

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

European Commission

Directorate-General Environment

<i>Update Date</i>	<i>Author</i>
23th February	Alberto Telletxea
16th March	Alberto Telletxea
22 nd April	Alberto Telletxea
08 th May	Alberto Telletxea
15 th May	Jorge Rodriguez / Fernanda Nery
20 th May	Alberto Telletxea
29 ^h May	Alberto Telletxea
5 th June	Mikel Santamaria
17 th June	Mikel Santamaria
29 th July	Alberto Telletxea
02 nd July	Iker Garcia
13 th July	Fernanda Nery / Jorge Rodriguez
16 th July	Alberto Telletxea
23 th July	Jorge Rodriguez



Table of contents

1	Introduction	3
2	WFD 2016 4.9 version	4
3	WFD 2016 5.0 version	46

IMPORTANT NOTE: this document reflects the comments received during several months of the testing period of the 2016 WFD schemas and reporting tools. Some of the earlier comments were made and replied on the basis of versions of the schemas that have been changed later on and therefore neither the comment nor the response are relevant anymore.

1 Introduction

This document reflects the ongoing log of questions and clarifications during the Testing phase of the WFD 2016 for the reporting on River Basin Management Plans. The access to the WFD 2016 helpdesk is: <https://helpdesk.eionet.europa.eu/otrs/customer.pl>

The log issues registered regards on the following reporting tools:

- WFD Reporting Guidance 2016
- GIS guidance 2016
- WFD reporting schemas
- QA/QC tools

Further information on the WFD 2016 reporting resources can be found at:

http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/help/WFD/WFD_521_2016

2 WFD 2016 4.9 version

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150210 10000047	Iker Garcia (Bilbomat ca)	10/02/15	All	WFD schemas v4.9 – Add 'C_CD' Country code The country code C_CD although it is not on the guidance Document should be included again to have an easy reference to where file are coming from.	The schemas has been included and updated in: http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/help/WFD/WFD_521_2016 .	Done v4.9	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150223 10000102	Iker Garcia (Bilbomat ca)	23/02/15	SWB GWB Common	WFD schemas v4.9 --- Small Issues SWB XSD: SWTypeOfAssociation: set minOccurs to '1' (or just remove the attribute minOccurs) SWTypeOfProtectedArea: set minOccurs to '1' (or just remove the attribute minOccurs) SWProtectedAreaExemptions: set minOccurs to '1' (or just remove the attribute minOccurs) GWB XSD: GWTypeOfAssociation: set minOccurs to '1' (or just remove the Attribute minOccurs) GWTypeOfProtectedArea: set minOccurs to '1' (or just remove the attribute minOccurs) GWProtectedAreaExemptions: set minOccurs to '1' (or just remove the attribute minOccurs) SVM XSD: SWChemicalMatrixPurpose: set minOccurs to '1' (or just remove the attribute minOccurs) Common XSD: Substance 'Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH)e', that last 'e' is a typo and should be removed.	The schema changes have been included and updated in: http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/help/WFD/WFD_521_2016	Done v4.9	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150305 10000341	Stefan Hofmann (DE)	05/03/15	RBMPoM	There's a mismatch in RBMPoM_2016.xsd: The current occurrence attribution of NewKeyTypeMeasures (which defaults to 1) doesn't match the minimal occurrence of its	We will update the schema in this regards, so as soon as a new schemas version is published the 'NewKeyTypeMeasures' will not be required (minOccurs=0).	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	Pending for v5.0

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				children: minOccurs="0" is set for NewKeyTypeMeasure and NewKeyTypeMeasureIndicators.	This part of the schema has been further simplified.				
20150305 10000297	Stefan Hofmann (DE)	05/03/15	SWB	SWChemicalExceedance is part of SWB_2016.xsd: <xs:element name="SWChemicalExceedance" type="wfd:Annex8d"></xs:element>. It isn't included in WFD reporting guidance_v4 9 clean.docx, though. It is expected to be mentioned after Schema element: SWChemicalExceedances (p. 72) and before Schema element: SWChemicalExceedancesType (p. 73).	In order to allocate a 'SWChemicalExceedancesType' for each SWChemicalExceedance reported (Annex8d) a parent element was created 'SWChemicalExceedances' which encapsulates 'SWChemicalExceedance' (annex8d) and 'SWChemicalExceedancesType'	Done v4.9	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150305 10000279	Stefan Hofmann (DE)	05/03/15	SWB	Subunits are part of SWB_2016.xsd: <xs:element name="EUSubUnitCode" type="wfd:FeatureUniqueEUCodeType">. They aren't included in GWB_2016.xsd, though. This is not in sync with Chapter 3.4.2. How will the European Commission and the EEA use the information reported? of WFD reporting guidance_v4 9 clean.docx: the table included in this chapter lists Subunits as Scale of Information.	Sub-units are not relevant for groundwater. The references to sub-units in the guidance document section 3.4.2 will be deleted.	No action needed	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150317 10000247	Stefan Hofmann (DE)	17/03/15		In http://dd.eionet.europa.eu/schemas/WFD2016/WFDCommon_2016.xsd the following element is missing a type attribute: (...) <xs:element name="SoECategories"> (...)	A full enumeration list for the element InputCategory needs to be developed, made up of all the possible facets (CIS inventory guidance categories, SoE categories and WFD list of pressure categories). This will be included in the schemas and guidance.	Done for v5.1	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150424 10000062	Stefan Hofmann	24/04/15	SWMET	there's an element naming mismatch:	This will be corrected	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	Pending for v5.0

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
	(DE)			<p>-in SWMET_2016.xsd: (...) <xs:element name="SWSignificantLinkFailure"</p> <p>-in WFD reporting guidance_v4 9 clean.docx: (...) Schema element: SWSignificanceLinkFailure</p>					
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	RBMPPoM	<p>Schema: RBMPPoM Parent element: Element: ChemicalSubstances Comment: There is no way to ascertain what year the data relates to. We suggest that another element is required to state the year.</p>	The element RBMPPoM/InputPollutant/ChemicalSubstance /InputCategory/inputYearPeriod allows specifying the year the data relates to.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	RBMPPoM	<p>Schema: RBMPPoM Parent element: PoM Element: PressureType Comment: England, Wales and Northern Ireland collect data at the root level for Pressure Type i.e. Point, Diffuse etc. We would like to enquire why is there no root level option any more and ask for them to be added back in. We do not collect data at a more detailed level than this and will not be able to report this data at this level. Additionally Scotland store their data in another structure and have fed back that: Scotland would recommend we introduce further high level options for Water Quality, Flows and Levels,</p>	<p>This has been heavily debated during the preparation of the guidance and the Commission would not like to reopen this discussion. The Commission believes the information requested is essential to enable a DPSIR analysis, as reporting of the first RBMP showed. It is not possible to implement the WFD without knowing which are the drivers behind the pressures. The Commission recommends that Scotland maps their categories to the ones in the guidance. This mapping can be documented so that the link to the published plans is clarified.</p>	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				INNS, Physical condition and Fish Barriers. We collect data at more detailed levels but it will be difficult to match these to the currently provided list and we will lose links to the published Plan.					
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	RBMPPoM	Schema: RBMPPoM Parent element: KTM Element: MeasureType Comment: Request an option to have "Both Basic and Supplementary" or 0:many	We prefer not to include this option as it is likely that we will lose a lot of information. If the measure is considered both basic and supplementary, then the option 'Supplementary' should be chosen.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	RBMPPoM	Schema: RBMPPoM Parent element: TargetedQ Element: OtherAspectsReference Comment: Should be conditional as there will be no supporting documents if no was chosen for all answers.	The element will be amended to conditional as suggested. Conditional check: report if any of the following elements take the indicated values: WaterReUse is 'Yes' WaterReUseMeasure is 'Yes' EcologicalFlow is 'Yes...' or 'Partly...' ClimateChange is 'Yes' FloodsDirective is 'Yes' WinWinNWRMDroughtsFloods is 'Yes' StructuralMeasures is 'Yes' MSFDCoOrdination is 'Yes' MSFDAssessment is 'Yes'	Done for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	Pending for v5.0
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	RBMPPoM	Schema: RBMPPoM; Parent Element: WaterQuantity; Element: AlternativeWQIndicator; Comment to EEA: This element should link out to the generic reference element and not be a simple string.	Yes, this will be modified to become a Annex 9 generic reference element.	Done for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWB	Schema: SWB; Parent Element: ChemicalStatus; Element: SWChemicalMonitoringResult;	See proposal to change in ticket 2015051810000125 below. If monitoring is available for this water body and is used for	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				Comment to EEA: We request that the pick list should include an option for Y/N/Both as some of our classifications are a mix of monitoring and expert judgment	classification then the option 'Monitoring' should be selected..				
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWB	Schema: SWB; Parent Element: ChemicalStatus; Element: SWEEffectStatusNewThresholds; Comment to EEA: We don't currently produce this data and will not be able to determine if the change is due to threshold changes or water body redelination. Question why this is requested and why it is limited to only a few chemicals	The purpose of this element is to understand the effect of the new EQS introduced by Directive 2013/39/EU for a few <u>existing</u> substances. This assessment with the new EQS is necessary to plan the programme of measures by 2018 as required by the aforementioned Directive. This is all thoroughly explained in the guidance.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWB	Schema: SWB; Parent Element: ChemicalStatus; Element: SWImprovementChemicalStatus; Comment to EEA: Cardinality should be 0:many as there maybe 0 priority substances which have improved	The options 'None' and 'No information' will be added to the enumeration list. This way we avoid having to infer any conclusion from non-reporting.	Done for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWB	Schema: SWB; Parent Element: ChemicalStatus; Element: SWChemicalExceedancesType; Comment to EEA: Request option to include 90 percentile in addition to average (50 percentile)	The schema element is about asking which EQS is exceeded, not about what statistical metric is used to assess exceedance.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWB	Schema: SWB; Parent Element: QualityElement; Element: FailingRBSPCAS; Comment to EEA: This is a duplicate element from SWEcologicalStatus. Suggest it is removed.	Not clear where is the duplication. There is only one element SWB/SurfaceWaterBody/SWFailingRBSP	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWB	Schema: SWB; Parent Element: SurfaceWaterBody; Element: Reservoir;	This is difficult to understand. Whether the water body was a river or a lake is essential information for the HMWB designation	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				Comment to EEA: We don't currently record this. It would be a disproportional amount of work to do so this should be an optional element.	process. Again this was debated in detail in the preparation of the guidance.				
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWMET	Schema: SWBMET; Parent Element: SWMethodologies; Element: SmallWBsMethodologyReference; Comment to EEA: We don't have specific small waterbodies and therefore will not have any specific methodology references. This element should be conditional on having a small waterbody methodology or optional	This is relevant for all Member States. It is about how small water bodies have been considered or not in WFD implementation. It should be documented e.g. which size thresholds are used for delineation of water bodies, how smaller water bodies than the threshold are protected, etc.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWMET	Schema: SWBMET; Parent Element: ; Element: IRBDTypologyCoOrdinationReference; Comment to EEA: This element is described as conditional but it required in the schema. Min Occurrence should be 0	This needs to be corrected, indeed Min Occurrence should be 0.	Done for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWMET	Schema: SWBMET; Parent Element: SWBQE; Element: PercentageOfTypes; Comment to EEA: We are unsure of what is being requested. Please can we have further guidance or clarification for what the Commission want to receive	The element requires MS to report "the percentage of types for this BQE and category for which an assessment method is fully developed". I.e. we want to know if the existing methods are applicable to all existing types for each BQE (in that case the percentage would be 100) or if there are types for which there are no methods available yet (in that case the percentage would be less than 100). For example if there are 5 transitional water types and assessment methods are available for macroalgae for all 5 types, this would mean 100%. If there are methods available for only 3 out of 5 types (the other 2 being still under development) then 60% should be reported. The guidance will be amended with further explanation.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWMET	Schema: SWBMET; Parent Element: SWPhysicoChemicalQE; Element: PhysChemMBoundary; Comment to EEA: We are unsure of what is being requested. The term "linked" seems ambiguous and we seek further guidance or examples.	The request is to "indicate whether the physico-chemical standard is linked to the good-moderate status boundary of BQEs". It should rather be read " indicate whether the physico-chemical standard is consistent with the good-moderate status boundary of the relevant sensitive BQEs". The guidance will be amended.	Done for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWMET	Schema: SWBMET; Parent Element: SWTargetedQ; Element: GESGEPComparison; Comment to EEA: We are unsure what the term "comparison" is referring to. Please can we have further examples and guidance for what this means. Specifically what to what level of comparison would mean "yes".	See conclusions of the 2010 CIS HMWB workshop, paragraph 60A https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/a/cd419883-ff4d-4d43-a82b-aef3d33e04ed/Conclusions%20HMWB%20workshop%20Brussels%20March%202009.pdf A reference to this document will be added to the guidance.	No action needed	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWMET	Schema: SWBMET; Parent Element: SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD; Element: ApproachSWBNotMonitoredChemical; Comment to EEA: We may have applied different approaches under different conditions. For example in some situations we report good and in others we extrapolate from another waterbody. We request that this is made either 1:many or an option that encompasses more than one approach such as "Multiple approaches used"	The option "Multiple approaches used" will be added. The conditional check for the element 'ApproachSWBNotMonitoredChemicalReference' has to be changed to add "...or 'Multiple approaches used'".	Done for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWMET	Elements: ApproachSWBNotMonitoredChemicalReference BackgroundConcentrationsReference BioavailabilityReference LongTermTrendAnalysisReference AlternativeMixingZoneMethodologyReference	All these will be corrected to Min Occurrence 0.	Done for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				MixingZoneMeasuresReductionReference Comment to EEA: These elements are described as conditional but are required in the schema. Min Occurrence should be 0					
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	SWB	Schema: SWB; Parent Element: ; Element: QualityElement; Comment to EEA: The schema does not match the guidance. The previous schema did match the guidance but it appears that the schema as been improved and simplified but the guidance has not been updated to reflect the changes. What is being requested is essential the same but slightly different element names. We request that the guidance is updated to reflect the schema.	The guidance will be updated to reflect the schemas.	No action needed	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150327 10006106	Timothy Doran (UK)	27/03/15	RBMPPoM	Schema: RBMPPoM; Parent Element: Costs; Element: Various; Comment to EEA: Several of the elements request "total investment expenditure should exclude expenditure on construction of waste water treatment plants.". Our economists request why this is important as a method of exclusion will have to be created.	This is a mistake introduced during the language check of the guidance. Instead of "total investment expenditure should exclude" should read "For example". Affects the following elements: Article113aInvestment20092015 Article113b114115Investment20092015 Article113a114115Investment20092015 Article113aInvestment20152021 Article113b114115Investment20152021	Done for v5.1	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150401 10003174	Timothy Doran (UK)	01/04/15	GWB	Schema: GWB; Element: GWPollutantCausingRisk; Comment to EEA: In England we do not have a list of chemicals causing individual water bodies to be at risk of failing their environment objectives. Our classification tool did not collect this information, as it was not needed at the time. We request that this element is made	We would kindly request further clarification as it seems contradictory to perform a risk assessment for chemical pollution and ending up not knowing which chemicals would cause the risk. Response to additional comment: We have significant problems to understand	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>optional or is removed.</p> <p>Additional comment from Tim (06/05/2015): We perform risk assessments for chemicals (GWBAtriskChemical = Yes) but do not produce a list of pollutants (GWPollutantCausingRisk). Although in xml terms GWPollutantCausingRisk is optional the QA/QC conditionality means that it is required in our case. This behaviour is not fine for us as we will not be able to validate the xml. Is it possible to either amend the QA/QC conditionality test to make it truly optional (not conditional) or add a value to the enumeration list such as "pollutant not recorded" or "not applicable" etc.</p>	<p>the logic of this the data collection practice. If the pollutant causing risk is not recorded, it will not be possible to take this up in the subsequent planning steps, hence the risk assessment will be void of purpose. Still, we agree to add an option to the enumeration list 'Pollutant not recorded'.</p>				
20150424 10000151	Stephan Hofmann (DE)	24/04/15	SWMET	<p>There are occurrence mismatches for the elements listed below in SWMET_2016.xsd: The text in the documentation tag isn't in sync with the attributive minimal occurrence (in absence defaulting to 1). This issue is also occurring in WFD reporting guidance_v4 9 clean.docx, which states the relationship explicitly.</p> <p>SCHEMA ELEMENT OBLIGATION SWMET AlternativeMixingZoneMethodologyReference doc: conditional.; att: 1 SWMET ApproachSWBNotMonitoredChemicalReference doc: conditional.; att: 1 SWMET BackgroundConcentrationsReference doc: conditional.; att: 1 SWMET</p>	<p>Changes to be updated in the schema and reporting guidance. Stating 0 to n relationship for the reported elements.</p>	Done for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed (check if conditional validation is implemented)

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				BioavailabilityReference doc: conditional.; att: 1 SWMET IRBDTypologyCoOrdinationReference doc: conditional.; att: 1 SWMET LongTermTrendAnalysisReference doc: conditional.; att: 1 SWMET MixingZoneMeasuresReductionReference doc: conditional.; att: 1 SWMET WaterResourcesPlansReference doc: conditional.; att: 1					
20150424 10000106	Stephan Hofmann (DE)	24/04/15	RBMPPoM	There are occurrence mismatches for the elements listed below in RBMPPoM_2016.xsd: The documentation isn't in sync with the minimal occurrence defaulting to 1. This issue is also occurring in WFD reporting guidance_v4 9 clean.docx, which states the relationship explicitly. ELEMENT OBLIGATION as stated in documentation SubPlansReference Conditional SEAReference Conditional WQCalculationMethodReference Conditional IRBMPReference Conditional EconomicAnalysisReference Conditional CostEffectivenessReference Conditional	Changes to be updated in the schema and reporting guidance. Stating 0 to n relationship for the reported elements.	Done for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				ServiceArticle94Reference Conditional ServiceCostInstrumentReference Conditional InputMethodReference Conditional					
20150407 10000201	Mans Denward (SE)	07/04/15	SWB	The xs:documentation to the schema element "SWB/SurfaceWaterBody/SWAssociatedProtectedAreas/SWOtherTypeOfProtectedArea" (version supplied at the resource page, 4.9, 23.02.2015) seems wrong. It does not describe the "Other" element but rather the "SWTypeOfProtectedArea".	The element 'SWOtherTypeOfProtectedArea' description was indeed wrong. We updated it on the UML, hence, it will be available on the next schemas v5.0 delivery. Current 'SWOtherTypeOfProtectedArea' description taken from the guide: Conditional. If the type of Protected Area is reported as 'Other', provide more information. Quality checks: Element check: String length must be a maximum of 250 characters. More than one value can be reported. Conditional check: Report if SWTypeOfProtectedArea is 'Other'.	Done for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150414 10000232	Kleemola Sirpa (FI)	14/04/15	SWB SWMonit GWB GWMonit RBDSUCA	In several places SWBs, SWMonitoringSites etc. there are requests for 'Readily understandable names or names in English'. Finnish lakes, rivers, waterbodies, and stations have names in Finnish and sometimes in Swedish, BUT NO English names! What are you looking for in these cases? Names without Scandinavian characters Ä,Ö,Å OR something else?	The names of rivers or lakes as such do not have translation but some of the water bodies or monitoring stations may have a more descriptive name (river X between lake Y and river Z; river X at the crossing with road A13; etc). If this is the case, we would like that descriptive name to be translated. If an English name does not exist, the attribute should read "Not applicable". Duplicating the original name will create problems (because we then have a mistach with the language codes).	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150414 10000232	Kleemola Sirpa (FI)	14/04/15	SWMonit	The flattening of the schemas has resulted into strange structures, were one should repeat the	The 'cardinality' issue on Access DB has been fixed. Since it is not required for the Schemas;	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				element several times. For example SWMonitoringPurpose. earlier there were separate elements for each of the directives, surveillance and operational sites etc. and now one should repeat the element for a number of purposes.	we didn't specify the 'source' multiplicity; after specifying it 'intermediate' tables are automatically created for N..N relationships This new Access DB version will be delivered with the v5.0 of the schemas.				
20150414 10000232	Kleemola Sirpa (FI)	14/04/15	SWB	In addition to point 2, there is a similar problem with Pressures and Impacts Instead of the earlier structure one should repeat the element SWSignificantPressureTypes several times, for all possible pressure types. Also in the Access table you would need to have several lines for one SWBody, if you have more than one pressure.	See above.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150414 10000232	Kleemola Sirpa (FI)	14/04/15	All	The date formats used are strange dd/mm/year	Not sure if the issue is clear but the date formats will be checked. Date format has changed following ISO8601 (YYYY-MM-DD).	Done v5.0	No action needed	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v6.0 (if needed)
20150414 10000232	Kleemola Sirpa (FI)	14/04/15	GWMonit SWMonit	Quantitative frequency (at least in GWMonitoring) is a decimal number. What is meant by this? is it times per year, what about times per month? If the groundwater monitoring site is used for quantitative monitoring, report the frequency of monitoring. Further guidance on what should be reported is provided in the glossary below. Quality checks: Element check: A decimal numeric value must be reported. Only one value can be reported. Conditional check: Report if Quantitative is 'Yes'	See guidance section 4.3.5 for guidance on how to fill in this element. However, the values for both 'Frequency' and 'Cycle' should be integers and not decimals.	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150417 10000058	Bilbomatic a	17/04/15	All	Generic Schemas Changes: #1 Naming convention	UML already updated	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>Classes (or complex types...): Singular form of noun, UpperCamelCase Attributes (or elements...): lowerCamelCase #2 Singulars / Plurals Fix the singular/plural forms of the elements</p> <p>Correct way of naming elements should be similar to: <SWAssociatedProtectedAreas> <SWAssociatedProtectedArea></p> <p>#3 2010/Old Only use one prefix to refer to old directive values, now both '2010' and 'Old' names are used.</p> <p>#4 Remove INSPIRE elements If an element is already defined on the GML schemas, remove it from the reporting schemas to avoid redundancies.</p> <p>#5 Root attributes - CreationDate: should be a 'Date' type. - DataConfidentialityClassificationCode: may be removed. Jorge's confirmation needed. - Language: define it for example as 'LanguageCodeType'; must be in accordance with INSPIRE code list. - Primary: Remove it.</p> <p>#6 Intermediate empty elements Delete, if possible, all the intermediate empty elements.</p> <p>#8 Multiplicity Check the multiplicity/cardinality of all the elements to be coherent with the Guide.</p>					
20150420 10000051	Bilbomatic a	20/04/15	WFDComm on	<p>Common schema changes: #1 Sanitize enumeration lists</p>	UML already updated	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use same values everywhere Only use a single '-' hyphen character Trim values; removing left/right blank spaces Use 'inheritance' <p>#2 Remove duplicates Remove duplicates, only defining a single enumeration list if the same values are needed for instance for SW and GW. e.g SWChemicalSubstances , GWChemicalParameterCodes,...</p> <p>#3 Rename enumeration Rename enumerations, so that they are not the same as the schemas elements names</p> <p>#4 ConcentrationUnitsCode The element enumeration list could/should follow UCUM as recommended by OGC, INSPIRE, etc...</p> <p>#5 URLType Create a new type (pattern) on the UML for URLs ('hyperlink' element) on Annex9</p>					
20150421 10000228	Bilbomatic a	21/04/15	RBDSUCA	<p>RBDSUCA schema changes</p> <p>#1 SubUnit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'SubUnitsDefined' element should be moved to 'RBD' complex type. Update 'SubUnit' cardinality to 0..* Review SubUnit elements (EUSubUnitCode, MSSubUnitCode, SubUnitName,..) and update their cardinality to 1..1 / 1..* if the elements are compulsory IF a SubUnit is specified. <p>#2 CompetentAuthority Add a new element 'OtherCompetentAuthorities' (type: FeatureUniqueEUCodeType) with a</p>	UML already updated	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	Pending for v5.0

