

# Public Consultation On the Review of Annexes I and II of the Groundwater Directive

<b>A. Introductory Questions</b>	
1. Please indicate your name (i.e. the name of the person submitting the response). <i>[Format: title; first name; last name]</i> -open reply-( <b>compulsory</b> )	Dr Nineta Majcen
1a. Are you responding to this consultation as an individual or on behalf of an organisation or public authority? (Please choose <b>one</b> response) -single choice reply-( <b>compulsory</b> )	On behalf of an organisation
1a.ii. What type of organisation do you represent? (Please choose <b>one</b> response) -single choice reply-( <b>compulsory</b> )	NGO / civil society (including environmental groups)
1a.iii. Please indicate the full name of your organisation. -open reply-( <b>compulsory</b> )	European Association for Chemical and Molecular Sciences (EuCheMS) aisbl
1a.iv. Please provide your Register ID <i>if applicable</i> . -open reply-( <b>optional</b> )	03492856440-03
1b. Please indicate the country where you or, if applicable, your organisation or public authority is located. -single choice reply-( <b>compulsory</b> )	Belgium
2. Unless you specify otherwise, your contribution may be published under your name or, if you are responding on behalf of an organisation or public authority, the name of the organisation or authority, on the Commission's website. Please indicate here if you wish your contribution to be anonymous. (For full information please refer to the Specific Privacy Statement point 3) -single choice reply-( <b>compulsory</b> )	You may identify the author/source of this contribution when publishing it
<b>B. Main challenges to address in the review of Annexes I and II of the Directive</b>	
3. Do these four main challenges cover the most important issues for the review of Annexes I and II of the GWD? -single choice reply-( <b>compulsory</b> )	No
4. Should any other challenges be considered? If so, which and why? Do you have any other comments on the list of four main challenges. -open reply-( <b>optional</b> )	Frequency of monitoring (see response to Q18a); Elemental speciation (for inorganic compounds) due to the impact of speciation on bioaccessibility and (eco)toxicity.
<b>C. List of substances: pollutants regulated in Annex I of the Directive</b>	
5. Should any of the naturally occurring or synthetic substances on Part B of Annex II be moved to the list in Annex I? (Please choose	Yes, one or more substances from Part B of Annex II should be moved to the list (please specify in the follow-up questions)

<p><b>one</b> response) -single choice reply-(<b>compulsory</b>)</p>	
<p>5aa. Should any of the substances or ions or indicators which may occur both naturally and/or as a result of human activities be moved from Part B of Annex II to the list in Annex I? (Please choose <b>one or more</b> responses) -multiple choices reply-(<b>optional</b>)</p>	<p>Arsenic - Cadmium - Lead - Mercury</p>
<p>5ab. Should any of the man-made synthetic substances be moved from Part B of Annex II to the list in Annex I? (Please choose <b>one or more</b> responses) -multiple choices reply-(<b>optional</b>)</p>	
<p>5ac. Should the parameter indicative of saline or other intrusions be moved from Part B of Annex II to the list in Annex I? -multiple choices reply-(<b>optional</b>)</p>	<p>Conductivity</p>
<p>5b. Please describe briefly the reasons for your suggestions in your answer to Questions 5aa, 5ab, 5ac. -open reply-(<b>optional</b>)</p>	<p>As, Cd, Pb and Hg species have significant human and ecosystem health implications. Conductivity is a simple parameter to measure and a good indicator of saline intrusion, e.g. from sea level rise.</p>
<p>5c. Please indicate appropriate EU-wide quality standards for the substance(s) you suggest adding to Annex I and explain their derivation. -open reply-(<b>optional</b>)</p>	
<p>5d. Please provide information or expert judgement regarding the feasibility, costs and benefits of introducing quality standards for the substances you suggest. -open reply-(<b>optional</b>)</p>	
<p>6. Apart from the substances in Part B of Annex II, should any other substances be added to the list in Annex I? -single choice reply-(<b>compulsory</b>)</p>	<p>Yes, one or more substances not on Part B of Annex II should be added to the list (please specify in the follow-up question)</p>
<p>6a. Please specify which substance(s) should be added to the list in Annex I. -open reply-(<b>optional</b>)</p>	
<p>6b. Please describe briefly the reasons for your suggestions in your answer to question 6a. -open reply-(<b>optional</b>)</p>	
<p>6c. Please indicate appropriate EU-wide quality standards for the substance(s) you suggest adding to Annex I and explain their derivation. -open reply-(<b>optional</b>)</p>	
<p>6d. Please provide information or expert judgement regarding the feasibility, costs and benefits of introducing quality standards for the substances you suggest. -open reply-(<b>optional</b>)</p>	

7. Do you have any further comments regarding the review of Annex I?  
-open reply-(optional)

## D. List of substances: pollutants and indicators regulated in Part B of Annex II

8. As noted in the background paper, only the substances/parameters currently listed in Annex I and Annex II Part B have been identified, according to the latest information from Member States, as being of Europe-wide concern. If you have new information concerning substances that should be identified as being of Europe-wide concern which would justify listing them in Annex II Part B, please specify these substances and provide the information you consider would justify their inclusion in Annex II Part B. If you do not think substances should be added, please write "None".  
-open reply-(compulsory)

Phosphorus (as molybdate reactive phosphorus).

