

Comparison of methodology of HMWB's in Nordic countries

Antton Keto & Mika Marttunen

Background

- Status classification of heavily modified water bodies has been done in a hurry case by case using hydromorphological mitigation measures and expert judgment.
- Methodology cause deviation in status classification between different HMWB's and makes it difficult to verify that similar type of HMWB's are classified equally in different areas and countries. Nevertheless there wasn't time to harmonize procedures.

Objective

- Improve conformity in designation and ecological status classification of heavily modified water bodies' within Nordic countries in order to have better assessment system for the 2nd planning period.

WP 1: Comparison of heavily modified water body designation criteria and threshold values

- In order to understand possibilities to harmonize designation criteria, existing national designation criteria are screened and compared with each other at River Basin District level in different member states.
- Possibilities to utilize other countries' results and experiences related in the second planning period are tested.

WP 2: Development of mitigation measures method

- Mitigation measures based classification method has been used in many countries in the 1st planning period. Although, method is quite simple, there might be big differences in which type of mitigation measures and what kind of information on impacts and costs of mitigation measures has been used in final assessments.
- Moreover, how significant impact on use has been identified in selecting feasible mitigation measures is also important question which influence on final results.
- One of the key questions in this method is what does a slight change mean as it defines which measures should be included in the program of measures.

WP 3: Comparison of different approaches used in HMWB's classification

- Those countries which have been able to classify heavily modified water bodies for the 1st planning period have been used two methods:
 - the reference-based method and the mitigation measures method
- Although, some Member States believe that the two CIS methods identified for defining GEP should give comparable results, further studies are needed to assure that opinion.
- In this study both methods are tested at the same time in 4-6 case studies and results of those studies are analyzed and compared more detailed in expert meetings.

WP 4: Impacts of more detailed biological data on existing classification procedure

- Monitoring produces more information on biological quality elements for the status assessments of the 2nd planning period.
- There might be needs to take into account what need for change more precise biological data makes for classification procedures of HMWBs, which are now based quite much on indirect criteria and expert judgment.
- In this study, development needs to HMWB classification procedure with full biological data are identified and necessity changes to procedure are suggested.

The main outcomes

- summary on existing designation criteria and existing development ideas concerning criteria
- arranged seminars, where discussions with WFD experts and key stakeholders are enforced of HMWB designation and classification
- recommendations how assessment methods for heavily modified water body designation and classification procedure in Nordic countries are harmonized on a sufficient level for the 2nd planning period
- recommendations regarding the development of ecological classification system in heavily modified water bodies
- final report which summaries results of previous outcomes