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				cardinality of 0..* below 'PrimeCompetentAuthority' element.					
20150421 10000639	Bilbomatic a	21/04/15	SWMonit GWMonit	Monitoring schema changes #1 Schema name & Root element 'Monitoring' should be renamed to MonitoringSite	The schemas that have been changed are: SWMonitoring and GWMonitoring. Monitoring schema does not need changing.	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	Pending for v5.0
20150421 10000273	Bilbomatic a	21/04/15	SWB	SWB schema changes #1 Surface/Ground naming convention To avoid misunderstandings, same elements in Surface and Ground schemas should be named identically, in other words, avoid using SW/GW prefixes. #2 EUSurfaceWaterBodyCode2010 Element type should be updated to 'FeatureUniqueEUCodeType' #3 SurfaceWaterBodyNameNLLanguage Set the element cardinality to 1..1 ??? #4 SurfaceWaterBodyLongitude / SurfaceWaterBodyLatitude Delete this elements if MS agree #5 SurfaceWaterBodyTypeCode 'SurfaceWaterBodyTypeCode' SWB element and 'TypeCode' SWMET element should have identical names. #6 SurfaceWaterBodyNameNLLanguage No Action about cardinality required, the element will be moved to the GML schema.	UML already updated	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0
20150421 10000684	Bilbomatic a	21/04/15	GWMonit	GWMonitoring schema changes: #1 OldGWMonitoringSiteCode Element type should be changed to 'FeatureUniqueEUCodeType' #2 NewGWMonitoringSiteCode Since this element is not a Code, rename it to something like 'NewGWMonitoringSite'	UML already updated	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>#3 OldGWMonitoringSite Name is confusing, rename it to something like 'SupersedesOldGWMonitoringSite'</p> <p>#4 GWMonitoringSiteLongitude / GWMonitoringSiteLatitude Delete these elements if MS agree</p> <p>#5 Surface/Ground naming convention To avoid misunderstandings, same elements in Surface and Ground schemas should be named identically, in other words, avoid using SW/GW prefixes.</p> <p>#6 EURBDCode Add 'EURBDCode' element to 'GWMonitorings' complex type.</p>					
20150422 10000066	Bilbomatic a	22/04/15	SWMonit	<p>SWMonitoring schema changes:</p> <p>#1 OldSWMonitoringSiteCode Element type should be changed to 'FeatureUniqueEUCodeType'</p> <p>#2 SWChemicalSubstanceMonitored 'SWChemicalSubstanceMonitored' element should be moved to 'SWMonitorings' complex type and 'ChemicalSubstance' intermediate complex type removed.</p> <p>#3 OldSWMonitoringSite Name is confusing, rename it to something like 'SupersedesOldSWMonitoringSite'</p> <p>#4 SWMonitoringSiteLongitude / SWMonitoringSiteLatitude Delete these elements if MS agree</p> <p>#5 Surface/Ground naming convention To avoid misunderstandings, same elements in Surface and Ground schemas should be named identically, in other words, avoid using SW/GW prefixes.</p> <p>#6 EURBDCode</p>	UML already updated	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				Add 'EURBDCode' element to 'SWMonitorings' complex type.					
20150422 10000075	Bilbomatic a	22/04/15	ProtArea	<p>ProtectedArea schema changes They will pass to the GML</p> <p>#1 ProtectedAreaLongitude / ProtectedAreaLatitude Delete this elements if MS agree</p> <p>#2 ProtectedAreaSize / ProtectedAreaLength Simplify how this data is structured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ProtectedAreaSize: decimal (where the numeric value of the area in square km, or the numeric value of the length in km will be reported). ProtectedAreaSizeDimension: DimensionCode (where DimensionCode is a code list with two values: length and area) 	UML already updated	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0
20150421 10000326	Bilbomatic a	21/04/15	GWB	<p>GWB Schema changes</p> <p>#1 Surface/Ground naming convention To avoid misunderstandings, same elements in Surface and Ground schemas should be named identically, in other words, avoid using SW/GW prefixes.</p> <p>#2 EUGroundWaterBodyCode2010 Element type should be updated to 'FeatureUniqueEUCodeType'</p> <p>#3 GroundwaterBodyNameNLLanguage Set the element cardinality to 1..1 ???</p> <p>#4 GroundWaterBodyLongitude / GroundWaterBodyLatitude Delete this elements if MS agree</p> <p>#5 LinkSurfaceWaterBodiesCodes Element type should be updated to 'FeatureUniqueEUCodeType'</p> <p>#6 GWSignificantPressureTypes</p>	UML already updated	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>Fix typo: Pressure #7 Expected2015GoodQuantitativeStatus Fix typo: Quantitative #8 GroundwaterBodyNameNLLanguage: No Action about cardinality required, the element will be moved to the GML schema. #9 BackgroundNaturalSubstances BackgroundNaturalSubstance structure should be simplified. Particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'BackgroundOtherNaturalSubstances' complex types removed. 'BackgroundOtherNaturalSubstance' added as an element to 'BackgroundNaturalSubstancesC' <p>Implement a 'choise' type for 'BackgroundOtherNaturalSubstance' and 'BackgroundNaturalSubstance'</p>					
2015042410000071	Stefan Hofmann (DE)	24/04/15	ProtArea	<p>there's an occurrence mismatch for element "ProtectedAreaLegislationReference":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in ProtectedArea_2016.xsd: (...) <xs:element name="ProtectedAreaLegislationReference" type="wfd:Annex9" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"> (... in WFD reporting guidance_v4.9 clean.docx: (...) Schema element: ProtectedAreaLegislationReference Field type / facets / relationship: Reference structure (see Annex 9) (1-∞) Guidance on completion of schema element: Optional. (...) 	The guide seems to be wrong, the guide and the schemas will be updated for version 5.0 stating 0 to n relationship for the reported element.	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed (check if conditional validation is implemented)

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150506 10000255	Bilbomatic a	06/05/15	GML	<p>Changes on the spatial data schemas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All GML schemas: Attributes related with the version of the spatial objects will be moved to the spatial data (GML schema). - RiverBasinDistrict: Shape and location of the river basin district, as a surface, related to non-spatial information using EURBDCode. - SubUnit: Shape and location of the sub-units, as a surface, related to non-spatial information using EUSubUnitCode - RiverNetwork: Shape and location of the segments (real or virtual) of a watercourse (linear geometry) within a hydrographic network (<u>only river water body category and transitional represented by lines</u>), related to non-spatial information using EUSurfaceWaterBodyCode. - SurfaceWaterBody: Shape and location of the surface water bodies, as a surface, related to non-spatial information using EUSurfaceWaterBodyCode (<u>Water categories lakes, coastal and transitional as well as heavily modified rivers – reservoirs - represented by polygons</u>). - RiverBasinDistrict: Shape and location of the river basin district, as a surface, related to non-spatial information using EURBDCode. - SubUnit: Shape and location of the sub-units, as a surface, related to non-spatial information using EUSubUnitCode. - RiverNetwork: Shape and location of the segments (real or virtual) of a watercourse (linear geometry) within a hydrographic network (<u>only river water body category and transitional represented by lines</u>), related to non-spatial 	UML already updated	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				information using EUSurfaceWaterBodyCode - SurfaceWaterBody: Shape and location of the surface water bodies, as a surface, related to non-spatial information using EUSurfaceWaterBodyCode (Water categories lakes, coastal and transitional represented by polygons).					
20150219 10000101	Stephan Hofmann (DE)	19/02/15	GWB	<p>Mismatch in GWB_2016.xsd there's a Mismatch in GWB_2016.xsd: The following element's documentation doesn't match its current occurrence attribution: Element:</p> <pre><xs:element name="GroundwaterBodyChanges" type="wfd:YesNoNewCodeChanged"> <xs:annotation> <xs:documentation> Current writing: "Required. If the groundwater body has been re-delineated since it was reported in the first RBMP in 2010, this element must be reported." This conditional statement isn't in sync with the current occurrence attribution of element GroundwaterBodyChanges, which defaults to 1 and represents therefore the unconditional obligation "required"</pre>	The guidance would be needed to be updated.	No action needed	Pending v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150316 10000187	Iker Garcia (Bilbomatika)	16/03/15	SWMET	There is a mistake in the guidance document version 4.9 page 165-166, 'IRBDTypologyCoOrdinationReference' multiplicity should be 0-many, not 1-many to reflect that it is conditional.	Included in Ticket#2015042410000151 above.	Done for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150317 10000265	Stephan Hofmann (DE)	17/03/15	SWMET	In http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/help/WFD/WFD_52_1_2016/WFD%20reporting%20guidanc[.]. , chapter	The table referred to is to be included in the RBMPs or background documents. The information requested is not readily derivable from the schemas.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>7.3.3.3. Guidance on contents of RBMPs/background documents, it is mentioned, that the European Commission expects to find a table called "Drivers and impacts behind failure": "(...) Include the following table in the RBMP or background document on the drivers and impacts behind the failure of ecological status. The cells should contain the number of surface water bodies failing due to the relevant driver and impact.(...)" (see p. 183). It is understood that the numbers of waterbodies concerned are requested, aggregated on RBD-Level. Could you please advise how this detailed driver / impact relationship is reflected in the schemas available and therefore could be reused for the aggregation required?</p>					
20150325 10000115	Stephan Hofmann (DE)	25/03/15	All GML	<p>In the WFD Reporting Guidance 2016 (Vers. 4.9) we read: INSPIRE check: this will ensure that the reporting contents are in line with the INSPIRE data specifications The result of the INSPIRE Check does not show any progress to us. There are a couple INSPIRE documents available that clearly state how to bind the INSPIRE spatial object data with other thematic data describing the same real world object - which exactly covers our use case "e-reporting". Every INSPIRE object carries an external object identifier (Attribute: inspireId) and a thematic identifier (thematicId, e.g. the thematicId in the INSPIRE Annex theme "Data Specification on</p>	<p>This was discussed at the WG DIS in April 2015. The objective is not full alignment with the INSPIRE data specifications but foster convergence. However, after discussions it seems more efficient to move the INSPIRE elements that are currently scattered across the schemas to the spatial datasets (GML). The suggestion on thematic identifiers was adopted in order to keep data models stable.</p>	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				Area Management/Restriction/Regulation Zones and Reporting Units" and its counterpart, the EUSurfaceWaterBodyCode within the SWB_2016 schema). These are the elements/attributes to bind the data sets. We wonder why these INPIRE identifiers have not been integrated into the WFD reporting schemas (conditional, mandatory by 2020) in order to keep the schemas stable for the coming years? Instead it looks like that some elements have been chosen from the INSPIRE IR data model arbitrarily. These will inevitably lead to competing information for an identical object in two separate data models. It is questionable whether the result presented in the Guidance Document is not counter-productive.					
20150327 10000148	Hana Prchalova, Olaf Büttner, Vít Kodeš (ETC)	27/03/15	WFDCommon	the ETC/ICM works on the common codelist of substances, I think there is a good chance to incorporate this list into the WFD guidance (codelist currently contains cca 4000 substances). This would help to unify identification of substances across various reporting streams.	The guidance would be needed to be updated.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed	Pending for v5.0
20150401 10000257	Renata Grofova (SK)	01/04/15	-	Thank you for possibility to commenting the WFD Reporting Guidance 2016 and WFD GIS guidance. Slovak comments are as follow: 1. Editorial proposal for "WFD Reporting Guidance 2016 (version 4.9 of 30 January 2015)": 12.1. Targets for the third planning cycle - proposal to add reference for MIG Wiki for further information: "These are essential parts of the INSPIRE Maintenance and implementation work programme (https://ies-svn.jrc.ec.europa.eu/projects/mig-inspire/wiki),	The guidance would be needed to be updated.	No action needed	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>which is therefore to be considered in the implementation."</p> <p>2. Clarification from the GIS guidance (version 5 of 23 January 2015):</p> <p>2.1. Current guidance is mainly referring to the INSPIRE Hydrography data specification, whilst recent EEA/EC activities (https://ies-svn.jrc.ec.europa.eu/attachments/download/1022/Darja_INSPIRE-WFD-Reporting.pptx) indicates extensibility of WFD & INSPIRE reporting mapping on conceptual level also towards the INSPIRE Area management, Environmental monitoring facilities, Protected sites and Geology themes.</p> <p>Although this kind of reporting harmonisation initiative are very important and work done so far highly appreciated, at this moment it's unclear under which extent this mapping is foreseen to be supported on the data level either during the testing phase, or WFD implementation phase with respect to the resources and expertise available on MS level.</p> <p>3. Other small editorial comments for GIS guidance:</p> <p>[endif]Section 3: Reference to WISE reporting arrangement is missing.</p> <p>[endif]Section 6.3: Incorrect webpage. Correct webpage is: http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu.</p> <p>[endif]Section 7.1: We suggest adding possibility to use INSPIRE metadata profile too. "E. g .”Metadata should be reported using the WISE profile or INSPIRE metadata profile at least.”</p> <p>[endif]Section 9: Reference [6] is not correct.</p>					

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				Link is not touching the document directly. The link is matching only with CIRCABC homepage and it is not easy to find the right document). [endif]Section 8.2: Nor EC neither EEA can not distribute all forms of geographical data (shapefiles, gml (?), because of licence policy of national data sources. These conditions should be mentioned in Section 8.2. Also, it is not clear what the Categories 1, 2, 3 refer to.					
20150330 10000025	Fernanda Nery (EEA)	30/03/15	GML	<p>As a parallel activity to the review of the GIS guidance, a number of duplications and potential sources of inconsistency were identified in the WFD Reporting Guidance - namely in the "GIS information" sections.</p> <p>The following changes are proposed:</p> <p>#1 (Page 37) Remove the text in 2.2.3.3. Put the information in the GIS guidance. Refer the reader to the GIS guidance. In the GIS guidance, don't separate polygons per type of surface water bodies (as discussed on 2015-04-27 meetings).</p> <p>#2 (Page 83) Remove the text in 3.2.3.3. Put the information in the GIS guidance. Refer the reader to the GIS guidance. In the GIS guidance, confirm if the attributes Horz_type and GW Sub-Unit are indeed used and where.</p> <p>#3 (Page 132) Remove the text in 4.3.3.</p>	The guidance would be needed to be updated.	Done v5.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>Put the information in the GIS guidance. Refer the reader to the GIS guidance. The text need to be reviewed according to the decision to be taken on the geometry of monitoring stations (also connected to the discussion on the inspireID, see OTRS ticket and discussion on the 2015-04-27 meetings).</p> <p>#4 (Page 149) Remove the text in 5.3.3. Put any relevant information in the GIS guidance. Refer the reader to the GIS guidance. There is still no decision from ENV on the data reported under other directives.</p> <p>#5 (Page 160) The text under heading 6.3.1 requires no change, since it simply refers the user to the GIS guidance. Full information on the reporting of RBD and SUs should be there.</p> <p>#6 (Page 300) The text under 10.2.2 is correct, no change necessary.</p> <p>#7 (Page 375) Remove Annex 4: Groundwater bodies and horizon assignment Rewrite the text so that it is consistent with the final reporting structure, and put it in the GIS guidance.</p> <p>#8 (Page 389) Remove the text under the heading.</p>					

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>#9 (where applicable) All the sections named "GIS information" to be renamed to "Spatial data sets".</p> <p>Finally, a number of minor changes that have to do with the terminology being used.</p>					
20150401 10000195	Katrien Bursens (BE)	01/04/15	GWB GML	<p>The Flemish region of Belgium had some comments or questions about the GIS guidance. There seems to be an inconsistency between the GIS-guidance (4.2.6.3. pg. 21) and Annex 4 to the WFD Reporting Guidance 2016 which is mentioned as reference in the guidance. In the guidance only 4 horizons in groundwater are possible: "For the purpose of preparation of GWB reference layers and future WISE maps it is appropriate to specify the succession of the GWB-horizons (1, 2, 3, 4 where 1 is the first horizon from the surface). In case data for more than four horizons exist, all horizons beneath horizon 3 could be combined in horizon 4. This horizon could accordingly be named "deeper horizons"."</p> <p>In Appendix 4 "Groundwater bodies and horizon assignment", 2.1. it is written that: "There is no limitation in the number of horizons;" Can this be clarified?</p> <p>A normal river network is consisting in an inversed tree of brooks, rivers and a stream flowing to the sea. Each main river has several tributaries coming together in confluences. But this flow pattern can be altered by interventions of humans. Rivers can be diverted by canals or other artificial derivations. Is there the need to make the distinction between confluences, bifurcations or other derivations ? On which way</p>	<p>There can be many horizons but the proposal is to combine the horizons 4 and beyond into a single dataset for the purpose of reporting. As regards the distinction between confluences and bifurcations there is no need to distinguish those.</p> <p>In the case of rivers that cross the border or that form a border between countries the recommendation is to harmonise the geographical dataset. Both Member States would report the same water body. Please note that the GIS data sets and reporting guidance are being updated.</p>	No action needed	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				to make this distinction ? In an international river basin district, gaps or overlaps of rivers are not allowed. Each member state will represent the river network on his territory. But what about common river segments where the river forms the border between two member states ex. Meuse between Belgium and the Netherlands? If both member state represent the common river segment, it will appear twice.					
20150326 10000417	Hana Prchalova (ETC)	26/03/15	GWB GWMET GWMonit	<p>Enumeration lists of groundwater pollutants: Groundwater pollutant information is included in three groundwater schemas – GWB (Pollutants causing failure or upward trends and information about Natural background values); than GWMET (threshold values for each assessed pollutants) and GWMonitoring (monitored pollutants). While enumeration list of GW pollutants for GWMonitoring (see Annex 8c) covers several tens of pollutants (without CAS), enumeration lists for GWB and GWMET (see Annex 8j and 8p) include only 12 pollutants according to the Annex of GWD. The names and CAS of all other assessed pollutants should be developed by MSs. Herewith the enumeration lists for SWB (e.g. Annex 8e) covers most of assessed groundwater pollutants.</p> <p>We recommend harmonising GWB pollutant enumeration lists (keep 12 pollutants and indicators, but prepare extended list of other pollutants, e.g. based on previous reporting with added CAS – if exists). The common list will reduce some work of MSs, but mainly helps to EEA – if countries develop their own lists (in national language) it is very difficult to split</p>	The enumeration lists for pollutants will be updated and harmonised.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v5.0	Pending for v5.0	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				them. Only very specific pollutants should be reported by countries, but CAS and English name for pollutant or indicator should be required.					
20150518 10000027	Ramona Curelea (RO)	18/05/2015	RBMPPoM	Path: RBMPPoM/EconomicAnalysis/Services Schema element: ServiceEnvironmentalCharge Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. Indicate whether an environmental charge or tax is applied for this water service. Quality checks: Element check: ServiceEnvironmentalCharge must be reported. A valid option must be selected from the enumeration list. Only one option can be selected. Comment: We talk about Environmental cost ?	The answer to your first question is yes, the schema element ServiceEnvironmentalCharge refers to environmental charges or taxes to recover environmental costs.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000027	Ramona Curelea (RO)	18/05/2015	RBMPPoM	Path: RBMPPoM/EconomicAnalysis Schema element: CostRecoveryReference Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. Provide references or hyperlinks to documents and sections where specific information on the application of cost recovery can be found. Guidance on what should be included in this document is provided in Section 11.2.3. Quality checks: Element check: More than one reference structure can be reported. Comment: There are different references due to different services under the cost recovery principles. In which way we should fill in? By adding a new row for each service?	As regards your second question, you can report as many references as you wish (the multiplicity of the schema element CostRecoveryReference is one to many).	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000116	Ramona Curelea (RO)	18/05/2015	SWB	#1. For the simplification and streamlining of the reporting process we recommend to use the water body code (unique) instead of WaterBodyID. The reason is to simplify the schema and to avoid unfeasible multiplication of	These comments have been incorporated in the Access DB 5.0	Done v5.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>number of waterbodies (multiple surfaceWaterBodyID) as a consequence of selecting multiple choices when inserting information for a certain waterbody in these tables.</p> <p>For example, to use the water body code instead of surfaceWaterBodyID in the tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SurfaceWaterBody, - QualityElementQEXSoP, - SWEcologicalExemptionTypes, - SWAssociatedProtectedAreas, - SWExceedances, - SWChemicalExceedances, - SWChemicalExemptionTypes 					
20150518 10000116	Ramona Curelea (RO)	18/05/2015	Monitoring, ProtectedArea, SWB, GWB, SWMET, GWMET, SWMonitoring, GWMonitoring and RBD	#2. For schema element Primary from tables Monitoring, ProtectedArea, SWB, GWB, SWMET, GWMET, SWMonitoring and RBD it is not possible to select the indicated options (Yes/No), the access database auto-generating 0 or -1.	The primary field is not longer present in the Access DB 5.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000116	Ramona Curelea (RO)	18/05/2015	Access DB	#3. We propose to rename each table in order to contain the name of the schemas, for example: from BackgroundOtherNaturalSubstancesC to GWBBackgroundOtherNaturalSubstancesC.	This is not present in the Access DB 5.0, due to the limitations on the table name length limitations	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000116	Ramona Curelea (RO)	18/05/2015		#5. The conversion and validation tools available in the testing phase, respectively: [1]Conversion tool from Access Database to XML following v. 4.9 and	We are working on a new version of the XML conversion tool for the v5. And further documentation will be provided.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>[2]converterstest.eionet.europa.eu are running incomplete. The XML schemas converted from access database are not correct, the information filled in is missing and the schemas are duplicated (GWB1, GWB2, SWB1, SWB2, etc.). There are unclear and insufficient specifications related to conversion procedure. What is content registry file list? Please provide details for the conversion steps.</p> <p>[1] http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/help/WFD/WFD_521_2016/FME_processes/FME_AccessToXML.html [2] http://converterstest.eionet.europa.eu/do/qaSandboxForm</p>					
20150518 10000125	Ramona Curelea (RO)	18/05/2015	SWB	<p>#1. In table QualityElementQEXSoP, the schema element QEXGrouping is conditional and will be filled in relation with the previous column, MonitoringResults. If the column MonitoringResults is filled with 'No', then the column QEXGrouping must be also filled by indicating „the codes of the surface water bodies which have been monitored and used in grouping”.</p> <p>Comment: It must be clarified what the term “grouping” means. If the term grouping refers only to the extrapolation of monitoring data from other surface bodies or „grouping” refers “to extrapolating monitoring data from other surface water bodies or by expert judgement”. In our national approach, grouping means only: by extrapolating monitoring data from other surface bodies. In case that status has been derived by expert judgement, no water body</p>	<p>The comment is pertinent. The option "Expert judgement" will be allowed in this element. The guidance and the QA/QC will be amended consequently. The guidance text for the element 'qexMonitoringResults' will be amended as follows:</p> <p>Conditional. If the status is reported, indicate on what basis the status classification was derived: 'Monitoring': means the this QE was monitored in this surface water body and the results are used as a basis for classification. 'Grouping': the QE was not monitored in this surface water body. Monitoring from other similar water bodies was used as a basis for classification, as described in the methodology for classification. 'Expert judgement': the QE was not monitored</p>	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	Pending for v6.0

