanders, The Netherlands (Maximum of two participants (preferably: one technical expert and one responsible policy servant) for each Member State/ Region), Denmark, ICPDR. In addition, maybe two representatives of the EU 6th Framework Programme Project SWIFT.
- Mode of work: On each challenging topic (if possible to be defined in advance (e.g. aggregation of water bodies): (1) an introduction to the topic focussing on WFD requirement and CIS guidance (incl. AMPS and any other relevant working group products); (2) tour de table and/or two slides presentations by each Member State/Region on approach on the topic; (3) discussion; (4) conclusions and drafting of summary notes.

Possible challenging topics to be discussed

1. Exchange of already existing national WFD monitoring strategies.

2. Aggregation of water bodies for WFD monitoring (focus: aggregation for operational monitoring):
   Justification of aggregation (representation & homogeneity) and ideas on the size of the aggregation groups/units. Can aggregation also be applied for surveillance monitoring (the guidance is not clear about this issue)? Size of aggregation units seems to be directly Inked to the required levels of confidence and precision, homo-/ heterogeneity of natural and anthropogenic catchment properties etc. Therefore, the aggregation methodology may be of common interest.

3. Where are the boundaries between the different monitoring types (surveillance, operational and investigative monitoring)?
   Common understanding of these would be helpful.

4. Installation of monitoring sites
   Finding the best possible location for monitoring sites within a water body depending on each relevant pressure type as well as quality parameter.

5. Exchange of thoughts on timing and design of investigative monitoring.

6. Selection of quality elements (QEs) for both biological and chemical monitoring
   Which biological QEs are chosen for which anthropogenic pressure (refers especially to operative monitoring)? Which priority substances and other relevant compounds (annex VIII) are to be monitored? etc..

7. Dealing with confidence, sampling frequency and precision.

8. Exchange and discussion on monitoring methods
   biological monitoring of fish, sampling analysis of priority substances in surface waters, etc..

9. The role of hydromorphology and general physico-chemical parameters within WFD monitoring.
   Although the guidance paper deals with these issues there is still ambiguity.

10. Strategy to establish long time series for trend analysis although assessment methods are changing over time.
   Discussion comparability of results over time.