9. Should any other changes be made to the list of pollutants in Annex II Part B?  
-single choice reply-(compulsory)

No

## E. Threshold values (Annex II Part A)

10. Should Annex II provide further specifications regarding NBLs and the relationship between TVs and NBLs in order to make TVs more comparable across Member States? (Please choose **one or more** responses)  
-multiple choices reply-(compulsory)

Annex II should be amended to state that NBLs are not taken into account in the setting of TVs but should instead be considered later, if necessary, in the status assessment

10a. Please describe the reasons for your choices. -open reply-(optional)

10b. Please provide any information or expert judgement regarding the feasibility, costs and benefits of the options listed in question 10.  
-open reply-(optional)

## F1. Clarifying reporting requirements

11. Should there be an obligation for Member States to provide (where relevant but otherwise unconditionally) the following information listed in Part C of Annex II? (Please choose **one** response)  
-single choice reply-(compulsory)

Yes, all elements listed in Part C (a) to (d)

11b. Please describe the reasons for your choice.

It will provide a valuable resource of observational measurements for further investigation and scenario modelling.

-open reply-(optional)	
11c. Please provide any information or expert judgement regarding the feasibility, costs and benefits of the options. -open reply-(optional)	
<b>F2. Reporting on groundwater bodies at risk</b>	
12. Should Part C of Annex II incorporate these specifications in the mandatory reporting requirements for groundwater bodies at risk? (Please choose <b>one</b> response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Yes, all of the specifications
12a. Please describe the reasons for your choice. If you chose 'some specifications', please indicate which ones. -open reply-(optional)	The reasons are better harmonisation and transparency of information.
12b. Please provide any information or expert judgement regarding the feasibility, costs and benefits of the options. -open reply-(optional)	
<b>F3. Reporting on methodology for deriving NBLs</b>	
13. Should Part C of Annex II include an obligation to report the methodology for deriving NBLs? (Please choose <b>one</b> response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Yes
13a. Please describe the reasons for your choice. -open reply-(optional)	The reasons are better harmonisation and transparency of information.
13b. Please provide any information or expert judgement regarding the feasibility, costs and benefits of the options. -open reply-(optional)	
<b>F4. Reporting on reasons for not establishing TVs</b>	
14. In several cases, Member States have not specified TVs for all pollutants and indicators listed in Part B of Annex II. Should Part C of Annex II include an obligation to report the reasons for not establishing TVs? (Please choose <b>one</b> response) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Yes
14a. Please describe the reasons for your choice. -open reply-(optional)	The reasons are better harmonisation and transparency of information.
14b. Please provide any information or expert judgement regarding the feasibility, costs and benefits of the options. -open reply-(optional)	
<b>F5. Reporting on the compliance regime</b>	

15. Should Part C of Annex II include an obligation to report certain elements of the compliance regime? (Please choose <b>one or more</b> responses) -multiple choices reply-( <b>compulsory</b> )	Report the method, level and period of aggregation of monitoring results - Report the definition and identification of the acceptable extent of exceedance when assessing chemical status
15a. Please describe the reasons for your choices. -open reply-( <b>optional</b> )	The reasons are better harmonisation and transparency of information.
15b. Please provide any information or expert judgement regarding the feasibility, costs and benefits of the options. -open reply-( <b>optional</b> )	
16. Should any other changes be made to the list of information subject to mandatory reporting? If so, please specify. -open reply-( <b>optional</b> )	

## G1. Mechanism for gathering monitoring data

17. Should a mechanism for systematic gathering of monitoring data on groundwater contaminants of concern, including emerging contaminants, be established at EU level and should these data be reported to an EU-wide chemical monitoring database? (Please choose <b>one</b> response) -single choice reply-( <b>compulsory</b> )	Yes, and it should be a mechanism with compulsory Member State contribution
17a. Please describe briefly the reasons for your choice. -open reply-( <b>optional</b> )	The reasons are better harmonisation and transparency of information.
17b. Please provide any information or expert judgement regarding the feasibility, costs and benefits of the options. -open reply-( <b>optional</b> )	

## G2. Further provisions for substances and pollutants of concern

18. Should Annex II specify the mandatory establishment of TVs for and/or monitoring of all pollutants and indicators listed in Annex II Part B? (Please choose <b>one</b> response) -single choice reply-( <b>compulsory</b> )	All Annex II Part B pollutants/indicators should be monitored and a TV should be established for them
18a. If you consider that monitoring should be mandatory, please comment on the monitoring characteristics (monitoring type), e.g. frequency, duration, spatial distribution. -open reply-( <b>optional</b> )	The most important aspect is the response to Q18a on monitoring characteristics. Monitoring should be mandatory and a sampling frequency specified. The frequency should be fit for purpose but a minimum number of samples per year should be specified and these should be evenly distributed across the year. With regard to duration; this should be on - going. With regard to spatial distribution: location(s) should be specified. The above would give an informative and "stable" long term dataset, which should be made publically available.
18b. Please describe the reasons for your choice.	

<p>-open reply-(optional)</p>	
<p>18c. Please provide any information or expert judgement regarding the feasibility, costs and benefits of the options.</p> <p>-open reply-(optional)</p>	
<p>19. Do you have any further comments regarding provisions in Annexes I and II of the GWD to address substances and pollutants of concern, including emerging contaminants?</p> <p>-open reply-(optional)</p>	
<h2>H. Further comments and follow-up</h2>	
<p>20. Do you have any further comments regarding the review of Annexes I and II of the GWD?</p> <p>-open reply-(optional)</p>	
<p>21. We may wish to contact some respondents by email or telephone for further information, in particular regarding information and expert judgement on the feasibility, costs and benefits of the options. If you are available for follow-up, please provide your email address and/or telephone number.</p> <p>-open reply-(optional)</p>	<p>nineta.majcen@euchems.eu</p>