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>code is in view! Idem for SWChemicalMonitoringResults.</p>	<p>in this surface water body. Results from other similar water bodies were not used. The QE status is mainly based on expert judgement. Quality checks: Conditional check: Report if element qexStatusOrPotentialValue is '1', '2', '3', '4' or '5' (i.e. not 'N' or 'U'). Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0</p> <p>The conditional checks of the element 'qexGrouping' should be: Conditional check: Report if qexMonitoringResults is 'Grouping'</p> <p>The guidance text for the element 'swChemicalMonitoringResults' will be amended as follows (please note the change from required to conditional):</p> <p>Conditional. indicate on what basis the status classification was derived: 'Monitoring': there is monitoring data available from this water body and this is used for classification. 'Grouping': there is no monitoring data available from this water body. Monitoring from other similar water bodies was used as a basis for classification, as described in the methodology for classification. 'Expert judgement': there is no monitoring data available in this surface water body. Results from other similar water bodies were not used. The status is mainly based on expert judgement.</p>				

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					Quality checks: Conditional check: Report if element swChemicalStatusValue is '2' or '3' (i.e. not 'U'). Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0				
20150518 10000125	Ramona Curelea (RO)	18/05/2015	SWB	#2. For schema element EcologicalStatusOrPotentialValue we suggest to create the symbol for classification "N" Not-applicable (in relation to ecological status or potential classifications for QE1 which also includes this symbol).	The element 'EcologicalStatusOrPotentialValue' reports the status or potential of the surface water body. The option 'Not applicable' is not possible. At QE level this option makes sense because the quality element may not be applicable for a specific type or water body (e.g. phytoplankton for small streams).	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000125	Ramona Curelea (RO)	18/05/2015	SWB	#3. Table SurfaceWaterBody should be split in two (one part should refer to the ecological status and the other to the chemical status) otherwise would be difficult to follow one water body (there will be too many lines multiplied for a single water body due to multiple pressures, impacts, water uses, etc. Also there is certain information that is relevant for ecological status (e.g. IC type, hydromorphological alterations, etc.) or chemical status only (mixing zones, etc.);	This is a question of presentation. One of the aims of the review of the schemas was to keep them as flat as possible. This reduces the number of tables but makes them larger. The advantage of creating another layer is not clear.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000125	Ramona Curelea (RO)	18/05/2015	SWB	#4. Schema element SurfaceWaterBodyChanges: "NameChanged" should be added as an alternative response.	If only the name has changed, the same code should be reported under 'euSurfaceWaterBodyCode', new name should be reported under 'surfaceWaterBodyName' and the option 'No' should be chosen in 'SurfaceWaterBodyChanges'. We are only interested in changes in delineation.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150402 10000184	Ernst Überreiter	02/04/2015	Guidance	WFD Reporting guidance 2016 v.4.9:	Notes have been added before each product table to indicate that for all relevant products	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
	(AT)			There are still evaluations only on the basis of number of waterbodies; additional evaluations on the basis of length/area of water bodies are missing although it was agreed by EC to provide both;	"information on surface water bodies will be presented by number of surface water bodies and by size (length or area) as well as percentage" and " information on groundwater bodies will be presented by number of groundwater bodies and by size (area) as well as percentage"				
20150402 10000184	Ernst Überreiter (AT)	02/04/20 15	Guidance	<u>XML schemas v.4.9:</u> A cross check with the WFD Reporting guidance 2016 v.4.9 - which is endorsed by the Water Directors – showed, that a huge number of elements is not correctly implemented as „conditional“ but as „required“. This must be corrected in the XML schemas.	This will be thoroughly revised.	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150402 10000184	Ernst Überreiter (AT)	02/04/20 15	QA/QC	<u>QA/QC specifications for the 2016 WFD reporting cycle – v.2.2:</u> Chapter 4: most evaluations are only on the basis of number of waterbodies; additional evaluations on the basis of length/area of water bodies are missing although it was agreed by EC to provide both; please add „length/area“ as appropriate; e.g.: chapter 4.2.1 Total number, <i>length/area</i> of surface waterbodies; e.g. chapter 4.2.2 Number, <i>length/area</i> and percentage <i>respectively</i> of HMWB; We very much appreciate that the row „critical?“ was deleted in the tables of chapter 2.	The document will be reviewed to include additional presentations on the basis of length/area.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	Pending for v6.0
20150402 10000184	Ernst Überreiter (AT)	02/04/20 15	GIS	<u>Draft GIS guidance for 2016:</u> Why do you still reference to the WISE Metadata Profile and not to the INSPIRE Profile?	This has been corrected. The INSPIRE metadata profile is adopted.	No action needed	No action needed	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150408	Krzysztof	08/04/20	QA/QC	I have a problem with content of xml file	The problems should be solved in the new	Pending	No action	No action	No action

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
10000128	Chechtacz (PL)	15		extracted from 'WFD Reporting Database v3' with data . XML conversion tool don't extract a data from database file. When I write down xml file, program does automatically suggests no date (like in flood conversion tool). My system win8.1 x32 ent.	versions of the converter.	for v6.0	needed	needed	needed
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/20 15	SWB	<i>SurfaceWaterBodyChanges:</i> In case a SWB has been re-delineated since it was reported in 2010 and it also has changed its code, how this situation has to be reported? (e.g. we have many cases in which some SWBs have been merged in a SWB. At the same time the SWBs reported in 2010 changed their codes and the new codification has a 1 to many relationship.) (CAP 2.2)	This information has been moved to the spatial data.	No action needed	No action needed	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/20 15	SWB	<i>SWSignificantPressureTypes and SWSignificantImpactTypes:</i> <i>Some pressures/impacts in the enumeration list of the access DB are different from the pressure/impacts of Annex 1a and Annex 1b (e.g. pressure "1.3 Point - Point - IED plants" in the DB enumeration list is "1.3 Point - IED plants" in Annex 1a); In Annex 1b "Unknown impact types" is missing. (CAP 2.3)</i>	Indeed there are 3 entries with the word 'Point' duplicated in 'SignificantPressureTypes_Enum'. To be corrected in the schemas. 'Unknown impact types' will be reflected as well in the guidance.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/20 15	SWB	<i>QEXGrouping:</i> <i>if QEXMonitoringResults is No, it means that the status can be derived by grouping or by expert judgment; if it is derived by expert judgment, in QEXGrouping it also should be possible to put a string without codes i.e. "expert judgment". The QA/QC- within schema check should allow this.</i> <i>Moreover the guidance is not clear where says: "the status has been derived through grouping by extrapolating monitoring....or by expert</i>	This is solved by the proposal in ticket 2015051810000125 above.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<i>judgment”; it seems that grouping has to be done in both cases and this is justified also by the fact that this field requires the codes of the SWB used in grouping also in case of expert judgment. (CAP 2.4)</i>					
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/20 15	SWMET	SWMET – SWRBSP, element: RBSP <i>If it is chosen “Other”, it is not possible to report the name and CAS of RBSP that are not in the enumeration list; This specific information is lost. (CAP 7.3)</i>	Indeed this seems to be the case in both SWB/swFailingRBSP and in SWMET/SWRBSP This needs to be corrected by adding an additional element after each of these to allow the report of CAS and name of substance (string).	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/20 15	GWB	GWPressuresNotAssessed <i>The list of pressure is unique for GW and SW. Should be reported also the pressures that are merely for SWBs? (CAP 8)</i>	No, those pressures that are obviously applicable only for surface waters should not be reported in this element.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/20 15	GWB	GWB-GWChemicalStatus, element: GWGoodChemicalStatusAchievementDate. <i>The min occurrence should be 0 (CAP 3)</i>	Yes, this needs to be corrected.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/20 15	GWMonitoring	GWMonitoring, element: QuantitativeLastMonitored Should be Conditional and not Required (CAP 4)	Yes, this needs to be corrected. Replace the annotation of 'quantitativeLastMonitored' by the following, with the pertinent QA conditional check: Conditional. If the groundwater monitoring site is used for quantitative monitoring, report the most recent year in the format YYYY that was monitored. Enter -8888 if parameter has yet to be measured. Quality checks: Element check: Year must be in the format YYYY. Report -8888 if the parameter has not yet been measured. Conditional check: report if 'quantitative' is 'Yes'. Properties:	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0				
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/20 15	PA	PA - ProtectedAreas , element: <i>ProtectedAreaLegislationReference</i> The min occurrence should be 0 (CAP 5)	This information is now in the ProtectedAreas spatial data set and it is called 'legalBasisName', 'legalBasisLink' and 'legalBasisLevel'. All three are required by INSPIRE.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/20 15	GWMET	<i>GWMethodologiesTransboundaryReference</i> It should be CONDITIONAL and not Required, because element <i>GroundWaterBodyTransboundary</i> could be NO (CAP 8)	Yes, this needs to be corrected. Replace the annotation of 'GWMethodologiesTransboundaryReference' by the following, with the pertinent QA conditional check: Conditional. Provide references or hyperlinks to the documents and sections where relevant information relating to transboundary co-ordination of threshold value setting can be found. Guidance on what should be included in this document is provided in Section 8.3.3.3. Conditional check: report if 'transboundaryGWBPpresent' is 'Yes'. Properties: maxOccurs =unbounded minOccurs = 0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	Pending for v6.0
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/20 15	SWMET SWBQE	SWMET –SWBQE , elements: <i>QECODEBQENAME</i> <i>PhysChemStandardValue</i> The quality checks (max 1000 character) is not correct because the string length is max 250 (CAP 7)	This comment is no longer relevant as the element quality checks will not be explicitly mentioned in the guidance.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/2015	SWMET	<p>SWMET- SWChemicalStatusClassificationPS, elements:</p> <p><i>PSMatrix,</i></p> <p><i>PSCategory,</i></p> <p><i>PSType,</i></p> <p><i>PSValue,</i></p> <p><i>PSUnit,</i></p> <p><i>PSEULevel</i></p> <p>All CONDITIONAL; the min occurrence should be 0 (CAP 7)</p>	Yes, this needs to be corrected. The order of the elements in the schema needs to be changed so that the element 'psStandardsUsed' appears before the elements listed to the left which are conditional on it. In addition, the element 'psEULevel' needs to be moved below the element 'CombinationMatrixCategoryType'.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	Pending for v6.0
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/2015	SWMET	<p>SWMET- SWPhysicoChemicalQE, element:</p> <p><i>PhysChemStandardExpression</i></p> <p>Quality check has to be corrected. Only one option can be selected (CAP 7)</p>	This is no longer relevant as these comments have been deleted (redundant with multiplicity).	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/2015	SWMET	<p>SWMET – SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD, elements:</p> <p><i>ApproachSWBNotMonitoredChemicalReference</i></p> <p><i>BackgroundConcentrationsReference</i></p> <p><i>BioavailabilityReference</i></p> <p><i>LongTermTrendAnalysisReference</i></p> <p><i>AlternativeMixingZoneMethodologyReference</i></p> <p><i>MixingZoneMeasuresReductionReference</i></p> <p>All the elements are CONDITIONAL. The min occurrence should be 0 (CAP 7)</p>	<p>The multiplicity in the guidance 4.9 is not correct in some cases, but the text in the "guidance..." is correct. All references should be conditional in its corresponding element except the 'chemicalStatusReference' which is required.</p> <p>The order of the elements in the schema has to be changed to match that in the guidance 4.9, otherwise it is confusing.</p>	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/2015	SWMET	SWMET – SWManagementObjectives , elements: <i>ManagementObjectivesReference</i> <i>WaterResourcesPlansReference</i> All CONDITIONAL; the min occurrence should be 0 (CAP 7)	Yes, it will be corrected [already included in version 5.1].	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/2015	RBMPPoM	RBMPPoM – RBMP <i>SubPlansReference</i> <i>SEAReference</i> <i>InternationalCoOrdination</i> <i>InternationalCoOrdinationPublicParticipation</i> All CONDITIONAL; the min occurrence should be 0 (CAP 9)	Yes, it will be corrected [already included in version 5.1].	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/2015	RBMPPoM	RBMPPoM – InputPollutants- InputCategories , element: <i>InputYearPeriod</i> Number or String? (CAP 9)	This is a string. If reporting a year, use e.g. '2010' If reporting a period, use the ISO notation: '2008--2010'	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000063	Francesca Piva (IT)	18/05/2015	RBMPPoM	RBMPPoM – KTM , element: <i>BasicMeasureType</i> It is CONDITIONAL; the min occurrence should be 0 (CAP 10)	The order of the elements have to be the same as in the guidance 4.9. 'basicMeasureType' is conditional and therefore minoccur should be 0.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000223	Cécile GOZLER (FR)	18/05/2015	SurfaceWaterBodyCategory	For the 2 nd cycle : No need to have a territorial category even as an artefact since the chemical status is only to be considered for coastal waters. <u>Proposal</u> to add a schema element into chapter 7 asking MS if they have included (Yes/No) the	If France does not associate a differentiated status to territorial waters, it can opt not report the territorial waters using the available "artefact". The approach taken can be explained in the reference element 'chemicalStatusReference' in the schema SWMET.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				chemical status of territorial waters in the chemical status of coastal waters and ask MS to provide links to an explanatory document. If the MS have not taken into account the chemical status of territorial waters then provide an explanation in the readme first note. (Page 2.2.3.2)					
2015051810000223	Cécile GOZLER (FR)	18/05/2015	Reservoir	Add "artificial" in the guidance on completion to be coherent with the schema element NaturalAWBHMWB (page 2.2.3.2)	"Artificial" plays no role in this element as it deals with HMWB only (see conditional check). Therefore this element does not need to be reported for AWBs.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
2015051810000223	Cécile GOZLER (FR)	18/05/2015	SWChemical Monitoring Results and SWChemical StatusGrouping	We will reply "No" for SWB status not directly derived from monitoring but we won't be able to answer the conditional question on grouping because we don't group or extrapolate monitoring data or use expert judgement. We have other ways to evaluate status which don't allow to refer to any water bodies. What could we do ? (Page 2.5.3.2)	See changes to these elements in ticket 2015051810000125 above. If France advises what is the approach they use an option could be added.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
2015051810000223	Cécile GOZLER (FR)	18/05/2015	SWImprove mentChemicalStatus	At the end of the guidance add: "except for Naphtalene based on the 2013 EQS" (Page 2.5.3.2)	We would like to know if there have been real improvements independently of the regulatory change, also for Naphtalene even if the standard for transitional and coastal waters have been made less stringent.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
2015051810000223	Cécile GOZLER (FR)	18/05/2015	GWPollutantCausingRisk	In annex 8j "Active substances in pesticides" is required. Given that mainly products of deterioration of active substances pesticides are found in GW that means most parameters of pesticides causing risk of not reaching objectives would be reported under OtheRelevantGWPollutantRisk. How to report the total of pesticides under the	Unclear what is proposed.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				GW Directive, which set up a European quality standard, which is often a downgrading parameter? (Page 3.5.3.2)					
20150518 10000223	Cécile GOZLER (FR)	18/05/20 15	OldSWMoni toringSite OldSWMoni toringCode	No information on the genealogy and no provisions to do in the future. What use/interest of this kind of information ? (Page 4.3.2)	The interest is to be able to keep track of the time series and develop trends of monitoring data e.g. under SoE, if monitoring station are replaced.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000223	Cécile GOZLER (FR)	18/05/20 15	SWChemical MatrixPurp ose SWChemical Frequency	We won't select "suspended sediment trend" in the list so the quality check in SWChemicalFrequency won't work. (Page 4.3.2)	Unclear what the issue is. The frequency needs to be reported for each substance/matrix combination. If "suspended sediment trend" is not used, then it should not be reported.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000223	Cécile GOZLER (FR)	18/05/20 15	Programme Category	In fact it is a summary of what has already reported at the site. It's redundant. Proposal not to report (Page 4.3.2)	Although it is recognised there is a degree of redundancy, the former reporting of monitoring networks demonstrated that it is beneficial for data processing and exploitation to have the information on water category at the level of monitoring programme.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150518 10000223	Cécile GOZLER (FR)	18/05/20 15	KTM to tackle significant pressures	The reporting guidance considers RBD or Sub-unit level to report pressures and indicators of pressures and measures. The requested information are not available at the sub unit level nor relevant /used. The PoM is at RBD level and therefore we will report at this level . But the cross schema check with RBDSUCA schema will be a problem when sub units are declared in RBDSUCA schema. (Page 10.1.8)	The main objective of the subunits is to report on measures. If reporting of measures is not done at subunit level, why would FR report them at all?	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150519 10000132	Denward Måns (SE)	19/05/20 15	SWB	<i>About reporting of status or potential, for quality elements, in schema SWB.</i>	The proposed approach will risk losing important information from other MS. It is proposed that Sweden reports the nutrient	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p><i>Status or potential of nutrient conditions are to be reported as SWB/SurfaceWaterBody/QualityElement "QE3161NitrogenConditions" and "QE3162PhosphorusConditions". This is not possible for Sweden without difficulty since nutrient conditions are assessed and not nitrogen or phosphorus respectively. The assessment methods are designed for the combination of nitrogen and phosphorus, together. Sweden does not have readily available separate assessments of nitrogen and phosphorus.</i></p> <p><i>Even though we realise the benefits of separate status assessments of nitrogen and phosphorus, this is not possible to achieve at this stage in the ongoing water management cycle. We suggest that it is made possible to report status or potential for nutrient conditions (QE3-1-6) as a complement to the quality elements available at present. This will enable Sweden to report this important aspect.</i></p> <p><i>In the last reporting exercise, regarding WFD and ecological status, nutrient conditions were reported as a part of general conditions also including transparency, thermal conditions, oxygenation conditions, salinity and acidification conditions. The water framework directive only refers to nutrient conditions in annex V and not to nitrogen or phosphorous separately.</i></p>	<p>conditions in both "QE3161NitrogenConditions" and "QE3162PhosphorusConditions" elements, i.e. the same information in both elements, and the approach is explained in the reference element 'ecologicalStatusReference' under SWMET.</p>				
20150519 10000141	Denward Måns (SE)	20/05/20 15	SWB	<p><i>Sweden has revised the delineation between coastal waters and transitional waters. This has resulted in a change in water category for some</i></p>	<p>This should be no problem. The same ID can be associated to a different water category. The enumeration list in</p>	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<i>water bodies. How should this change be reported? We are keeping the identification number (MS/EU_CD) for these water bodies and will report them as the new category. Will that suffice? There is no item suitable for this type of change in SWB/SurfaceWaterBody/TypeSurfaceWaterBody Changes (Merged, Split, Both merged and split, Extended, Reduced).</i>	'TypeSurfaceWaterBodyChanges' can be used independently of the change of water category.				

3 WFD 2016 5.0 version

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150521 10000404	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	21/05/2015	RBMPPoM	<p>during a meeting with LAWA experts held yesterday following question relating to SchemaElement "BasicMeasureType" (page 287, Schema Schema: RBMPPoM, "For each national or RBD specific measure report the following information:") occurred:</p> <p>"Why does the enumeration list for SchemaElement "BasicMeasureType" not include Nature Directives, especially Habitats Directive?" I checked WG DIS minutes from last meetings and also my notes but I can't find justification for this. As far as I remember the omission of Nature Directives was decided because PoM information should bring into focus relations between Key Type Measures and pressures. Therefore it was agreed to limit required information to those Directives with needs for measures tackling significant pressures.</p> <p>If so it would be very helpful to add this clarification or the reason for omission in chapter 10.1.</p> <p>In this context I have seen that there is no chapter or SchemaElement with a reference to Annex 8r List of indicators for pressures. Therefore the relevance of Annex 8r is unclear. Please add references to Annex 8r in SchemaElement "IndicatorGap". In addition it would be helpful to add an explanation about the relationship between Annex 3 (non-exhaustive (?) indicative mapping of pressures to KTM) and</p>	<p>You are right about the schema element BasicMeasureType and we will add some clarification text to the guidance.</p> <p>As regards Annex 8r, it is the extraction of the column "Indicators for pressures" of the table in Annex 3 and it should have been referred to in the schema element IndicatorGap on page 279. We will make this clear in the guidance and in the schema.</p>	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<i>Annex 8r.</i>					
20150522 10000215	Kleemola Sirpa (FI)	22/05/20 15		I downloaded the new HTML files (version 5.0), but I am not able to use them! Please provide HTML files, similar to the 4.9 version files	The files seem to work in a variety of browsers. The schemas are available in other formats on the webpage.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150526 10000128	Ramona Curelea (RO)	22/05/20 15	GWB	In GroundWaterBody table (No. 2 logical) there are two columns: <i>groundwaterBodyChanges</i> and <i>typeGroundwaterBodyChanges</i> , and we have such situation but the codes of the GWBs have not changed. May be a new column regarding "groundwaterBodyChangesCode: Yes or No" it would be useful, to avoid duplicate in the " GroundWaterBody_euGroundwaterBodyCode 2010 " table!	If code has not changed please report the same in 'euGroundwaterBodyCode2010'	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150526 10000128	Ramona Curelea (RO)	22/05/20 15	GWB	In WFD Reporting v 5.0 table schema list.xls there is no the GroundWaterBody_gwChemicalReasonsFor Failure table! Have to insert under the GroundWaterBody_euGroundwaterBodyCode2010 . But, see comment below...	The schemas and Access DB seem correct. The excel sheet will be corrected if necessary.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150526 10000128	Ramona Curelea (RO)	22/05/20 15	GWB	The table GroundWaterBody_euGroundwaterBodyCode2010 would be better to be insert in the GroundWaterBody - just one column next to groundwaterBodyChanges and typeGroundwaterBodyChanges columns.	This is because maxOccur is unbounded. Therefore a new table needs to be generated.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150526 10000128	Ramona Curelea (RO)	22/05/20 15	GWB	It is no useful to have more tables: GroundWaterBody_gwOtherPollutantsExceedancesNotCounted , GroundWaterBody_gwPollutantCausingRisk ,	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				GroundWaterBody_gwPollutantsExceedancesNotCounted and GroundWaterBody_otherRelevantGWPollutantRisk . All these table would be better to merge them in only one. Also, we suggest to add in the same table the information contained in the tables from point 10 of this email.	automated way from the UML model.				
20150526 10000128	Ramona Curelea (RO)	22/05/2015	GWB	The same comment like the previous one, having in view the tables GroundWaterBody_gwQuantitativeExemptionPressure , GroundWaterBody_gwQuantitativeExemptionType , GroundWaterBody_gwQuantitativeReasonsForFailure , GroundWaterBody_gwReasonsForRiskQuantitative . Moreover, GroundWaterBody_gwQuantitativeReasonsForFailure and GroundWaterBody_gwReasonsForRiskQuantitative tables contain the same information.	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150526 10000128	Ramona Curelea (RO)	22/05/2015	GWB	The table GroundWaterBody_linkSurfaceWaterBodiesCode could be included in the GroundWaterBody table.	No because maxOccur is unbounded.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150526 10000128	Ramona Curelea (RO)	22/05/2015	GWB	The GroundWaterBody_gwSignificantImpactTypes and GroundWaterBody_gwSignificantPressureTypes tables could be merged.	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150526 10000128	Ramona Curelea (RO)	22/05/2015	GWB	The BackgroundNaturalSubstances and BackgroundNaturalSubstance tables could be merged.	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150526 10000128	Ramona Curelea (RO)	22/05/2015	GWB	All the three tables on the TrendReversal (no.17, 18, 19 form logical list) could be better to merge into one table, and it is important to have only the GWB code as reference, not ID number which could create confusion. The same comments for the 3 Upward Trend tables and for the 3 GWAssociatedProtectedArea tables.					
20150526 10000128	Ramona Curelea (RO)	22/05/2015	GWB	It is not necessary to have 3 tables: PollutantsCausingFailure , GWPollutantsCausingFailure , GWOtherPollutantsCausingFailure and GroundWaterBody_gwChemicalReasonsForFailure , which could be merged and keep only the necessary columns, without the multiple ID .	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150526 10000128	Ramona Curelea (RO)	22/05/2015	GWB	The GWChemicalExemptionType and GWChemicalExemptionType_gwChemicalExemptionPressure tables could be merged but without the multiple ID.	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150526 10000217	Ramona Curelea (RO)	26/05/2015	RBMPOM	Path: RBMPoM/KTM/Measure/basicMeasureType Comment: no possibility to report basic measures (art. 113.a) other than Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive, Nitrate Directive and IED IPPC Directive. Taking into account that there are still significant efforts in some Member States to implement these missing Directives (i.e. assuring the drinking water infrastructures), we suggest to add in the drop down list all the Directives included in the Annex VI A of the Water Framework Directive.	The purpose is not to be comprehensive in the electronic reporting but to report on the main basic measures under art 11(3) which contribute to the achievement of the environmental objectives of the WFD.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150526 10000217	Ramona Curelea (RO)	26/05/2015	RBMPOM	Path: RBMPoM/Costs Schema element: Article113aInvestment20092015	See ticket 2015032710006106 above. The exclusion of waste water treatment plants expenditure is a mistake introduced during the	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>Comment: In the Guide there are stressed that the European Commission will use the information reported to ensure that Member States are implementing the WFD appropriately and consistently; to identify any financial barriers that may be obstructing implementation; to identify the costs of implementation for RBDs, Member States and the total costs of implementation, and to carry out a full cost-effectiveness analysis of the WFD. In this context is unclear the requirements to report the total investment expenditure (in millions of Euros) of measures under Article 11.3.a that were effectively implemented during the first planning cycle, but should exclude expenditure on construction of waste water treatment plants. At list if the table <i>Measure_basicMeasureType</i> requires information about implementation of the UWWTD, information on costs for its implementation are needed.</p>	language check of the guidance.				
20150526 10000217	Ramona Curelea (RO)	26/05/2015	RBMPOM	<p>Path: RBMPPoM/Costs Schema element: Article113bl114115Investment20092015 Comment: The requirement to report the total investment expenditure (in millions of Euros) of measures under Articles 11.3.b-l and Articles 11.4 and 11.5 that were effectively implemented during the first planning cycle, but excluding expenditure on infrastructure to control over-abstraction is unclear.</p>	See ticket 2015032710006106 above. This is a mistake and will be corrected.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150527 10000108	Ramona Curelea (RO)	27/05/1985	SWB	<p>Path: SWB/SurfaceWaterBody/euSurfaceWaterBodyCode2010</p>	This element has been moved to the spatial data as required by INSPIRE.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				Comment: for schema element euSurfaceWaterBodyCode, the row source is SELECT euSurfaceWaterBodyCode FROM SurfaceWaterBody. We propose (if it's possible) that the selection to be euSurfaceWaterBodyCode when surfaceWaterBodyChanges is Yes and CodeChanged.					
20150527 10000108	Ramona Curelea (RO)	27/05/19 85	SWB	Path: SWB/SurfaceWaterBody/SWAssociatedProtected Area Comment: why did you removed type National from schema element swTypeOfProtectedArea? Previous WISE (2009) included type National in the field ProtectedAreaType and the reporting guide specified that National represents protected areas defined under national legislation (for RO: natural parks, national parks, natural reserves, scientific reserves, etc).	This element has been moved to the spatial data as required by INSPIRE.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed
20150527 10000108	Ramona Curelea (RO)	27/05/19 85	SWB	Path: SWB/SurfaceWaterBody/SWAssociatedProtected Area/swProtectedAreaExemptions Comment: Still unclear the approach related to protected area exemptions. How to apply an exemption defined under WFD to a birds or habitats protected area? There are different provisions and objectives in the specific legislation (WFD and BHD).	See sections 5.1 and 5.3.4 of the guidance.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150527 10000108	Ramona Curelea (RO)	27/05/19 85	SWB	Path: SWB/SurfaceWaterBody Schema elements: swOtherPressureDescription and swOtherImpactDescription Comment: these schema elements are not relevant in SurfaceWaterBody table.	Not clear what the issue is. These elements are there to indicate other pressures and impacts if not on the predefined list.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150529 10000159	Ramona Curelea (RO)	29/05/19 85	SWMET	We propose to remove the table SWType_intercalibrationType (path: SWMET/SWType/intercalibrationType) and schema element Intercalibration Type to be inserted in the table SWTYPE (path: SWMET/SWType).	In some cases the relationship between national types and intercalibration types are many to many.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150529 10000159	Ramona Curelea (RO)	29/05/19 85	Monitoring	- the information contained in Monitoring_monitoringProgrammesReferences table (the monitoringProgrammesReference column) , could be inserted in Monitoring table. - 2 tables from this Schema: Programme_monitoringProgrammePurpose and Programme_programmeCategory could be merged.	All references may be 1 or more and therefore need a separate table. The structure of the monitoring schema will be simplified.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150529 10000159	Ramona Curelea (RO)	29/05/19 85	SWMonitoringSites	- Please revise the document <i>WFD reporting v5.0 table schema list</i> having in view the logical steps to fill in the tables and also, some table should be included (e.g. euRBDCode from table RBD – path RBDSUCA/RBD, should be fill in before table Monitoring-path: Monitoring. It is necessary to move the logical order so as to RBDSUCA scheme to be fill in before Monitoring scheme. The swMonitoringSitesID from table SWMonitoringSite is auto-generated in the next logical table-SWMonitoringSites, so it is impossible to be fill in table SWMonitoringSite). - The Table SWChemicalMatrixPurpose and SWMonitoringPurpose are not included in the <i>WFD reporting v5.0 table schema list</i> and please clarify the relation between the tables. - Tables SWChemicalMatrixPurpose and SWChemicalSubstance could be merged. - the link between the tables JoinSWMonitoringSiteToQualityElementCode and QualityElementCode to be via qualityElementCode and not using	The documentation will be updated	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>qualityElementCodeID. Also, it is important to have dropdown list for qualityElementCode to select it. The same observation for table related to JoinSWMonitoringSiteToSWChemicalSubstance and SWChemicalSubstance.</p> <p>- In the SWMonitoringSite table, in the column euSWMonitoringSiteCode - not allowed to duplicate the site monitoring code from multiple purpose (e.g. one monitoring site could have programme codes).</p>					
20150529 10000159	Ramona Curelea (RO)	29/05/19 85	GM Monitoring Sites	<p>- Our proposal is to merge the following tables: GWMonitoringSite_euProgrammeCode, GWMonitoringSite_gwMonitoringPurpose and GWMonitoringSite_gwMonitoringSiteCode2010 - GWParameter table is not relevant.</p>	<p>Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model. The structure of the monitoring schema will be simplified.</p>	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150529 10000239	stalslar Lars Stalsberg (NO)	29/05/19 85	SWB GWB	<p>My question now is about the Expected2015GoodEcologicalStatusOrPotential and the Expected2015GoodChemicalStatus and of course groundwater for the same year. Since Norway is six years behind our year here should have been 2021. I suppose we have to fill in data for the 2015 and then you have to treat it as 2021. As long as we know what we are doing I think it should work. Do you agree?</p> <p>The same we have to do for the periods 2016-2021 and 2022-2027.</p>	Agree	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150602 10000153	Fernanda Nery (EEA)	02/06/20 15	SWMET	<p>The following code lists in the schemas: PhysChemCategoryCode_Enum</p>	OK	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
			SWMonitoring	SWTypeCategoryMethodologies_Enum SWCategoryCode_Enum MonCategoryCode_Enum SWBorGWB_Enum should be consolidated.					
20150602 10000224	Fernanda Nery (EEA)	02/06/2015	SWB	We currently have codes for intercalibration types under Annex 8a. Intercalibration types are also used in WISE SoE: http://dd.eionet.europa.eu/dataelements/48817 http://dd.eionet.europa.eu/dataelements/63434 The code lists are not consolidated. In the attached file, there is an attempt at a consolidated codelist. However it was not possible for me to find the definitions for the codes marked in red (that only exist in WISE SoE). Also, some codes exist in WISE SoE that do not exist in Annex 8a. Questions: Is there any authoritative code list of intercalibration types that we can/should reuse?	Yes, has been provided by JRC	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150602 10000322	Fernanda Nery (EEA)	02/06/2015	Monitoring	Codes for monitoring purposes associated with the following elements: programmeMonitoringPurpose swMonitoringPurpose	Consolidation will be done	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>gwMonitoringPurpose gwChemicalMonitoringPurpose need to be consolidated. Also in WISE SoE, the monitoring purposes are requested at monitoring site level. The attached file contains a consolidated codelist. The suggestion (at least for WISE SoE) is that the 3-letter codes be used.</p>					
20150604 10000079	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/20 15	SWMET	<p>In the Table SWTargetedQ, the autonumber (schema element sWTargetedQID) is always one number – respectively the number 1, because one single row is filled (one national approach will be selected). This sWTargetedQID generated (number 1) is used as a link also in the following tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWTargetedQ_bqeForMEPGEP . • SWTargetedQ_driversFailureEcologicalStatusPotentialReference • SWTargetedQ_ecologicalStatusMethodReference • SWTargetedQ_gepMethodReference • SWTargetedQ_mitigationMeasures <p>No matter how many BQE elements are choosed from the dropdown list in the table SWTargetedQ_bqeForMEPGEP or how many drivers in the Table SWTargetedQ_mitigationMeasures the WTargetedQID remains the same, respectively number 1, which, in our opinion, gives an useless information. Also, these tables could be merged and arranged in a better logical order.</p>	<p>Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model. The structure of the monitoring schema will be simplified.</p>	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150604 10000079	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	SWMET	We suggest that schema element bqeForMEPGEP and schema element mitigationMeasures to be included in the Table SWTargetedQ and not in separate tables, in order to facilitate the correlations between these elements.	These are one to many relationships and that's why they are in different tables.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150604 10000079	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	SWMET	We suggest that schema element bqeCategory to be maintained in the Table SWBQE and not in a separate table. In this way, the information about an assessment method of a certain biological quality element and category of water body, required in the Table Percentage BQE will be easier to be followed (through the swBQEID Autonumber generated in the table SWBQE). The other possibility is to merge in one table, the following tables: SWBQE SWBQE_bqeCategory PercentageBQE PercentageBQE_bqeSensitivityImpact .	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150604 10000079	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	SWMET	In the table SWMethodologies please create dropdown list to the hmwbMethodologyReference column, link to the Annex9Type.	This will be looked at in the next version.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150604 10000079	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	SWMET	The following tables– can be merged SWMethodologies_iRBDTypologyCoOrdinationReference SWMethodologies_smallWBsMethodologyReference SWMethodologies_typologyMethodologyReference .	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150604 10000079	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	SWMET	The following tables– can be merged SWSupportingQE SWSupportingQE_supportingQECategory .	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150604 10000079	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	SWMET	The following tables– can be merged SWPhysicoChemicalQE SWPhysicoChemicalQE_otherDeterminand – this table is not relevant ?! SWPhysicoChemicalQE_physChemCategory SWPhysicoChemicalQE_physChemTypeCode - this table is not relevant ?!	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150604 10000079	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	SWMET	In the tables: SWRBSP , SWRBSP_rbspCategory and SWRBSP_rbspMatrix we propose that the unique ID to be the element code of the rbsp (like an identification element) in these three tables which could be merged.	This will be simplified.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150604 10000079	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	RBMPPoM	The following tables– can be merged SWManagementObjectives SWManagementObjectives_managementObjectivesReference SWManagementObjectives_waterResourcesPlansReference	References have a one to many relationship in case MS want to provide more than one.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150604 10000097	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	SWB	We propose to add schema element euSurfaceWaterBodyCode in the tables QualityElementQEXSoP_qexEcologicalExemptionType (path: SWB/SurfaceWaterBody/QualityElementQEXSoP/qexEcologicalExemptionType) and QualityElementQEXSoP_qexGrouping (path: SWB/SurfaceWaterBody/QualityElementQEXSoP/qexGrouping).	These tables are already linked.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150604 10000097	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	SWB	Path: SWB/SurfaceWaterBody/SWAssociatedProtectedArea Comment: in Romania, most of the protected areas for birds and habitats, are associated with more than one waterbody. For reporting accuracy, all water bodies associated with a protected area should be reported but schema	This will be checked and corrected.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				element euProtectedAreaCode is primary key and prohibits duplicate values of euProtectedAreaCode.					
20150604 10000097	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	RBMPoM	<p>Path: RBMPPoM/PoM/PoMs/SignificantPressureSubstanceFailing/SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType</p> <p>Comment: Table SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType has only one schema element (significantPressureOrSubstanceFailingTypeID) which generates an ID and don't allow writing or selecting a value, but in the same time is in relationship with other 3 tables (via this ID). We suggest to remove this table and to merge following ones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType_pressureTypes SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType_prioritySubstances SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType_rbdSpecificPollutants <p>or to justify the need of this table SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType and to adjust its functionality.</p>	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150604 10000097	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	RBMPoM	<p>Path: RBMPPoM/PoMs and RBMPPoM/PoMs/PoM</p> <p>Table PoMs generates an ID which is used in table PoM (poMsID). We propose to remove table PoMs and to replace poMsID with euRBDCode.</p>	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150604 10000097	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	RBMPoM	<p>Path: RBMPPoM/KTM/Measure</p> <p>Comment: in table Measure, the enumeration list from schema element msfdRelevance is not activated.</p>	This will be checked and corrected	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150604 10000097	Ramona Curelea (RO)	04/06/2015	RBMPoM	Path: RBMPPoM/PoM/PoMs/SignificantPressureSubstanceFailing Comment: a valid option must be selected from the enumeration list (PressureTypes, PrioritySubstances, RBDspecificPollutants) for schema element significantPressureOrSubstanceFailing but the enumeration list is not active.					
20150605 10000121	Fernanda Néry (EEA)	05/06/2015	SWB	The different lists of quality elements (in Annex 8, in the SWPhysicoChemicalQE enumeration and in the QualityElements_Enum) need to be made consistent in the codes and names.	Will be corrected.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150610 10000138	Iker Garcia (Contractor)	10/06/2015	SWB	QualityElement is defined as 19 to 19 in the UML / schemas. However there are plenty of QA/QC validations that validate qualityElementX codes according to surfaceWaterBodyCategory ; which already enforces the QE provided. Doesn't this mean that QualityElement should be defined as 0 to 19 ? If not MS will always have to fill all the different 19 QEs.	The intention is that MS fill the 19 QEs. We do not want to infer any information from non-reporting. This created a lot of misunderstandings and problems in the 2010 reporting. Whenever a QE is not relevant, there is the possibility to state this in the relevant schema elements.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150610 10000192	Lars Stalsberg (NO)	10/06/2015		Could you please add Norway as a valid country choice in WISE?	Norway should be already a valid country choice in WISE with 'NO' code	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150610 10000218	Dragos Ungureanu (RO)	10/06/2015	SWB	In accordance with the latest changes in the SWB shapefiles , maybe the other attributes from SWB schema should be moved to the shapefile SWB (egg. Surface water body scale).	Suggestion is adopted and the scale is reported in the metadata file for each specific spatial data set.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150610 10000218	Dragos Ungureanu (RO)	10/06/2015	PA	Regarding the Protected Area shapefile, Romania is able to report Article 7 Abstraction for drinking water only as point geometry, similar to previous WISE reporting. Please take this in consideration for the final version of PA	This will be allowed.	No action needed	No action needed	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				shapefiles.					
20150610 10000236	Stepahn Hofmann (DE)	10/06/20 15	SWB	in WFD_2016_v5.0.eap and in SWB_2016.xsd the documentation of attribute hmwbPhysicalAlteration is the same as for hmwbWaterUse. It doesn't match WFD reporting guidance_v4 9 clean.docx.	This will be corrected.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150610 10000236	Stepahn Hofmann (DE)	10/06/20 15	SWB	in WFD reporting guidance_v4 9 clean.docx : Conditional. For HMWBs only, report the physical alteration that has resulted in the designation of the surface water body as a HMWB. In the context of designation, physical alterations mean any significant alterations that have resulted in substantial changes to the hydromorphology of a surface water body such that the surface water body is substantially changed in character. In general, these hydromorphological characteristics are long-term and alter both the morphological and hydrological characteristics. Further guidance on the terms is found under the Glossary section below.	Indeed the description of the 'hmwbPhysicalAlteration' (SWB) element was wrong. It has been fixed according to the Guide and will be available on the next schemas release.	Pending on v6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150610 10000245	Stepahn Hofmann (DE)	10/06/20 15	GML	in GML_SurfaceWaterBodyLine_2016.xsd the element supersededByIdentifier is listed. As stated at http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/help/WFD/WFD_52_1_2016 the uploader "(...)" can also use Shapefiles to produce the spatial data. (...)" (retrieved on 10/06/15). But this field doesn't exist in SurfaceWaterBodyLine_2016_v50.zip The issue arises with e.g. supersedesIdentifier, thematicIdIdentifier, relatedZoneIdentifier whereas EU_SU_CD is not part of the GML.	This will be checked and corrected.	No action needed	No action needed	Pending on v6.0	No action needed
20150610 10000254	Stepahn Hofmann	10/06/20 15	GML	in GML_GroundwaterBodyPolygon_2016.xsd the element relatedZoneIdentifier is listed.	This will be checked and corrected.	No action needed	No action needed	Pending on v6.0	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
	(DE)			But this field doesn't exist in GroundWaterBodyPolygon_2016_50.zip In the shapefile: could EU_WB_CD be changed into thematicIdIdentifier (using an 10 character shortname)?					
20150611 10000083	Stepahn Hofmann (DE)	11/06/2015	All	Ticket # 2015042110000273 states (with response: UML already updated; Implemented?: Schemas: Done v5.0) : (...)#1 Surface/Ground naming convention To avoid misunderstandings, same elements in Surface and Ground schemas should be named identically, in other words, avoid using SW/GW prefixes. (...). But several elements like SWChemicalExemptionType or swExpected2015GoodChemicalStatus having siblings in GW still exist in SWB_2016.xsd.	This will be corrected.	Pending on v6.0	Pending on v6.0	No actions	No actions
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	All	General remark: We recommend using the Water Body Code (unique) in addition to the WaterBodyID in all the Tables. This will allow the reporter to follow easier a certain water body and check all related issues afterwards.	Unclear what is meant.	No actions	No actions	No actions	No actions
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	SWB	We suggest splitting this Table in two parts (one Table related to the ecological status and the other referring to the ecological status). In addition we suggest merging the following Tables as follows: SurfaceWaterBody (columns referring to the chemical status) with SurfaceWaterBody_substancesExceedingEQSInMixingZone, SurfaceWaterBody_swChemicalStatusGrouping, SurfaceWaterBody_swEffectStatusNewThresholds and SurfaceWaterBody_swImprovementChemicalStatus;	One of the requirements was to develop schemas as flat as possible. The order of the elements will be such that elements related to the same issue will be kept together.	Pending on v6.0	Pending on v6.0	No actions	No actions

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	SWB	We suggest moving Columns swOtherPressureDescription and swOtherImpactDescription to the Tables SurfaceWaterBody_swSignificantPressureTypes and SurfaceWaterBody_swSignificantImpactTypes which have to be merged;	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	SWB	We suggest merging Table SWExceedances, SWChemicalExceedance with Table SWChemicalExemptionType.	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	Monitoring Site	We suggest merging Table SWChemicalSubstance with Table JoinSWMonitoringSiteToSWChemicalSubstance.	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	SWMET	We suggest merging Table SWChemicalStatusClassificationPS with Table PrioritySubstanceCT and Table CombinationMatrixCategoryType;	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	SWMET	Table CombinationMatrixCategoryType: We recommend adding option "other" for column psType (the enumeration list does not cover sediments and/or biota); We recommend adding option "mg/kg" for column psUnit (the enumeration list does not cover sediments).	This will be simplified.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	SWMET	Table SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD: the requirement of column mixingZoneDesignation is exactly the same with the one from Table SurfaceWaterBody_substancesExceedingEQSIInM	This will be corrected	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				ixingZone. We suggest to keep it only in Tabel SurfaceWaterBody_substancesExceedingEQSInM ixingZone as long as Table SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD refers to the methodological approach;					
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	SWMET	We suggest merging Table SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD with Table SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD_alternative MZMR, Table SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD_approachS WBNMCR, Table SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD_background CR, Table SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD_bioavailabilityReference, Table SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD_chemicalStatusReference, Table SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD_longTTAR and Table SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD_mixingZMR R;	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	SWMET	We suggest merging Table SWPressures with Table SWPressures_swPressuresNotAssessed and Table SWPressures_swPressuresReference.	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	RBMPoM	In Table ChemicalSubstanceCT: column "relevance RBD Scale"- we suggest the followings: change the name of the column in "relevance scale" and the enumeration list in: RDB, sub-unit, no., n.a.; column "inventoryMethodology" – we suggest to be conditional if InputValue/InputValueCategory was reported; we suggest amending the pick-up list of	This will be clarified.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				"twoStepApproach" as follows: Step 1, Step 1 + 2, No.					
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	RBMPoM	Please add the enumeration list to the column "InputCategory" of Table InputCategory;	This will be corrected.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	RBMPoM	We suggest merging Table InputPollutant with Table InputPollutant_inputPollutantsReference, Table ChemicalSubstanceCT, Table ChemicalSubstanceCT_inputMethodReference, Table InputCategory and Table InputCategoryType.	References have a one to many relationship in case MS want to provide more than one.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	RBMPoM	We suggest merging Table SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType with Table SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType_pressureTypes, Table SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType_prioritySubstances, Table SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType_rbdSpecificPollutants and Table SignificantPressureSubstanceFailingType;	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	RBMPoM	Table IndicatorGap: it is not clear what is required in column "valueIndicator Gap" having in view that this should be a number. Please provide clarifications;	The value of the indicator.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	RBMPoM	We suggest merging Table PoMs with Table SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType (Table POM it is not necessary);	This will be corrected.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150612 10000205	Ramona Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	RBMPoM	We suggest moving "Column MSFD" from Table TargetedQ to Table TargetedQ_msfdMeasuresNeeded.	Opportunities for simplification of the access database will be looked at in the next version. The process though is limited by the requirement to generate the database in an automated way from the UML model.	Pending for v.6.0	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150612 10000241	Iker Garcia	12/06/2015	RBMPoM	<p>Now WQUSE is defined as 11 to 11 in the UML / schemas and we validate that all the 11 wqUseTypes are provided. However the former QA/QC validations validated WaterQuantity depending on WQPressure being 'Yes' and WQPreviousReporting being 'No'.</p> <p>Doesn't this mean that WQUSE should be defined as 0 to 11 and continue to validate it according to wqPressure and reportedUnderSoEQuantity (previously named WQPreviousReporting) ?</p>	This is correct, the 11 'wqUseTypes' should be reported only if 'wqPressure' is 'Yes' and 'reportedUnderSoEQuantity' is 'No'.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	Pending for v6.0
20150615 10000183	Francesca Piva (IT)	15/06/2015	SWB	SWChemicalExceedance : For this RBMP, we ask for the possibility to report the sum of the 2 PAH, Benzo(g,h,i)perylene and Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene, (as also in the 2008 Directive) adding an item to the enumeration list.	The list of priority substances is used in several context in the reporting. Therefore, we would like to keep it as simple as possible. We advise to report as exceedance both Benzo(g,h,i)perylene and Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene and explain in the methodology that these are assessed together.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150615 10000183	Francesca Piva (IT)	15/06/2015	SWM	SWMonitoringPurpose (SWMonitorings) : In the enumeration list for the programme of measure there is the item "Trend detection and assessment". It should be possible to have this item also in the SWMonitoringPurpose ?	The enumeration lists MonitoringPurpose will be streamlined to one that will only be used at site level linking sites with purposes and programmes.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150615 10000183	Francesca Piva (IT)	15/06/2015	SWMET	SwPressureNotAssessed (SWPressures) : It is not clear the link between PressureNotAssessed and SWSignificantPressureXXXTools . If a pressure is not assessed, why it is related with the tools used to define the significance of the pressures?	There is no link between the two elements in the schema. There are two different things. 'swPressuresnotAssessed' asks to report those pressures that have not been assessed. The information requested on the tools are for the rest of the pressures, that have been assessed.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150615 10000183	Francesca Piva (IT)	15/06/2015	RBMP	InputCategory (InputCategories) : In the guidance the Field type is an enumeration list (CIS inventory, SOE, lista pressioni WFD). In the DB it is a string.	The appropriate enumeration list will be developed.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150615 10000183	Francesca Piva (IT)	15/06/2015	RBMP	AlternativeWQIndicator (WaterQuantity): This field type should be a string.	No, this should be a Annex 9 type to provide the reference to the document where the alternative indicator is explained.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150615 10000183	Francesca Piva (IT)	15/06/2015	RBMP	WQCalculationMethodReference: This field type should be a Reference Structure	Yes, correct.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150615 10000183	Francesca Piva (IT)	15/06/2015	POM	PoMCoOrdinationNonMS (CoORD): In the access DB the enumeration list is the same of PoMCoOrdinationOtherMS	This will be corrected by deleting the following words from the option: Explicit links made with national RBMPs of the MS within the RBMP This way the same enumeration list can be use in both	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150615 10000183	Francesca Piva (IT)	15/06/2015	POM	IRBMPIssues: In the enumeration list, the item "other measures" should probably be "other issues".	Yes, it will be corrected	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150615 10000183	Francesca Piva (IT)	15/06/2015	All	In the <i>WFD reporting v5.0 table schema list.xls</i> some access tables are missing: GroundWaterBody_gwChemicalReasonsForFailure EconomicAnalysis_ServiceArticle94Reference SWMonitoringPurpose SWChemicalMatrixPurpose	Documentation will be corrected	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150615 10000183	Francesca Piva (IT)	15/06/2015	RBMPPoM	The table InputCategoryType, there is in the xls file but is not a schema in the guidance	Documentation will be corrected	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150616 10000216	Karl Schwaiger (AT)	16/06/2015	RBMPPoM	Please allow me to come back to my proposal made in Riga (agenda item 10, progress CIS process with 4th European water Conference) to provide MS with the opportunity to report on progress achieved with the implementation of EU Water Framework Directive as "free text". Rational behind our proposal: Member States as well as European Commission are under pressure to report on progress achieved. Unfortunately neither the present	An optional text field will be incorporated to report general progress, most probably in the RBMPPoM schema.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>reporting format nor the indicators (which are developed at present) allow to report on many aspects of progress achieved (e.g. reduction of pressures...) and on measures taken by MS.</p> <p>Please allow me to take the presentation provided by UK at the 4th European Water Conference as example (see enclosure); this very presentation provides a quite impressive long and comprehensive list of measures triggered by the EU WFD, however most of the contents of that list (with measures and progress achieved which maybe would never have been taken without the EU WFD) will not show up directly in the reporting format and thus might get lost in some links to background docus, thus showing a somehow biased picture of WFD implementation with often weak results. This is why our request is to provide MS with the possibility to report their “main achievements, key progress achieved” directly within the reporting as “free text” rather than providing a link to one of the many background docus(see chapter 10.5 of reporting guidance V 4.9). We perfectly know that free texts are not that easy to assess across MS. Nevertheless we believe that difficulties to assess these texts are limited if the extent of free text is limited (maybe one page) and that the advantages will prevail, as more details on key progress achieved will be available in one single piece rather than hidden in many different places of our rather comprehensive reporting.</p> <p>This is why we politely request the EC to consider this our proposal. We would be also happy if you (respectively your experts in the reporting group)</p>					

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				could support my proposal. Last but not least I would like marine director to accept my apologies for having them included in my mailing list, but this one is the only most recent (unfortunately joint) mailing list I am disposing of.					
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	All	General comment: We have noticed that there have been some significant changes in schema elements names between v4.9 and v5.0 (such as for the schema element SurfaceWaterBodyCategory which has been removed from the XML schemas and will be reported under GML files through the GML element WFD_WaterBodyTypeZone). It would have been preferable not to change the names of elements this significantly. The comparison between the different versions is much more complicated when names change from one version to the other.	surfaceWaterBodyCategory is still present in the SWB schema. It has also been added to the spatial data for convergence with INSPIRE.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	SWB	Schema: SurfaceWaterBody Element: surfaceWaterBodyArea riverlength surfWaterBodyScale Comment: Why don't you remove these elements from the XML reporting and derive this information from the reported data under GML files (as for centroid elements)? This comment also applies to rbdArea and subUnitArea.	Area and length have been moved to the spatial data sets (see <i>sizeValue</i> and <i>sizeUom</i>). Scale is to be reported under the metadata file of each spatial data set.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	GWB	Schema: GroundwaterBody Element: groundwaterBodyArea groundwaterBodyScale Comment: Why don't you remove these elements from the XML reporting and derive this information from the reported data under GML files (as for centroid elements)?	Area and length have been moved to the spatial data sets (see <i>sizeValue</i> and <i>sizeUom</i>). Scale is to be reported under the metadata file of each spatial data set.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				This comment also applies to rbdArea and subUnitArea.					
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	SWB	Schema: SurfaceWaterBody Element: targetStatusOrPotential Comment: In v4.9. the schema element targetStatusOrPotential could have been derived from information reported under naturalAWBHMWB and surfaceWaterBodyCategory. Please, make sure that this redundancy in reporting is no longer in the final version of XML schemas and Guidance document.	We agree this element is redundant and will be deleted.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	Pending for v6.0
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	SWB	Schema: SWChemicalExceedance Element: swChemicalExceedances Comment: Could you please add to Annex 8d the following categories of priority substances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Cyclodiene pesticides'; - 'Benzo(b)fluoranthene and Benzo(k)fluoranthene'; - 'Benzo(g,h,i)perylene et indeno (1,2,3-cd)pyrene'; so that we can report these priority substances according to the EQS definition in the 2008 EQS Directive (revised in 2013).	The list of priority substances is used in several context in the reporting. Therefore, we would like to keep it as simple as possible. We advise to report as exceedance both individual PAHs and explain in the methodology that these are assessed together. cyclodienes will be available both as sum and as individual.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	GWB	Schema: GroundWaterBody_gwSignificantImpactTypes Element: gwSignificantImpactTypes Comment: There is a consistency issue between the list of impact types proposed in Annex 1b and the fields that can be selected in the database v5.0. In the GWB schema, the element gwSignificantImpactType links to	This needs to be corrected. The enumerations list for gwSignificantImpactTypes should be the following: Nutrient pollution Organic pollution Chemical pollution Saline pollution/intrusion Microbiological pollution Diminution of quality of associated surface	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>SignificantImpactType_Enum which proposes the following enumeration list:</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>Whereas the list of impact types proposed in Annex 1b is:</p> <p>(...)</p> <p><xs:enumeration value="Diminution of quality of associated surface waters for chemical / quantitative reasons"/></p> <p><xs:enumeration value="Damage to groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems for chemical / quantitative reasons"/></p> <p><xs:enumeration value="Alterations in flow directions resulting in saltwater intrusion"/></p> <p><xs:enumeration value="Abstraction exceeds available GW resource (lowering water table)"/></p> <p><xs:enumeration value="Other Significant Impacts"/></p> <p></xs:restriction></p> <p></xs:simpleType></p> <p>The 4 impact types highlighted in yellow can thus not be selected in the database. This means we cannot report impact types related to quantitative risks.</p> <p>Please, insert these four impacts types from Annex 1b in SignificantImpactType_Enum so that they can be selected in the database.</p>	<p>waters for chemical / quantitative reasons</p> <p>Damage to groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems for chemical / quantitative reasons</p> <p>Alterations in flow directions resulting in saltwater intrusion</p> <p>Abstraction exceeds available GW resource (lowering water table)</p> <p>Other Significant Impacts</p> <p>Unknown impacts</p> <p>No significant impact types</p>				
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	GWB	<p>Schema: GroundWaterBody_gwPollutantCausingRisk</p> <p>Element: gwPollutantCausingRisk</p> <p>Comment: For these two schema elements we are being asked to select groundwater pollutants or indicators of pollution that are causing the</p>	The option 'Pesticides (Active substances in pesticides, including their relevant metabolites, degradation and reaction products)' will be included in the enumeration list.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>groundwater body to be at risk, or the failure of the groundwater body to reach good chemical status.</p> <p>Among the proposed groundwater pollutants in annex 8j, 'Active substances in pesticides' does not take into account pesticide degradation products. Given the fact that pesticide degradation products are among the main groundwater pollutants, this would imply that most of reported groundwater pollutants would be reported via the schema element OtherRelevantGWPollutantRisk.</p> <p>Could you please add 'Relevant metabolites, degradation and reaction products' in the list of groundwater pollutants?</p> <p>What about the sum of pesticides for which a European quality standard exists (Cf. Groundwater Directive) and which frequently causes failure.</p>					
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	GWB	<p>Schema: GroundWaterBody_gwPollutantCausingFailure</p> <p>Element: gwPollutantCausingFailure</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>For these two schema elements we are being asked to select groundwater pollutants or indicators of pollution that are causing the groundwater body to be at risk, or the failure of the groundwater body to reach good chemical status.</p> <p>Among the proposed groundwater pollutants in annex 8j, 'Active substances in pesticides' does not take into account pesticide degradation products. Given the fact that pesticide degradation products are among the main groundwater pollutants, this would imply that most of reported groundwater pollutants would</p>	The option 'Pesticides (Active substances in pesticides, including their relevant metabolites, degradation and reaction products)' will be included in the enumeration list.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>be reported via the schema element OtherRelevantGWPollutantRisk.</p> <p>Could you please add 'Relevant metabolites, degradation and reaction products' in the list of groundwater pollutants?</p> <p>What about the sum of pesticides for which a European quality standard exists (Cf. Groundwater Directive) and which frequently causes failure.</p>					
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	SWMonitoring	<p>Schema: SWMonitoringSite</p> <p>Comment: This schema should be divided into two schemas: the schema element euProgrammeCode should be reported in another table in order to avoid duplications in the reporting of monitoring sites details when a monitoring site belongs to several monitoring programmes.</p>	The monitoring schemas will be merged in one and reorganised to avoid redundancies and clarify links between sites, purposes and programmes.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	SWMonitoring	<p>Schema: SWChemicalSubstance</p> <p>Comment: For this schema, we are being asked to report for each chemical substance reported at the surface water monitoring site and for each monitoring programme, the frequency at which the chemical substance is monitored, the related monitoring cycle, the most recent year that each substance was monitored, etc.</p> <p>This represents a considerable amount of work. Could you specify how the European Commission and the EEA will use this information?</p>	See sections 4.1.1 and 4.2 of the guidance document. We consider that reporting of monitoring programmes should include what is monitored, where and how often. These are basic requirements of WFD. Chemical monitoring has been identified as one of the aspects that needs to be improved considerably in the second RBMP. There were many gaps in many MS on this aspect.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	SWB	<p>Schema: SurfaceWaterBody_swImprovementChemicalStatus</p> <p>Element: swImprovementChemicalStatus</p> <p>Comment: "Except for naphthalene based on the 2013 EQS"</p>	We would like to know if there have been real improvements independently of the regulatory change, also for Naphtalene even if the standard for transitional and coastal waters have been made less stringent.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				should be added at the end of the guidance on completion for this schema element.					
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	Access DB	Could you please provide us with a document that details in which order we have to populate the database?	Documentation will be corrected	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	GML	<p>Geographical Information (GWB horizon):</p> <p>We agree with ticket 20150401 10000195 from Belgium and would like to add some additional comments:</p> <p>In France, in many cases, one GWB can be split in different horizons, depending on the number of other GWBs on their top. Our approach is exactly the same as the approach proposed in Annex 4 of the WFD Reporting Guidance 2016. As a consequence, in some places, one GWB can have more than 4 different horizons (horizon 1 is its "outcropping" part, horizon 2 correspond to its part under one other GWB...etc...) and thus a GWB can have several horizons!!!</p> <p>In France, we use to structure the GWB layers like this: one layer with the total extension of each GWB (no "horizon" field in the attribute layer) and a second layer with each GWB's horizon part (as proposed in annex 4 again).</p> <p>In the GIS guidance (4.2.6.3. pg. 21), it is mentioned that "only 4 horizons in groundwater" and "In case data for more than four horizons exist, all horizons beneath horizon 3 could be combined in horizon 4". So it implies that one GWB = one horizon. But this seems to be different approach than in Annex 4 of WFD Reporting Guidance 2016!!</p> <p>For the GIS Guidance, this chapter didn't change</p>	<p>The structure of the GIS data sets is now in accordance with the requirements stated:</p> <p>The GroundWaterBody data set allows the reporting of the full extent of the GWB. There is a <i>horizons</i> attribute where a comma separated list of horizons can be provided (or only one horizon if that's the case).</p> <p>The GroundWaterBodyHorizon data set allows the reporting as foressen in Annex 4. The <i>horizon</i> attribute should contain an integer identifying the horizon of that specific part of the GWB.</p>	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>since 2010....</p> <p>Could you please harmonise it or better explain how to deal with GWB horizon? Could you also describe more precisely the structure of the spatial data in accordance with these guidelines (for example, how many horizon numbers for each GWB?).</p>					
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	QA/QC	The conversion tool from Access Database to XML following v5.0. is still not working.	This will be corrected.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	QA/QC	<p>QA/QC Tests</p> <p>Will the final version of the QA/QC tool allow uploading files instead of URLs as inputs? Will the possibility to upload URLs be still available during the reporting phase?</p>	This will be considered.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	QA/QC	<p>QA/QC Tests</p> <p>Could you provide us with your QA/QC tool so that we can integrate it to our national platform?</p>	This is available and was discussed at the last WG DIS meeting. See ticket 2015062410000273 below.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	SWB	<p>Schema element: reservoir</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>Can't artificial surface water bodies be considered as reservoirs?</p> <p>In this case, you should mention artificial surface water bodies in the guidance on completion section for this schema element.</p>	Not in this reporting. An addition will be added to the guidance on completion of the schema: 'The water body is not a reservoir' = Indicates that the river or lake water body is not a reservoir. <i>Please also use this option if the <u>water body is an artificial lake</u> (<u>SurfaceWaterBodyCategory must be reported as 'LW' and NaturalAWBHMWB as 'Artificial'</u>)</i>	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard	16/06/2015	RBMPPoM	9.3.1. Introduction 1 st §	National RBD scale is meant to differentiate from international RBDs.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
	(FR)			<p>Comment:</p> <p>The first paragraph of the introduction section states : "Article 5 of the EQSD (2008/105/EC) requires Member States to establish, on the basis of the information collected in accordance with Articles 5 and 8 of the WFD and other available data such as that collected under Regulation (EC) No 166/2006, an inventory of emissions, discharges and losses of all Priority Substances and the eight other pollutants listed in Part A of Annex I EQSD for each RBD, or part thereof, lying within their territory. The CIS Guidance Document No. 28 addresses the preparation of the inventories at national RBD scale"</p> <p>As inventories are prepared at RBD spatial scale, could you please delete the word 'national'?</p>					
20150616 10000378	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	16/06/2015	RBMPPoM	<p>10.2. Targeted questions on basic measures and other aspects</p> <p>Could you specify the products from reporting for this section?</p>	<p>This purpose of this section is explained in 10.2.1.2. Basic statistics on methodological approaches can be derived from that information but it is not worth identifying in advance concrete products such as maps or graphs given the simple character of this information.</p>	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150511 10000218	Joaquim Capitaó	11/05/2015	Common	<p>In discussion with our MSFD colleagues, it came up that it would be useful to add coastal waters in the title of KTM 6, writing "... improvement of hydromorphological condition of transitional <u>and coastal</u>waters ..."</p>	<p>Even though on the guide the KTM 6 is detailed as:</p> <p><i>"Improving hydromorphological conditions of water bodies other than longitudinal continuity (e.g. river restoration, improvement of riparian areas, removal of hard embankments, reconnecting rivers to floodplains, improvement of hydromorphological condition of transitional waters, etc)."</i></p> <p>We ended up with a shorter value due to</p>	No actions	No actions	No actions	No actions

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					Enterprise Architect (UML) limitations: <i>"Improving hydromorphological conditions of water bodies other than longitudinal continuity"</i> Please use the WFD Guidance document as the main reference to understand the definitions and context, not the schemas or the access database.				
20150513 10000081	Fernanda Nery	13/05/2015	Commom	There is a mistake in the guidance for the completion of the schema element BackgroundNaturalSubstancesUnits. The units for conductivity are Siemens per metre, not per litre: Schema element: BackgroundUnits Guidance: Conditional. If a background level is set, select the relevant units for the natural background concentrations or levels (the reporting unit of Conductivity is milli Siemens per <i>metre</i>). Note: the UCUM code for the UoM code list is: Sm-1	It will be corrected. Units updated to follow UCUM naming convention: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ConcentrationUnitsCode_Enum• Unit_Enum• ThresholdValueRangeType_Enum• PSUnit_Enum• PhysChemStandardUnit_Enum• InputUnitCategory_Enum• InputUnitTotal_Enum	Done in v5.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150508 10000073	Contractor	08/05/2015	RBMPoM	The following changes are required to be implemented on the schemas (UML), hence the Reporting Guide, QA/QC XQuery scripts, Access DB, Access User Manual, FME jobs,... must be also updated accordingly. #1 RiverineLoadCode <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rename it to 'riverineLoadMonitoringSite'	Changes will be introduced	Done in v5.0	Pending for v6.0	No actions	Pending for v6.0

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change type to the FeatureUniqueEUCodeType New QA/QC: against the River MonitoringSites codes in the monitoring sites <p>#2 InputUWWTDCoverage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New QA/QC: Conditional check: report if "1.1" from Pressures, "U" from SoE or "P8" from CIS Guidance. <p>#3 InputIndustryCoverage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New QA/QC: Conditional check: report if "I" from SoE or "P10" from CIS Guidance. <p>#4 InputUnitTotal_Enum / InputUnitCategory_Enum: used UCUM naming convention.</p> <p>#5 InventoryMethodology_Enum: Fixed typo from 'Tiers 1 + 2 + 4)' to 'Tiers 1 + 2 + 4'</p> <p>#6 reportedUnderSoEEmissions: new DateType element created (0..1)</p> <p>#7 WEIWorstMonth: Type is an ISO Date as YYYY-MM</p> <p>#8 AlternativeWQIndicator: Renamed to wqAlternativeIndicator</p>					

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>#9 weiSeasonal : new YesNoCode [1..1] element created</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidance: Select Yes if there is seasonal pattern in WEI, else report No. New QA/QC: WEIWorst [0..1] Constraint: Report if WEISeasonal = Yes New QA/QC: WEIWorstMonth Constraint: Report if WEISeasonal = Yes <p>#12 KTM: simplification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'newKeyTypeMeasure' element moved to 'KeyTypeMeasure' complex type with 0..1 cardinality. 'NewKeyTypeMeasureIndicators' / 'NewKeyTypeMeasure' complex types removed. New QA/QC: 'newKeyTypeMeasure' conditional on keyTypeMeasure = "other". <p>#13 WaterQuantity: simplification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New QA/QC: elements (weiRBD, weiRBDYear, weiSeasonal) have the same constraint "report if WQPressure=Yes and reportedUnderSoEQuantity=No New QA/QC: elements (weiWorst, weiWorstMonth) Report if WEISeasonal=Yes 					

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New QA/QC: elements (wqAlternativeIndicator) Report if WEIRBD=0 • 'wqPreviousReporting' element renamed to 'reportedUnderSoEQuantity' • 'weiSeasonal' element cardinality changed to 0..1 • 'wqCalculationMethodReference' element cardinality changed to 0..1 • 'wqAlternativeIndicator' element type changed to 'Annex9Type' • Remove elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ consumptive... ○ reusedWater... ○ desalinatedWater... ○ waterImports... ○ waterExports... • New enumeration list named 'WQUseTypeList' created with the following values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ConsumptiveUseAgricultureGW ○ ConsumptiveUseAgricultureSW ○ ConsumptiveUseIndustryEnergy ○ ConsumptiveUseIndustryGW ○ ConsumptiveUseIndustrySW ○ ConsumptiveUseWaterSupplyGW ○ ConsumptiveUseWaterSupplySW ○ DesalinatedWater ○ ReusedWater 					

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WaterExports ○ WaterImports ● New complex type named 'WQUse' created <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Element name 'wqUseType' type 'WQUseTypeList' cardinality 1..1 ○ Element name 'wqUseVolume' type 'decimal' cardinality 1..1 ○ Element name 'wqCalculationMethod' type 'Annex8u_Enum' cardinality 1..* ○ New QA/QC ??: check that all the 11 different elements are reported in 'wqUseType'. ● Add a relation from 'WaterQuantity' to 'WQUse' with a 11..11 cardinality 					
20150629 10000121	Iker Garcia	29/06/2015	SWMonitoringSites, SWB, RBDSUCA, GWMonitoringSites, GWB	<p>The following elements need to be removed from the non spatial model:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SWMonitoringSites/SWMonitoringSite/swMonitoringSiteLinkToMSInformation ● SWB/SurfaceWaterBody/surfaceWaterBodyLinkToMSInformation ● RBDSUCA/RBD/rbdLinkToMSInformation ● GWMonitoringSites/GWMonitoringSite/gwMonitoringSiteLinkToMSInformation ● GWB/GroundWaterBody/groundwaterBodyLinkToMSInformation 	The elements have been removed from the non spatial model and moved to the GMLs.	Pending v6.0	Pending v6.0	Pending v6.0	No actions

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150612 10000198	Ramon Curelea (RO)	12/06/2015	SWB	Add in the table SurfaceWaterBody the schema element surfaceWaterBodyCategory	'surfaceWaterBodyCategory' was added again to the SWB schema and will be available in the final schemas/DB release.	Pending v6.0	Pending v6.0	No actions	No actions
20150610 10000236	Stepahn Hofmann (DE)	10/06/2015	SWB	<p>in WFD_2016_v5.0.eap and in SWB_2016.xsd the documentation of attribute hmwbPhysicalAlteration is the same as for hmwbWaterUse. It doesn't match WFD reporting guidance_v4 9 clean.docx.</p> <p>in WFD reporting guidance_v4 9 clean.docx : Conditional. For HMWBs only, report the physical alteration that has resulted in the designation of the surface water body as a HMWB. In the context of designation, physical alterations mean any significant alterations that have resulted in substantial changes to the hydromorphology of a surface water body such that the surface water body is substantially changed in character. In general, these hydromorphological characteristics are long-term and alter both the morphological and hydrological characteristics. Further guidance on the terms is found under the Glossary section below.</p> <p>in WFD_2016_v5.0.eap and in SWB_2016.xsd Conditional. For HMWBs only, report the water use for which it has been designated. 'Wider environment' can refer to designation in order to maintain nature protected areas and also archaeological sites and patrimony (see CIS Guidance Document No. 4 – Identification and Designation of Heavily Modified and Artificial Water Bodies). Quality checks: Element check: A valid option must be selected from the enumeration list. More than one option can be</p>	Indeed the description of the 'hmwbPhysicalAlteration' (SWB) element was wrong. It has been fixed according to the Guide and will be available on the next schemas release	Pending on v6.0	No actions	No actions	No actions

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				selected. Conditional check: Report if NaturalAWBHMWB is 'Heavily Modified'.					
20150602 10000055	Stephan Hofmann (DE)	02/06/2015	SWB	<p>Ticket # 2015041710000058 states (with response: UML already updated and Implemented?: Done v5.0) : (...) #3 MS Codes Remove MS Codes since they can be derived from EU Codes (...).</p> <p>But surfaceWaterBodyCode still exists. Moreover there's an element naming mismatch between different reporting products: -in SWB_2016.xsd: (...) <xs:element name="surfaceWaterBodyCode" type="wfd:String40Type" (...) MSSurfaceWaterBodyCode must be reported. (...) . Within-schema check:MSSurfaceWaterBodyCode must be unique. (...)</p> <p>-in WFD reporting guidance_v4 9 clean.docx: (...) Schema element: MSSurfaceWaterBodyCode (...)</p> <p>-in WFD_2016_v5.0.eap: surfaceWaterBodyCode</p>	<p>You are right. We have removed the 'surfaceWaterBodyCode' element from the SWB schema since it can be derived from 'euSurfaceWaterBodyCode'. This change will be available on the next schemas release.</p>	Pending in v6.0	No actions	No actions	No actions
20150630 10000127	Jorge Rodríguez Romero (ENV)	30/06/2015	Annex IV GML	Annex IV of reporting guidance – groundwater horizons	<p>add the attached new example number 4 to the Annex IV of the reporting guidance (document attached on the helpdesk ticket). This new example produced by the original author of the paper provides for the case of</p>	No actions	Pending on v6.0	Pending on v6.0	No actions

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					non-contiguous groundwater bodies.				
20150624 10000273	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	24/6/2015	RBMPPoM	Schema RBMPPoM: Concerning the schema element indicatorGap , the proposed selection among indicators for pressure listed in Annex 3 is not consistent with Annex 8r and thus not complete. We would like to be able to select pre-defined quantitative indicators that are listed in Annex 8r and not Annex 3 (where indicators for pressure are already assigned to a type of pressure).	See ticket 2015052110000404 above.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150624 10000273	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	24/6/2015	QA/QC	<p>Could you give us more details on how the QA/QC will be performed once the testing phase will be completed? How will the cross-schema checks be performed?</p> <p>A figure reflecting the complete process of the reporting phase would be greatly appreciated more or less as the one presented during the Eionet freshwater meeting last week with some additional detailed information and explanations on the phase QA/QC for each schema and the crossed checks.</p> <p>Also, we would like to insist on the fact that the elaboration of final XML files consistent with QA/QC imposes a significant workload and requires several reviews and corrections. Could you give us more information on the format and content of the Error Report that will be sent after every submission of XML files to the QA/QC tool? It would really facilitate our work if an exhaustive and readable report was delivered for each schema.</p> <p>Again, could you provide us with your QA/QC tool so that we can integrate it to our national</p>	<p>At the moment the Converter application provides an interface to allow external systems to call remotely a set of exposed methods through XML-RPC protocol. Among these methods, there is one to trigger the QA/QC validations; find the details below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Server URL: http://converterstest.eionet.europa.eu/RpcRouter • Method: <code>XQueryService.runQAScript</code> • Params: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ URL of the XML that needs to be validated (String) ○ ID of the script to run (String) • Result: an array containing the content type of the result (html in this case) and the byte array of the html itself containing the validations output. <p>Find below the ScriptIDs related with the WFD 2016 within schema QA/QC scripts:</p>	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				platform and perform the QA/QC checks more easily?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GWB_2016.xsd > 815 • GWMET_2016.xsd > 825 • GWMonitoring_2016.xsd > 826 • Monitoring_2016.xsd > 827 • ProtectedArea_2016.xsd > 828 • RBDSUCA_2016.xsd > 829 • RBMPPoM_2016.xsd > 830 • SWB_2016.xsd > 831 • SWMET_2016.xsd > 832 • SWMonitoring_2016.xsd > 833 <p>In case you are not familiar with XML-RPC, there are libraries: Apache XML-RPC (Java), xmlrpc-lib (python),... to assist in the implementation process</p>				
20150624 10000273	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	24/6/2015	GML	<p>Could you please provide a description of the new shapefile structures and GML schemas in the final GIS Reporting Guidance?</p> <p>In the GIS Guidance (§4.2.5.), it is recommended for the connection of borders of River Basin Districts or rivers across national border that Member States align their data with a selection of EuroRegionalMap at scale 1:250 000. We believe it would be unfortunate to lose information if the neighbouring Member States possessed more accurate data. The best solution would then be for Member States to use the best geometry they have in common to align their data. It seems the 2010 experience has shown difficulties with this tool, mainly on the limits of</p>	Documentation will be completed.	No action needed	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				coastal waters.					
20150624 10000273	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	24/6/2015	Protected Areas	<p>Do all protected areas reported under GML files need to be associated to a waterbody in the XML reporting? What will happen if a protected area is not associated to a surface or groundwater body (for instance bathing waters located on a mountain and isolated with no clearly identified dynamical or hydrological connection to a surface water body)?</p> <p>The WFD Reporting Guidance states: <i>“If the Protected Areas are already reported under other directives (e.g. Natura 2000 Protected Areas under the Habitats Directive, bathing waters under the Bathing Water Directive, sensitive areas under UWWTD or vulnerable zones under the Nitrates Directive) they do not need to be reported again under the WFD.”</i></p> <p>In this context, and given the fact that spatial data will be reported in June 2016 under the UWWTD and the Nitrates Directive, we will not report spatial data for sensitive and vulnerable areas.</p> <p>Moreover, our national rule for the reporting of protected areas is to report protected areas in force that were reported to the European Commission under other directives before 31 December 2014.</p> <p>A connection of the vulnerable and sensitive areas (reported in 2012 and 2014 referring to data from 2012) with the 2016 water body dataset does not seem relevant. Thus, we will not connect the water bodies to these protected areas. However, the connection of the most</p>	<p>ENV would expect that all waters identified as protected areas by the relevant EU legal instrument (or by the WFD art 7 in case of drinking water protected areas) would be identified as WFD water bodies. Otherwise it would be unclear how the protection afforded by the WFD would apply to such waters. We therefore expect all protected areas to have associated water bodies.</p> <p>It is ok not to report twice the geographic dataset of sensitive areas and vulnerable zones. However, timing of the various reporting processes is important. If FR reports the WFD by the deadline of March 2016, the reporting under UWWTD and ND may not be available. The QA/QC will check the protected area codes against the latest delivery and will fail if some of the codes have not been reported already.</p> <p>ENV does not understand the statement that the connection of the sensitive areas and vulnerable zones with water bodies is not relevant. Of course it is relevant and we would expect all Member States to report this information.</p> <p>The comment 'the connection between sensitive areas identified in 2014 and the respective water body dataset will be reported under the UWWTD Directive in June 2016' is not exact. In fact the reporting under UWWTD reports <u>for each discharge point</u>, the water body and the code of the sensitive area. The WFD guidance request an association of each water body and its corresponding sensitive</p>	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<p>recent designated vulnerable zones and the 2016 water body dataset will be reported in June 2016 under the Nitrates Directive. Also, the connection between sensitive areas identified in 2014 and the respective water body dataset will be reported under the UWWT Directive in June 2016.</p> <p>Besides, we draw to your attention that the cross-schema check stated for the element euProtectedAreacCode is not relevant when a protected area is reported under another directive and not reported under the WFD.</p>	<p>areas. This linking dataset is not reported in full under the UWWTD.</p>				
20150624 10000273	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	24/6/2015	ProtectedArea	zoneType 'habitatsBirdsProtectedArea' should be added to the allowable code list values	<p>This needs to be reviewed to make it consistent with the guidance. Protected area types should be the following (as per guidance version 4.9):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bathing Birds Fish Shellfish Habitats Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive Sensitive Area Nitrates Article 7 Abstraction for Drinking Water Other 	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150624 10000273	Elsa Ouvrard (FR)	24/6/2015	ProtectedArea	<p>spZoneType,C,50</p> <p>The description part is not clear. It is hard to understand considering the allowable code list values for this element.</p>	See above	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150624	Ramona	24/06/20	RBMPoM	Table KeyTypeMeasureIndicator: Romania	As agreed in the guidance, these elements are	No action	No action	No action	No action

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
10000139	Curelea (RO)	15		considers that fields "key type measure indicator value 2015/2021" shall be optional fields to be filled in as long as this information could not be provided in all the cases. Sorry for sending so late this comment.	required. If RO cannot report this information it should be included in the Annex 0.	needed	needed	needed	needed
20150618 10000221	Silvie Semerado va (CZ)	18/06/2015	XML conversion tool	1. is it possible to use this tool if not all tables in the access database are filled just to create one XML file (e.g. RBDSUCA.xml)?	Yes you can. You will get for the other XML a file without values, but do not delete the tables.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150618 10000221	Silvie Semerado va (CZ)	18/06/2015	GMLs	2. is there any possibility to test the GML files created by our software in terms of topology etc.?	There are no GML QA/QC rules created yet. They will be defined on the basis of the GIS guidance.	No action needed	No action needed	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0
20150617 10000223	Cécile Gozler (FR)	17/06/2015	Guidance document: 9.3.1. Introduction 1 st §	The first paragraph of the introduction section states : "Article 5 of the EQSD (2008/105/EC) requires Member States to establish, on the basis of the information collected in accordance with Articles 5 and 8 of the WFD and other available data such as that collected under Regulation (EC) No 166/2006, an inventory of emissions, discharges and losses of all Priority Substances and the eight other pollutants listed in Part A of Annex I EQSD for each RBD, or part thereof, lying within their territory. The CIS Guidance Document No. 28 addresses the preparation of the inventories at national RBD scale" As inventories are prepared at RBD spatial scale, could you please delete the word 'national'?	'National RBD' scale is used here to make clear that in case of international RBDs the inventories are made at the scale of the national part of the international RBD.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150629 10000639	Stefan Hofmann (DE)	29/06/2015	GML_Common	in GML_Common_2016.xsd a type called LegislationLevelValueType is found. This type isn't referenced in any of the other	In the new versions it will be included as codelist and it will be referred in the ProtectedAreas schema.	No action needed	No action needed	Pending for v6.0	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				GML Schemas. There isn't any information about it in WFD 2016_Helpdesk_Log. It is assumed that this type has been introduced for element legalBasisLevel in GML_ProtectedArea_2016.xsd. It's type is currently set to xs:string, though. Please confirm.					
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	SWB	SWSignificantPressureTypes Please add: "Abstraction/Flow diversion – Hydropower" Or is hydropower included in "3.3 Abstraction/Flow diversion – Industry"? Clarification needed under which type of pressure (the hydrological impacts of) impoundments shall be subsumed. E.g. under 4.3.3, 4.3.6, 4.5 or new pressure 4.3.X hydropower impoundment?	This is a significant omission. An additional category will be added: 3.1 Abstraction/Flow Diversion – Agriculture 3.2 Abstraction/Flow Diversion – Public Water Supply 3.3 Abstraction/Flow Diversion – Industry 3.4 Abstraction/Flow Diversion – Cooling water <u>3.5 Abstraction/Flow Diversion – Hydropower</u> 3.5 3.6 Abstraction/Flow Diversion - Fish farms 3.6 3.7 Abstraction/Flow Diversion – other	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	SWB	QualityElementX QE21, 22, 23, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 3162, 3161: only relevant for WBs of high status >> is this considered in schema checks?	The enumerations list for QE2X and QE3X is different from that of QE1X to take this into account.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	SWB	QEXStatusOrPotentialComparability Please add: more/better data available (Pressure Data und Monitoring Data)	It is requested that MS identify whether the change in status is condiered real due to decrease/increase of pressures or only due to change in monitoring and/or assessment. 'Having more data' will most likely be the case for all water bodies due to the revised pressure	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					analysis and longer time series in the monitoring. This additional option would not be consistent with the others.				
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	SWB	<p>QXEEcologicalExemptionType</p> <p>To report this information per QE does not make sense.</p> <p>Not clear what is the reference period for the exemption – status 2015 or 2021? Please specify</p>	<p>We wonder why this does not make sense. The failure of status is due to the failure of certain quality element(s). The fact that an exemption is applied is due to the fact that restoring such quality element(s) to good status would not be possible by the deadline due to natural conditions, technical unfeasibility or disproportionate costs. What does not make sense?</p> <p>The timetable in the WFD is to achieve good status by 2015. Delayed achievement means exemptions should be applied and conditions therein met.</p>	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	SWB	<p>SWAssociatedProtectedAreas</p> <p>Fish: not relevant any more</p>	See guidance section 5.1. If a MS does not identify fish protected areas anymore because it considers that the protection objectives of the former Fish life Directive is included in the objective of good ecological status then it does not need to report this kind of protected areas.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	SWB	<p>SWChemicalStatusGrouping</p> <p>It is not clear if only one SWB-code should be provided or if more than one can be filled in (comma separated) (text in AccessDB says: “[...]indicate the codes of the SWB”); we assume that only one SWB code should be filled in (to be able to check against SWB Codes in SWCharacterisation) and as many lines as necessary per SWB added.</p>	Multiplicity should be 0 to many so that more than one code can be added.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze	17/06/2015	GWMonitoring	<p>GWOtherChemicalParameterCode</p> <p>[...] provide the code and name of the other</p>	Text is unclear, it will be changed by: '...provide the code <u>CAS number (if relevant)</u>	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
	(AT)			parameter(s) monitored [...] >> Which codes? Does this mean to provide national name and code in one field?? Please specify	and name...'. The CAS and name are included in the same text field.				
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GWMonitoring	GWChemicalFrequency There is a glossary mentioned to provide further information – this glossary is missing; please provide further information how to report frequency	See section 4.3.5.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GWMonitoring	GWChemicalCycle There is a glossary mentioned to provide further information – this glossary is missing; please provide further information how to report cycle	See section 4.3.5.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	SWMET	PhysChemTypeCode Not clear which types should be reported; please specify and provide examples	The guidance will be amended to make reference to the relevant schema element: 'For each standard, report the Member State code for the characterisation type of the water body, as reported in the surface water characterisation schema (<i>in schema element SurfaceWaterBodyTypeCode</i>), and the RBMP and background documents'	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	SWMET	SWDisproportionateCostAlternativeFinancing It is not clear what to fill in; if costs are disproportional it does not make sense to check alternative financing (because otherwise the costs would not be disproportional)	See CIS guidance document nb 20 on exemptions section 3.2.5.3. The point here is to identify the alternative financing mechanisms that have been considered before declaring disproportionality (but obviously were not successful as if they were, there would not be disproportionality anymore).	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	RBMPPoM	MSFDRelevance The category „unclear/landlocked“ of the enumeration list must be divided into two separate categories „unclear“ and „landlocked“.	OK, it will be amended.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	RBMPPoM	WaterReUse „not relevant“ needed as additional category in the enumeration list	It is suggested that the option 'No' is used if in the Austrian context it is considered that water reuse does not provide any significant environmental benefit compared with other options.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	RBMPPoM	WaterReUseMeasure „not relevant“ needed as additional category in the enumeration list	This is a factual question, whether water reuse has been included or not.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	RBMPPoM	Obstacles This is a required element without option „not applicable“ within the enumeration list; what, if no substantial obstacles occurred	OK, an option 'Not applicable' will be added. This option cannot be selected with others (additional QA check).	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	Pending for v6.0
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	RBMPPoM	IndicatorGaps“ and „KeyTypeMeasureIndicators“: The same information is reported twice, this is a redundancy; we propose to consolidate it IndicatorGap = KeyTypeMeasureIndicator ValueIndicatorGap2015 = KeyTypeMeasureIndicatorValue2015 ValueIndicatorGap2021 = KeyTypeMeasureIndicatorValue2021 ValueIndicatorGap2027 = KeyTypeMeasureIndicatorValue2027	This is not necessarily the case. The first is a pressure (or substance) indicator and the second an indicator of the progress in implementing the measures to address the pressure. They may or may not use the same measurement as an indicator.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze	17/06/2015	Shapefile structures	In the GML schemas now available the attributes used are partly not corresponding to INSPIRE	- nameText - nameLanguage	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
	(AT)			<p>because the definition of the fields is different. Thus it will be difficult for MS to use spatial data prepared according to INSPIRE data specifications for WISE reporting. A transformation process will be necessary. We propose to use also for WISE reporting INSPIRE definitions.</p> <p>Element “name”: According to INSPIRE the field “name” is used to provide the name in the national language (in the data specification of AM there is a reference to the data specification of Annex I Geographical Name); it is quite confusing that in WISE reporting it is used differently. We propose to use the INSPIRE fields:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - nameText - nameLanguage - nameTextInternational: here the name in English can be provided (optional as it is now for “name”) <p>Element “localId”: the localId is part of the InspireId and to our understanding this is the member state ID and would therefore correspond to the former “MS_CD” in WISE reporting; for example in case of the RBD Schema: Austria, Danube = 1000.</p> <p>Element “thematicIdentifier”: We propose to set this element mandatory for WISE reporting and use it as EU_CD – as it is already foreseen but as optional element. (e.g. RDB Schema: Austria, Danube = AT1000).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - nameTextInternational: here the name in English can be provided (optional as it is now for “name”) <p>AT is correct. These will be corrected as the other issues pointed in the next version</p>				

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML ProtectedAreas	<p>legalBasisName</p> <p>legalBasisLink</p> <p>legalBasisLevel</p> <p>legalBasisLevel</p> <p>beginDesignationPeriod</p> <p>In the reporting guidance 4.9 these elements are optional – in the GML schema it is mandatory, please change</p>	This was corrected in the current version.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML SubUnit	<p>localId</p> <p>In “Notes” the following text is provided: <i>“Data providers are requested to use the value of the euRDBCCode as the object’s localId.”</i> We assume that it should be the euSubUnitCode</p>	Issue correct in the current version.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML SubUnit	<p>thematicIdentifierScheme</p> <p>In “Notes” the following text is provided: <i>Reporting not required. For this element, all the objects in the WISE European data set will be assigned the fixed value ‘EUSubUnitCode’;</i></p> <p>In the schema the element is mandatory: <code><xs:element name="thematicIdentifierScheme" type="xs:string"></code> please change to optional</p> <p>The UML picture gives the following information: <i>thematicIdentifierScheme: CharacterString = euRDBCCode</i></p> <p>Please clarify this element; what should be provided here?</p>	Issue correct in the current version.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML SubUnit	<p>endBeginLifespanVersion</p> <p>Typing error – should be endLifespanVersion</p>	Issue correct in the current version.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML MonitoringSite	endOperationalActivityPeriod This field is mandatory – what should be inserted for monitoring sites still active?	Changed to optional in the current version	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML MonitoringSite	relatedToIdentifierScheme Please specify and provide examples	Documentation will be improved.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML MonitoringSite	endLifespanVersion <xs:element name="endLifespanVersion" type="wfd:DateType"> Element should be optional	Changed to optional in the current version	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML MonitoringSite	beginLifespanVersion <xs:element name="beginLifespanVersion" type="wfd:DateType"> Element should be optional	Changed to optional in the current version	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML GroundwaterBodyPolygon	thematicIdIdentifierScheme In the GML "Notes" the following explanation is given: <i>Reporting not required. For this element, all the objects in the WISE European data set will be assigned the fixed value 'EUSubUnitCode'</i> We assume it should be "euGroundwaterBody...." In the schema the element is mandatory: <xs:element name="thematicIdIdentifierScheme"	The typo was corrected. The field is mandatory with a default fixed value.	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				<code>type="xs:string"></code> please change to optional					
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML GroundwaterBodyPolygon	endBeginLifespanVersion Typing error – should be endLifespanVersion	Corrected	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML GroundwaterBodyPolygon	localId Why should the euRDBCCode provided here? Notes for the element in the GML schema: -- Notes-- <i>Data providers are requested to use the value of the euRDBCCode as the object's localId.</i>	Corrected	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML SurfaceWaterBodyPolygon	localId Why should the euRDBCCode provided here? Notes for the element in the GML schema: -- Notes-- <i>Data providers are requested to use the value of the euRDBCCode as the object's localId.</i>	Corrected	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML SurfaceWaterBodyLine	continua Wrong definition: <i>Provide a reference or hyperlink to the fiche or information system on the surface water body available on the web</i>	Corrected	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML SurfaceWaterBodyLine	relatedSurfaceWaterBodyIdentifier River: In Austria a WFD SWB can be situated at more than one river; this it must be possible to provide more than one River IDs	Moved to the SurfaceWaterBodyLine data set to allow this possibility	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML SurfaceWaterBodyLine	relatedSurfaceWaterBodyNameNL River: In Austria a WFD SWB can be situated at more than one river; this it must be possible to	Moved to the SurfaceWaterBodyLine data set to allow this possibility	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				provide more than one River Names					
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	GML SurfaceWaterBodyLine	localId Why should the euRBDCode provided here? Notes for the element in the GML schema: -- Notes-- <i>Data providers are requested to use the value of the euRBDCode as the object's localId.</i>	Corrected	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	Access DB	Monitoring: There should be a LOV for the attribute "language". Monitoring_monitoringProgrammesReference: Filed type is a number. The description says that the reference or a hyperlink should be provided – this is not possible; we guess that the number should link to the table Annex9Type. But this is not clear at all. Please give more advice how references should be reported and the linking between tables.	This is an informative field we do not think is necessary to create an enumeration list. In the v6.0 there will be a single table name called Annex9Type_Reference where all the references to Annex9 will be centralised	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	Access DB	SWMonitoringSite: There should be a guidance providing an overview about the order of editing of tables (especially for cross schema constraints); it is very tedious to learn the order by filling in data into the DB – in this case, the data for SWB must be available in the DB otherwise SWMonitorinSites cannot be provided;	It has been uploaded a graph describing the order of the tables. It will be updated for the last version to be provided.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150617	Gabriele	17/06/20	Access DB	swMonitoringSitesID links the tables	In monitoring purpose are now related	Pending	Pending	Pending	No action

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
10000189	Vincze (AT)	15		<p>SWMonitoringSite and SWMonitoringSites – but the in SWMonitoringSites any number can be inserted in this field.</p> <p>One monitoring site can be in more than one program. It is not foreseen now to provide this information – one site can only be allocated to one program; please implement a 1..* relationship between monitoring sites and programs.</p>	program and monitoring site	for v6.0	for v6.0	for v6.0	needed
20150617 10000189	Gabriele Vincze (AT)	17/06/2015	Access DB	<p>SWMonitoringSites:</p> <p>There should be a LOV for the attribute "language".</p>	This is an informative field we do not think is necessary to create an enumeration list.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150710 10000092	David Edwards (UK)	10/07/2015	SWB GWB	<p>It is a requirement that where a water body will not have good ecological and/or chemical status by 2015 that a pressure causing that failure must be identified.</p> <p>We have identified some places where a water body has failed but it is not because of a pressure.</p> <p>Specifically this covers the assessment of fish classification and we have identified areas where it is the habitat that in its natural state is unsuitable for fish.</p> <p>To report unknown pressures or other anthropogenic pressures would be incorrect and not reporting a pressure will cause a schema failure.</p>	If the habitat in the natural state is unsuitable for fish this should be reflected in the reference conditions and therefore should not cause a failure of status.	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed	No action needed
20150716 10000091	Iker Garcia (Bilbomatika)	16/07/2015	Common	Annex9 Access DB structure has been simplified. In particular all the Annex9 intermediate tables ('xxxReference') have been merged into a single intermediate table	Access DB for v6.0 will be simplified	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				'Annex9Type_Reference'. Therefore reducing the number of tables (30+)					
20150716 10000232	Iker Garcia (Bilbomat ca)	16/07/20 15	GWB GWM RBMPPoM SWB SWMET	Remove empty entities from the UML	The following empty ComplexTypes have been removed from the schemas (UML) in order to simplify the schemas / access DB: GWB: GroundWaterBody/PollutantsCausingFailure GWM: GWMonitoringSite/GWParameter RBMPPoM: RBMPPoM/PoMs SWB: SurfaceWaterBody/SWExceedances SWMET: SWMET/SWChemicalStatusClassificationPS	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed
20150717 10000098	Iker Garcia (Bilbomat ca)	17/07/20 15	Monitoring	Simplification of the schema and the reporting Access DB	monitoringProgrammeReference -- > MOVE TO Programme class <hr/> CREATE NEW CLASS MonitoringPurpose + euMonitoringSiteCode [1..1] + euProgrammeCode [1..1] + monitoringPurpose [1..1] : enum Should have a 1..* association with the root element <hr/> Programme <hr/> THINGS TO BE REMOVED programmeBeginOperationalActivity programmeEndOperationalActivity programmeNameNL programmeNameNLLanguage monitoringProgrammePurpose	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>THINGS TO BE CONVERTED</p> <p>programmeCategory --> CONVERT TO BOOLEANS (AND KILL THE MonCategoryCode_Enum)</p> <p>NEW DATA ELEMENTS</p> <p>programmeCategoryRW : Boolean programmeCategoryLW : Boolean programmeCategoryTW : Boolean programmeCategoryCW : Boolean programmeCategoryTeW : Boolean programmeCategoryGW : Boolean</p>				
20150717 10000356	Iker Garcia (Bilbomat ca)	17/07/20 15	RBMPPoM	Improvements and simplifications to the schema	<p>InputPollutant</p> <hr/> <p>euRBDSUBUnitCode --> RENAME TO euSubUnitCode inputPollutantsReference--> RENAME TO inputPollutantReference</p> <hr/> <p>EconomicAnalysis</p> <hr/> <p>serviceArticle94 --> tranform to Boolean fields.</p> <p>-->serviceArticle94DrinkingWater : Boolean [1..1] -->serviceArticle94Wastewater : Boolean [1..1] -->serviceArticle94Irrigation : Boolean [1..1] -->serviceArticle94SelfAbstraction : Boolean [1..1] -->serviceArticle94Storage : Boolean [1..1] -->serviceArticle94FloodProtection : Boolean [1..1] -->serviceArticle94Navigation : Boolean [1..1]</p> <hr/> <p>Service</p> <hr/> <p>serviceWaterUse --> transform to Booleans</p> <p>--> serviceWaterUseHouseholds [1..1] - Yes, Not, NotApplicable --> serviceWaterUseAgriculture [1..1] - Yes, Not,</p>	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>NotApplicable --> serviceWaterUseIndustry [1..1] - Yes, Not, NotApplicable</p> <hr/> <p>Progress</p> <hr/> <p>finance --> financeSecured : Yes No financeNotSecured --> REMOVE financeSecuredAGR : Yes No NotApplicable (for Agriculture) financeSecuredIND : Yes No NotApplicable financeSecuredURB: Yes No NotApplicable financeSecuredTRA: Yes No NotApplicable financeSecuredEHY: Yes No NotApplicable financeSecuredENO: Yes No NotApplicable financeSecuredFIS: Yes No NotApplicable financeSecuredTOU: Yes No NotApplicable financeSecuredFLO: Yes No NotApplicable newRegulation : {No, YesProcessNotStarted, YesInProgress, YesAdopted} newRegulationStatus --> REMOVE obstacles --> REMOVE obstaclesGovernance : Boolean <-- ADD obstaclesDelay : Boolean <-- ADD obstaclesLackOfFinance : Boolean <-- ADD obstaclesLackOfMechanism : Boolean <-- ADD obstaclesLackOfMeasures : Boolean <-- ADD obstaclesNotCostEffective : Boolean <-- ADD obstaclesExtremeEvents : Boolean <-- ADD obstaclesOther : string (optional) <-- ADD</p> <p>----- Note: All other attributes remains the same -----</p> <p>Note: the 3-letter codes come from the DRIVERS codelist</p> <p>AGR – Agriculture FOR – Forestry FIS – Fisheries and aquaculture EHY – Energy - hydropower ENO – Energy - non-hydropower IND – Industry TRA – Transport</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>TOU – Tourism & recreation URB – Urban development FLO – Flood protection CLI – Climate change OTH – Other UNK – Unknown</p> <hr/> <p>CoOrd</p> <hr/> <p>pomCoorOtherMS --> REMOVE pomCoorNonMS --> REMOVE</p> <p>coordJointVision : Coord_Enum <-- ADD coordArt5SWMI : Coord_Enum <-- ADD coordIRBMPoM : Coord_Enum <-- ADD coordRoofReport : Coord_Enum <-- ADD coordLinks : Coord_Enum <-- ADD coordSectors : Coord_Enum <-- ADD coordTransparency : Coord_Enum <-- ADD coordFinancial : Coord_Enum <-- ADD</p> <p>----</p> <p>Coord_Enum <-- ADD to common schema with the following options + Yes with other MS + Yes with non-MS + Yes with both other MS and non-MS + None</p> <p>----</p> <p>iRBMPIssues --> REMOVE</p> <p>iRBMPIssuesNutrient : Boolean <-- ADD iRBMPIssuesSediment : Boolean <-- ADD iRBMPIssuesChemical : Boolean <-- ADD iRBMPIssuesRiverContinuity : Boolean <-- ADD iRBMPIssuesOtherHydromorphological : Boolean <-- ADD - ADD iRBMPIssuesOther : String</p> <hr/> <p>RBMP</p> <hr/> <p>rbmpInterimOverviewDates --> RENAME TO</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>rbmpInterimOverviewDate rbmpDraftVersionDates --> RENAME TO rbmpDraftVersionDate</p> <hr/> <p>WQUse</p> <hr/> <p>wqCalculationMethod [1:1] : codelist needs to have a "Water quantity use data not available" and a "Water quantity use not relevant or not significant" option. This should be the first options in the code list.</p> <p>wqUseVolume [0..1] - must be reported if wqMethod <> "Water quantity use data not available" or if wqMethod <> "Water quantity use not relevant or not significant"</p> <hr/> <p>ASSOCIATION WQUse multiplicity is 0 or 11</p> <hr/> <p>wqCalculationMethod : [1..1] wqUseVolume : [0..1] (conditional on the wqCalculationMethod value) --> reporting guidance must be updated. The -8888 and -9999 values are no longer applicable.)</p> <p>The enumeration list of SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType needs to be the union of SignificantPressuresType_Enum and ChemicalSubstances_Enum (which includes all substances, priority, RBSP and groundwater)</p> <hr/> <p>Indicator Gap</p> <hr/> <p>The enumeration list for indicatorGap needs to be renamed to IndicatorPressure_Enum and</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>built on the basis of Annex 8r of version 4.9 of the guidance plus 'Other' minus 'See list of potential indicators for the selected relevant pressures'.</p> <hr/> <p>KeyTypeMeasureIndicator</p> <hr/> <p>The enumeration list for keyTypeMeasureIndicator needs to be renamed to IndicatorKTM_Enum and built on the basis of Annex 8t of version 4.9 of the guidance plus 'Other'.</p> <hr/> <p>Progress</p> <hr/> <p>Add to beginning of the class Progress the new element rbmpGeneralProgress, type String01000Type, optional, guidance: Optional. Report a brief description of the progress achieved since the first RBMP, in particular on the reduction of pressures achieved and measures taken.</p> <hr/> <p>ChemicalSubstanceCT</p> <hr/> <p>Move the element inputYearPeriod to the</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>class ChemicalSubstanceCT.</p> <p>Add a new schema element in class ChemicalSubstanceCT called reportedUnderSoEEmissions with the following annotation and properties:</p> <p>Schema element: reportedUnderSoEEmissions Field type / facets: YesNoCode_Enum: Yes, No Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 1 Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. Indicate if the Member State has reported emissions for this chemical under SoE.</p>				
20150717 10000347	Iker Garcia (Bilbomat ca)	17/07/20 15	GWMonit ing	Improvements and simplifications to the schema	<p>GWMonitoringSites</p> <hr/> <p>EVERITHING MOVES TO THE Monitoring Schema</p> <hr/> <p>GWMonitoringSite</p> <hr/> <p>THINGS TO BE REMOVED gwEIONETSite --> ALREADY IN THE SPATIAL DATA gwEIONETCode --> ALREADY IN THE SPATIAL DATA</p> <p>gwMonitoringPurpose --> SEE THE NEW CLASS MonitoringPurpose CREATED IN THE Monitoring Schema euProgrammeCode --> SEE THE NEW CLASS MonitoringPurpose CREATED IN THE Monitoring Schema</p> <p>THINGS TO BE MOVED euRBDCCode --> To the root element (its already there in the Monitoring Schema).</p>	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<hr/> STILL OPEN + depth + wellSpring <hr/> GWChemicalParameterCode <hr/> CLASS AND ASSOCIATION TO BE RENAMED TO GWChemicalSubstance NOTE THAT THE STRUCTURE IS NEARLY IDENTICAL TO THE SWChemicalSubstance Bilbomatica to evaluate if they can be merged. <hr/> gwChemicalParameterCode --> RENAME TO swChemicalSubstanceCode gwOtherChemicalParameterCode --> RENAME TO gwChemicalSubstanceOther gwChemicalParameterPurpose --> gwChemicalPurpose Purpose_Enum + status + trend + both				
20150717 10000338	Iker Garcia (Bilbomatica)	17/07/2015	SWMonitoring	Improvements and simplifications to the schema	SWMonitoringSites <hr/> ALL CLASSES MOVE TO THE MonitoringSchema <hr/> SWMonitoringSite <hr/> THINGS TO BE REMOVED swEIONETSite --> ALREADY IN THE SPATIAL DATA swEIONETCode --> ALREADY IN THE SPATIAL DATA newSWMonitoringSite --> ALREADY IN THE SPATIAL DATA supersedesSWMonitoringSite2010 --> ALREADY	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>IN THE SPATIAL DATA swMonitoringSiteCode2010 --> ALREADY IN THE SPATIAL DATA</p> <p>swMonitoringPurpose --> SEE THE NEW CLASS MonitoringPurpose CREATED IN THE Monitoring Schema euProgrammeCode --> SEE THE NEW CLASS MonitoringPurpose CREATED IN THE Monitoring Schema</p> <p>THINGS TO BE MOVED euRBDCCode --> To the root element (its already there in the Monitoring Schema).</p> <p>THINGS TO BE ADDED swQualityElementMonitored : Boolean (IF TRUE THEN AT LEAST ONE QUALITYELEMENT MUST BE REPORTED)</p> <hr/> <p>SWChemicalSubstance</p> <hr/> <p>swChemicalSubstance --> RENAME TO swChemicalSubstanceCode</p> <p>swChemicalSubstanceOther : String <--- TO BE ADDED</p> <p>swChemicalMatrix : multiplicity is 1..1</p> <p>swChemicalPurpose : multiplicity is 1..1</p> <p>Matrix_Enum ----- + Water + Biota + Biota, fish + Biota, other + Sediment + Sediment, suspended sediment + Sediment, settled sediment</p> <p>Purpose_Enum ----- + Status</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					+Trend + Both <hr/> QualityElementCode <hr/> CLASS AND ASSOCIATION QualityElementCode --> RENAME TO QualityElement ASSOCIATION MULTIPLICITY IS 0..n (not 1..n) <hr/> qualityElementCode --> RENAME TO qeCode otherQECode --> RENAME TO qeOther				
20150717 10000329	Iker Garcia (Bilbomática)	17/07/2015	SWMET	Improvements and simplifications to the schema	SWType <hr/> RENAME ATTRIBUTES AND UPDATE CODELIST surfaceWaterBodyTypeCode --> swTypeCode typeDescription --> swTypeDescription typeCategory --> swTypeCategory intercalibrationType --> swIntercalibrationType bqeTypeSpecificReferenceConditions --> swTypeSpecificReferenceConditionsForBQEs : Enum {All, Some, None} hymoTypeSpecificReferenceConditions --> swTypeSpecificReferenceConditionsForHyMoQEs : Enum {All, Some, None} physChemTypeSpecificReferenceConditions --> swTypeSpecificReferenceConditionsForPhysChem QEs : Enum {All, Some, None} <hr/> SWManagementObjectives <hr/> waterResourcesPlansReference --> RENAME TO waterResourcePlansReference <hr/> PrioritySubstanceCT / CombinationMatrixCategoryType <hr/> MERGE THE TWO CLASSES INTO A NEW SWPrioritySubstance CLASS prioritySubstance --> RENAME TO psCode :	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>PS_Enum psStatusAssessment psStandardsUsed psCategory --> REMOVE psCategoryRW : Boolean <-- ADD psCategoryLW : Boolean <-- ADD psCategoryTW : Boolean <-- ADD psCategoryCW : Boolean <-- ADD psCategoryTeW : Boolean <-- ADD psMatrix psType --> RENAME TO psStandardType : EQStandardType_Enum psValue psUnit psAnalyticalMethod psAnalyticalMethodBAT ---- NOTE: the PS_Enum needs to be updated. ---- CONSTRAINT Check that all PS in list are reported (at least for one matrix type).</p> <hr/> <p>SWTargetedQ</p> <hr/> mitigationMeasures --> RENAME TO mitigationMeasures ---- BQEforMEPGEP_Enum --> REPLACE WITH BQE_Enum (and delete the BQEforMEPGEP_Enum code list) <hr/> <p>SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD</p> <hr/> limitofQuantification --> RENAME TO limitOfQuantification <hr/> <p>SWExemptions</p> <hr/> REPLACE Annex1b44NotApplied_Union_Enum Annex1b45NotApplied_Union_Enum				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>WITH THE SAME CODELIST {Impact_Enum + "Exemption not applied"}</p> <p>REPLACE Annex1c44NotApplied_Union_Enum Annex1c45NotApplied_Union_Enum WITH THE SAME CODELIST {Drivers_Enum + "Exemption not applied"}</p> <hr/> <p>SWRBSP</p> <hr/> <p>rbsp --> RENAME TO rbspCode : RBSP_Enum rbspOther : String <-- ADD rbspCategory --> REMOVE rbspCategoryRW : Boolean <-- ADD rbspCategoryLW : Boolean <-- ADD rbspCategoryTW : Boolean <-- ADD rbspCategoryCW : Boolean <-- ADD rbspMatrix --> CHANGE MULTIPLICITY TO [1:1] rbspType --> RENAME TO rbspStandardType : EQStandardType_Enum rbspValue rbspUnit rbspTechGuidance rbspAnalyticalMethod rbspAnalyticalMethodBAT ---- NOTE: the RBSP_Enum needs to be updated. ---- EQStandardType_Enum --> SEE NOTE IN THE COMMON SCHEMA</p> <p>AA-EQS MAC-EQS Both Other</p> <hr/> <p>Matrix_Enum <-- UPDATE VALUES TO</p> <p>+ water + biota + biotaFish + biotaOther + sediment</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>+ sedimentSettled + sedimentSuspended</p> <hr/> <p>SWPhysicoChemicalQE</p> <hr/> <p>physChemStandard --> RENAME TO physChemQECode : enum otherDeterminand --> RENAME TO physChemQEOther : string [1:1] <-- CORRECT THE MULTIPLICITY physChemCategory --> REMOVE physChemCategoryRW : Boolean <-- ADD physChemCategoryLW : Boolean <-- ADD physChemCategoryTW : Boolean <-- ADD physChemCategoryCW : Boolean <-- ADD physChemStandardExpression --> RENAME TO physChemStandardType physChemStandardExpression --> RENAME TO physChemStandardOther physChemStandardValue --> RENAME TO physChemValue physChemStandardUnit --> RENAME TO physChemUnit physChemStandardUnitNP --> REMOVE physChemMBoundary --> physChemMGBoundary ---- PhysChemStandardUnit_Enum --> Use a generic UnitOfMeasure_Enum (because it can be anything, really. Must include the options + ug/L + mg/L + mg{N}/L + mg{NO2}/L + mg{NO3}/L + mg{NH3}/L + mg{NH4}/L + mg{P}/L + mg{PO4}/L + %{saturation} + m + Cel + psu ---- PhysChemStandardExpression_Enum --> SEE</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>NOTE IN THE COMMON SCHEMA</p> <hr/> <p>SWSupportingQE</p> <hr/> <p>supportingQECategory --> CHANGE TO BOOLEANS</p> <p>supportingQECategoryRW : Boolean supportingQECategoryLW : Boolean supportingQECategoryTW : Boolean supportingQECategoryCW : Boolean</p> <hr/> <p>PercentageBQE / SWBQE</p> <hr/> <p>REPLACE WITH NEW CLASS BQEMethod</p> <p>+ bqeMethodName : String + bqeCode : enumeration BQE_Enum + bqeCategoryRW : Boolean + bqeCategoryLW : Boolean + bqeCategoryTW : Boolean + bqeCategoryCW : Boolean + percentageOfTypes : decimal + bqeSensitivityNutrientPollution : Boolean + bqeSensitivityOrganicPollution : Boolean + bqeSensitivitySalinePollution : Boolean + bqeSensitivityAcidification : Boolean + bqeSensitivityElevatedTemperature : Boolean + bqeSensitivityAlteredHabitatDueToHydrologicalChange : Boolean + bqeSensitivityAlteredHabitatDueToMorphologicalChange : Boolean + bqeSensitivityOtherImpact : String --- QEBiologicalCode_Enum --> RENAME TO BQE_Enum</p> <hr/> <p>SWPrioritySubstance</p> <hr/> <p>Rename psEULevel to psScale.</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<hr/> SWRBSP <hr/> <p>Add a new element to class SWRBSP after the element rbspUnit: Schema element: rbspScale Field type / facets: GeographicalScale_Enum (see Annex 8) Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 1 Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. Report the geographical scale at which the RBSP standard is applied.</p>				
20150717 10000311	Iker Garcia (Bilbomática)	17/07/2015	GWB	Improvements and simplifications to the schema	<p>GroundWaterBody</p> <hr/> <p>REMOVE gwOtherPollutantsExceedancesNotCounted otherRelevantGWPollutantRisk</p> <hr/> <p>groundWaterBodyChanges --> already in Spatial data (Evolution type enumeration to be changed) euGroundWaterBodyCode2010 --> already in Spatial data typeGroundWaterBodyChanges --> already in Spatial data groundwaterBodyArea --> TO BE ADDED in Spatial data groundwaterBodyScale --> should be provided in the spatial metadata groundwaterBodyScaleExplanation --> should be provided in the spatial metadata</p> <hr/> <p>GWAssociatedProtectedAreaGWHabitatsBirds_Enum --> REPLACE BY ProtectedAreaHabitatsBirdsObjective_Enum + Yes, specific water objectives have been set to protect all groundwater dependent habitats and species., + Yes, some specific water objectives have been set to protect groundwater dependent habitats and</p>	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>species but work is still on-going to determine needs., + No, no specific water objectives have been set to protect groundwater dependent habitats and species because the achievement of WFD good status is sufficient to achieve favourable conservation status., + No, no specific water objectives have been set to protect groundwater dependent habitats and species because additional needs are not known.,</p> <p>SWHabitatsBirds_Enum --> REPLACE BY ProtectedAreaHabitatsBirdsObjective_Enum + Yes, specific water objectives have been set to protect all water dependent habitats and species., + Yes, some specific water objectives have been set to protect water dependent habitats and species but work is still on-going to determine needs., + No, no specific water objectives have been set to protect water dependent habitats and species because the achievement of WFD good status is sufficient to achieve favourable conservation status., + No, no specific water objectives have been set to protect water dependent habitats and species because additional needs are not known.,</p> <p>ProtectedAreaHabitatsBirdsObjective_Enum + Yes, specific water objectives have been set to protect all dependent habitats and species., + Yes, some specific water objectives have been set to protect dependent habitats and species but work is still on-going to determine needs., + No, no specific water objectives have been set to protect dependent habitats and species because the achievement of WFD good status is sufficient to achieve favourable conservation status., + No, no specific water objectives have been set to protect dependent habitats and species because additional needs are not known.,</p> <p>----- SWHabitatsBirdsProtArea_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNoNoInformation_Enum and keep explanation in the Guidance</p>				

WFD 2016 testing Phase Helpdesk Log

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>+ Yes, the specific water objectives set to protect water dependent habitats and species are met., + No, the specific water objectives set to protect water dependent habitats and species are not yet met., + No information.,</p> <p>GWHabitatsBirdsProtArea_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNoNoInformation_Enum and keep explanation in the Guidance + Yes, the specific groundwater objectives set to protect groundwater dependent habitats and species are met., + No, the specific groundwater objectives set to protect groundwater dependent habitats and species are not yet met., + No information.,</p> <p>----- SWProtDrinking_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNo_Enum and keep explanation in the Guidance + Yes, specific standards have been set in the surface water body / Protected Area for all relevant parameters to protect the drinking water quality., + No, no specific standards have been set in the surface water body / Protected Area to protect the drinking water quality.,</p> <p>GWProtDrinking_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNo_Enum and keep explanation in the Guidance + Yes, specific standards have been set in the groundwater body / Protected Area for all relevant parameters to protect the drinking water quality., + No, no specific standards have been set in the groundwater body / Protected Area to protect the drinking water quality.,</p> <p>---- SWDrinkingProtArea_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNoNoInformation_Enum and keep explanation in the Guidance + Yes, the specific standards set in the surface water body / Protected Area to protect the drinking</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>water quality are met., + No, the specific standards set in the surface water body / Protected Area to protect the drinking water quality are not met., + No information.,</p> <p>GWDDrinkingProtArea_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNoNoInformation_Enum and keep explanation in the Guidance Yes, the specific standards set in the groundwater body / Protected Area to protect the drinking water quality are met., No, the specific standards set in the groundwater body / Protected Area to protect the drinking water quality are not met., No information.,</p> <p>----</p> <p>ProtShellfish_Enum --> RENAME TO ProtectedAreaShellfishObjective_Enum Yes, microbiological standards have been set to protect shellfish and these are identical to those in the repealed Shellfish Directive 2006/113/EC., Yes, microbiological standards have been set to protect shellfish and these are different to those in the repealed Shellfish Directive 2006/113/EC., No, no microbiological standards have been set to protect shellfish.,</p> <p>ShellfishProtArea_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNoNoInformation_Enum + Yes, the micrological standards to protect shellfish are met, + No, the micrological standards to protect shellfish are not met, + No, information,</p> <hr/> <p>Order the elements: + euProtectedAreaCode + protectedAreaType : enum + protectAreaOtherType : string + protectedAreaAssociationType : enum + protectedAreaHabitatsBirdsObjectivesSet : enum + protectedAreaHabitatsBirdsObjectivesMet : enum [previously the status information]</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>+ protectedAreaDrinkingWaterObjectivesSet : enum + protectedAreaDrinkingWaterObjectivesMet : enum [previously the status information] + protectedAreaComment + protectedAreaExemptions</p> <hr/> <p>TrendReversal / UpwardTrend / GWOtherPollutantsCausingFailure / GWPollutantsCausingFailure / BackgroundNaturalSubstances / BackgroundNaturalSubstance</p> <hr/> <p>All these go away...</p> <hr/> <p>GWPollutant -----</p> <p>+ gwPollutantCode : Enum + gwPollutantOther : String</p> <p>+ gwPollutantUpwardTrend : Enum + gwPollutantTrendReversal : Enum + gwPollutantExcedancesNotCounted : Boolean + gwPollutantCausingRisk : Boolean + gwPollutantCausingFailure : Boolean --> MUST REPORT EXEMPTIONS</p> <p>+ gwPollutantBackgroundLevelSet : Boolean. NOTE: should there be a list of valid options and a conditional check? + gwPollutantBackgroundLevelValue : String. Mandatory if gwPollutantBackgroundLevelSet = TRUE + gwPollutantBackgroundLevelUnit : Codelist. Mandatory if gwPollutantBackgroundLevelSet = TRUE -----</p> <p>Keep the association with the EXEMPTIONS.</p>				
20150717 10000301	Iker Garcia (Bilbomática)	17/07/2015	SWB	Improvements and simplifications to the schema	<p>SurfaceWaterBody</p> <hr/> <p>REMOVE: swEffectStatusNewThresholds</p>	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>swFailingRbsp substancesExceedingEQSInMixingZone</p> <p>These go to the new SWPrioritySubstance Class</p> <hr/> <p>THINGS TO BE RENAMED OR UPDATED</p> <p>swSignificantPressureTypes --> RENAME TO swSignificantPressureType swOtherPressureDescription --> RENAME TO swSignificantPressureOther swSignificantImpactTypes --> RENAME TO swSignificantImpactType swOtherImpactDescription --> RENAME TO swSignificantImpactOther</p> <p>targetStatusOrPotential --> RENAME TO swEcologicalStatusOrPotentialType ecologicalStatusOrPotentialValue --> RENAME TO swEcologicalStatusOrPotentialValue swEcologicalConfidence --> RENAME TO swEcologicalAssessmentConfidence expected2015GoodEcologicalStatusOrPotential --> RENAME TO swEcologicalStatusOrPotentialExpectedGoodIn2015 goodEcologicalStatusOrPotentialAchievementDate --> RENAME TO swEcologicalStatusOrPotentialExpectedAchievementDate</p> <p>swChemicalConfidence --> RENAME TO swChemicalAssessmentConfidence swExpected2015GoodChemicalStatus --> RENAME TO swChemicalStatusExpectedGoodIn2015 swGoodChemicalStatusAchievementDate --> RENAME TO swChemicalStatusExpectedAchievementDate</p> <p>mixingZones --> RENAME TO swMixingZones proportionSWBDesignatedMixingZone --> RENAME TO swMixingZonesProportion</p> <p>StatusOrPotentialType_Enum --> UPDATE codes</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>+ Status + Potential + Not applicable</p> <p>StatusEcologicalCode_Enum --> RENAME TO EcologicalStatusCode_Enum AND UPDATE codes + 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + Unknown + Not applicable (for TeW only)</p> <hr/> <p>THINGS TO BE REMOVED</p> <p>surfaceWaterBodyChanges --> already in Spatial data (Evolution type enumeration to be changed) euSurfaceWaterBodyCode2010 --> already in Spatial data typeSurfaceWaterBodyChanges --> already in Spatial data riverWaterBodyName --> already in Spatial data riverWaterBodyCode --> already in Spatial data surfaceWaterBodyArea --> already in Spatial data riverLength --> already in Spatial data surfaceWaterBodyScale --> should be provided in the spatial metadata surfaceWaterBodyScaleExplanation --> should be provided in the spatial metadata</p> <hr/> <p>SWAssociatedProtectedArea</p> <hr/> <p>GWHabitatsBirds_Enum --> REPLACE BY ProtectedAreaHabitatsBirdsObjective_Enum + Yes, specific water objectives have been set to protect all groundwater dependent habitats and species., + Yes, some specific water objectives have been set to protect groundwater dependent habitats and species but work is still on-going to determine needs., + No, no specific water objectives have been set to protect groundwater dependent habitats and</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>species because the achievement of WFD good status is sufficient to achieve favourable conservation status., + No, no specific water objectives have been set to protect groundwater dependent habitats and species because additional needs are not known.,</p> <p>SWHabitatsBirds_Enum --> REPLACE BY ProtectedAreaHabitatsBirdsObjective_Enum + Yes, specific water objectives have been set to protect all water dependent habitats and species., + Yes, some specific water objectives have been set to protect water dependent habitats and species but work is still on-going to determine needs., + No, no specific water objectives have been set to protect water dependent habitats and species because the achievement of WFD good status is sufficient to achieve favourable conservation status., + No, no specific water objectives have been set to protect water dependent habitats and species because additional needs are not known.,</p> <p>ProtectedAreaHabitatsBirdsObjective_Enum + Yes, specific water objectives have been set to protect all dependent habitats and species., + Yes, some specific water objectives have been set to protect dependent habitats and species but work is still on-going to determine needs., + No, no specific water objectives have been set to protect dependent habitats and species because the achievement of WFD good status is sufficient to achieve favourable conservation status., + No, no specific water objectives have been set to protect dependent habitats and species because additional needs are not known.,</p> <p>----- SWHabitatsBirdsProtArea_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNoNoInformation_Enum and keep explanation in the Guidance</p> <p>+ Yes, the specific water objectives set to protect water dependent habitats and species are met., + No, the specific water objectives set to protect water dependent habitats and species are not yet</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>met., + No information.,</p> <p>GWHabitatsBirdsProtArea_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNoNoInformation_Enum and keep explanation in the Guidance + Yes, the specific groundwater objectives set to protect groundwater dependent habitats and species are met., + No, the specific groundwater objectives set to protect groundwater dependent habitats and species are not yet met., + No information.,</p> <p>-----</p> <p>SWProtDrinking_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNo_Enum and keep explanation in the Guidance + Yes, specific standards have been set in the surface water body / Protected Area for all relevant parameters to protect the drinking water quality., + No, no specific standards have been set in the surface water body / Protected Area to protect the drinking water quality.,</p> <p>GWProtDrinking_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNo_Enum and keep explanation in the Guidance + Yes, specific standards have been set in the groundwater body / Protected Area for all relevant parameters to protect the drinking water quality., + No, no specific standards have been set in the groundwater body / Protected Area to protect the drinking water quality.,</p> <p>----</p> <p>SWDrinkingProtArea_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNoNoInformation_Enum and keep explanation in the Guidance + Yes, the specific standards set in the surface water body / Protected Area to protect the drinking water quality are met., + No, the specific standards set in the surface water body / Protected Area to protect the drinking water quality are not met.,</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>+ No information.,</p> <p>GWDDrinkingProtArea_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNoNoInformation_Enum and keep explanation in the Guidance</p> <p>Yes, the specific standards set in the groundwater body / Protected Area to protect the drinking water quality are met.,</p> <p>No, the specific standards set in the groundwater body / Protected Area to protect the drinking water quality are not met.,</p> <p>No information.,</p> <p>----</p> <p>ProtShellfish_Enum --> RENAME TO ProtectedAreaShellfishObjective_Enum</p> <p>Yes, microbiological standards have been set to protect shellfish and these are identical to those in the repealed Shellfish Directive 2006/113/EC.,</p> <p>Yes, microbiological standards have been set to protect shellfish and these are different to those in the repealed Shellfish Directive 2006/113/EC.,</p> <p>No, no microbiological standards have been set to protect shellfish.,</p> <p>ShellfishProtArea_Enum --> REPLACE BY YesNoNoInformation_Enum</p> <p>+ Yes, the micrological standards to protect shellfish are met,</p> <p>+ No, the micrological standards to protect shellfish are not met,</p> <p>+ No, information,</p> <p>----</p> <hr/> <p>Order the elements:</p> <p>+ euProtectedAreaCode</p> <p>+ protectedAreaType : enum</p> <p>+ protectAreaOtherType : string</p> <p>+ protectedAreaAssociationType : enum</p> <p>+ protectedAreaHabitatsBirdsObjectivesSet : enum</p> <p>+ protectedAreaHabitatsBirdsObjectivesMet : enum [previously the status information]</p> <p>+ protectedAreaDrinkingWaterObjectivesSet : enum</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>+ protectedAreaDrinkingWaterObjectivesMet : enum [previously the status information]</p> <p>+ protectedAreaShellfishObjectivesSet : + protectedAreaShellfishObjectivesMet : [previously the status information]</p> <p>+ protectedAreaComment</p> <p>+ protectedAreaExemptions</p> <hr/> <p>QualityElementQEXSoP</p> <hr/> <p>Why this odd class name? Why isn't it called QualityElement ?</p> <p>Also the "x" in the attribute names is not in the guidance.</p> <p>+ qeCode + qeStatusOrPotentialValue + qeMonitoringResults + qeMonitoringPeriod + qeGrouping + qeStatusOrPotentialChange + qeStatusOrPotentialComparability + qeEcologicalExemptionType</p> <hr/> <p>SWChemicalExemptionType</p> <hr/> <p>ASSOCIATION has multiplicity 0..n</p> <hr/> <p>SWChemicalExceedance</p> <hr/> <p>Rename CLASS and ASSOCIATION to SWPrioritySubstance</p> <p>swPrioritySubstanceCode : PS_Enum swPrioritySubstanceExceedanceType : enum swPrioritySubstanceCausingFailure : Boolean --> MUST REPORT Exemptions IF true swPrioritySubstanceEffectStatusNewThresholds : Yes No Not Applicable (QC required - must be one of the 7 substances with new thresholds) swPrioritySubstanceExceedanceInMixingZone :</p>				

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					Boolean swPrioritySubstanceImprovingChemicalStatus : Boolean <hr/> SWEcologicalExemptionType <hr/> There's an error here: the swEcologicalExemptionPressure should be 0..*				
20150717 10000187	Iker Garcia (Bilbomática)	17/07/2015	GWMET	Improvements and simplifications to the schema	GWCharacterisation <hr/> Class GWCharacterisation --> REMOVE gwCharacterisationReference --> MOVE TO CLASS GWMethodologies. <hr/> GWExemptions <hr/> REPLACE Annex1b44NotApplied_Union_Enum Annex1b45NotApplied_Union_Enum WITH THE SAME CODELIST {Impact_Enum + "Exemption not applied"} REPLACE Annex1c44NotApplied_Union_Enum Annex1c45NotApplied_Union_Enum WITH THE SAME CODELIST {Drivers_Enum + "Exemption not applied"} <hr/> GWMethodologies <hr/> impactsGWAbstraction --> REMOVE impactGWAbstractionGWBalance : Boolean <-- ADD impactGWAbstractionSWObjective : Boolean <-- ADD impactGWAbstractionSWDiminutionStatus : Boolean <-- ADD impactGWAbstractionDamageGWDE : Boolean <-- ADD	Pending for v6.0	Pending for v6.0	No action needed	No action needed

Ticket#	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
					<p>impactGWAbstractionSalineIntrusion : Boolean <- - ADD</p> <p>thresholdValueElements --> REMOVE thresholdValueElementProtectionEcosystem : Boolean <-- ADD thresholdValueElementProtectionGWDE : Boolean <-- ADD thresholdValueElementProtectionUses : Boolean <-- ADD thresholdValueElementSalineIntrusion : Boolean <-- ADD</p> <hr/> <p>PollutantsIndicator</p> <hr/> <p>CLASS AND ASSOCIATION PollutantsIndicator --> RENAME TO PollutantIndicator</p> <p>pollutantsIndicators --> RENAME TO pollutantIndicatorCode : _Enum thresholdValueRange --> RENAME TO pollutantIndicatorValue thresholdValueRangeUnit --> RENAME TO pollutantIndicatorUnit : {mg/L, ug/L } Rename levelITVEstablished to thresholdValueScale and use as enumeration list GeographicalScale_Enum</p> <p>Rename: PollutantIndicator class and association to ThresholdValue pollutantIndicatorValue to thresholdValue pollutantIndicatorUnit to thresholdValueUnit</p> <p>Class GWExemptions</p> <p>Rename gwDisproportionateScale to gwDisproportionateCostScale driversGWExemptionsReference to gwExemptionsDriversReference</p>				