WFD 2016 Helpdesk Log

European Commission

Directorate-General Environment

Update Date
04th September
15th September
16th September
21st September
25th September
02nd October
05th October
20th October

Table of contents

1   Introduction

This document reflects the ongoing log of questions and clarifications during 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 6.0 version

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
2015081710000176	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	17/08/2015	SWB	Nomenclature for qe-related information: In terms of qe-related information Version 5.0 of Reporting Guidance shows by an example how names of Schema Elements should look like. In Version 6.0 there is a "general version" only. Illustration: Version 5.0: QE11PhytoplanktonStatusOrPotentialValue Annex 8o: QE1-1 Phytoplankton Version 6.0: qeStatusOrPotentialValue Annex 8h: QE1-1 – Phytoplankton Therefore it is not clear how the nomenclature for Schema Element should look like. QE1-1-PhytoplanktonStatusOrPotentialValue, QE1-1 – PhytoplanktonStatusOrPotentialValue, qe1-1-PhytoplanktonStatusOrPotentialValue or qe1-1 – PhytoplanktonStatusOrPotentialValue? It would be helpful to add an example for one QE in the Guidance Document.	The way in which the information is organised was modified from v.5 to v.6. Instead of a series of schema elements for each QE, there is now one class QualityElement which, for eaqch QE, includes the identification of the QE (from the enumeration list in Annex 8h), followed by the information for that specific QE (including, among others, the schema element qeStatusOrPotentialValue).	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
2015081810000227	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	18/08/2015	SWB	Schema Element swSignificantPressureTypes + Annex 1a List of Pressure Types: please check Annex 1 a List of Pressures in Reporting Guidance 6.0 against Version 4.9 or 5.0.	"No significant pressure" and "Not applicable added to Annex 1a and enumeration list SignificantPressureType_Enum	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				Version 4.9/5.0: Schema element: SWSignificantPressureTypes Field type / facets: Enumeration list (List of pressure types (see Annex 1a) plus options 'No significant pressure types' and 'Not relevant'): (1-∞) was changed into Version 6.0 Schema element: swSignificantPressureType Field type / facets: SignificantPressureType_Enum (see Annex 1a) In Annex 1 a options 'No significant pressure types'and 'Not relevant' are not included. Due to this in Version 6.0 options 'No significant pressure types' and 'Not relevant" are "dropped". Is this a slip-off or are there substantive reasons for this?					
2015081810000307	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	18/08/2015	SWB	SchemaElement reservoir: Please check text in Field type /facets. Red marked text should not be included in "values" for YesNoUnclearReservoir_Enum or does not match with red marked text for valid values in Guidance on completion of schema element: Schema element: reservoir Field type / facets / relationship: YesNoUnclearReservoir_Enum Yes, it is a reservoir and the water body was originally a river No, it is a reservoir but the water body was originally a lake	The text in the "guidance on completion" and the schema element annotation was changed to reflect the options in the enumeration list.	Done in version 6.0.1 (annotation updated)	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				Unclear, it is a reservoir but originally included chained rivers and lakes The water body is not a reservoir Properties: maxOccurs = 1 mixOccurs: 0 Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. For heavily modified river or lake water bodies, indicate whether the water body is a reservoir that has been created by damming a river ('Yes') or an existing lake ('No'). It is the recommendation of this Guidance that reservoirs formed by damming rivers should be reported as heavily modified river water bodies.However, Member States may choose to report reservoirs formed by damming rivers as lake water bodies if they wish. The 'reservoir' schema element must be reported so that Member States can clarify the designation. 'Yes' = Select only if the whole surface water body represents a reservoir (or part of a reservoir) created by damming a river. (surfaceWaterBodyCategory must be reported as 'RW' and naturalAWBHMWB as 'Heavily Modified'). 'No' = Select if the whole surface water body represents a reservoir (or part of a reservoir) created by modifying an existing lake, or if the surface water body includes some small reservoirs which are not significant enough to be identified as separate surface water bodies. (surfaceWaterBodyCategory must be reported as 'LW' and naturalAWBHMWB as 'Heavily Modified'). 'Unclear' = Select in such cases where the reservoir has been created by damming a water body which contained chained rivers and lakes.					

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				(surfaceWaterBodyCategory must be reported as 'RW' or 'LW' and naturalAWBHMWB as 'Heavily Modified'). 'The water body is not a reservoir' = Indicates that the river or lake water body is not a reservoir.					
20150818 10000343	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	18/08/20 15	SWB	SchemaElement surfaceWaterBodyIntercalibrationType/ Annex 8a List of Intercalibration types: Annex 8a List of Intercalibration types for SchemaElement surfaceWaterBodyIntercalibrationType against Field type/ facets for SchemaElement SurfaceWaterBodyIntercalibrationType from Version 4.9 (page 36): Schema element: SurfaceWaterBodyIntercalibrationType Field type / facets / relationship: Enumeration list (List of common intercalibration types (see Annex 8a) plus option 'Not relevant'): (1-∞) Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. If the surface water body type corresponds with an intercalibration type, report the intercalibration type code (not name). The intercalibration type reported in this element must be appropriate to the surface water body's Category. If there is no corresponding intercalibration type, select 'Not relevant'. Report 'Not relevant' for territorial waters. Quality checks: Element check: SurfaceWaterBodyIntercalibrationType must be reported. A valid option must be selected from the enumeration list. More than one option can be selected.	Short enumeration lists were kept in the main text, longer lists were moved to annex. This one was already in an annex before, only the way in which this is stated changed slightly…	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				Within-schema check: 'Not relevant' should be reported if SurfaceWaterBodyCategory is 'TeW'. Cross-schema check: SurfaceWaterBodyIntercalibrationType must be consistent with the codes reported in SWMET/IntercalibrationType Version 6.0 (page 36): Schema element: surfaceWaterBodyIntercalibrationType Field type / facets / relationship: SWIntercalibrationType_Enum (see Annex 8a) Properties: maxOccurs = unbounded minOccurs = 1 Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. If the surface water body type corresponds with an intercalibration type, report the intercalibration type code (not name). The intercalibration type reported in this element must be appropriate to the surface water body's Category. If there is no corresponding intercalibration type, select 'Not applicable'. Report 'Not applicable' for territorial waters. Option 'Not relevant' from 4.9 changed into 'Not applicable', that is fine but it is confusing that in Version 6.0 sometimes options moved from Field type/ facets into an Annex list and sometimes not.					
20150818 10000352	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	18/08/20 15	SWB	Schema element: surfaceWaterBodyTransboundary Schema	The description of the QA/QC has been updated in the guidance and schemas and the implemented QA/QC rule already checks for 'Not applicable'.	Done in version 6.0.1 (annotati	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	Done in version 6.0.1

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				element: surfaceWaterBodyTransboundary Field type / facets / relationship: YesNoNotApplicable_Union_Enum: Yes, No, Not applicable Properties: maxOccurs = 1 minOccurs = 1 Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. Answer should be yes if the Water Body extends across the national border or is shared with other countries (i.e. the river is the national border). Not applicable for territorial waters. Quality checks: Within-schema check: 'No' should be reported if SurfaceWaterBodyCategory is 'TeW'.		on corrected)			
20150818 10000361	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	18/08/20 15	SWB	Inconsistency between SchemaElement Duidance and lists in Annex 1a and 1b Please check yellow marked text (page 42/43) against lists in Annex 1a or Annex 1b. Schema element: swSignificantPressureOther Field type / facets: String1000Type Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0 Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. If '7 Other anthropogenic pressures' is selected from the enumeration list and reported under swSignificantPressureType, provide details of any other anthropogenic pressure types which are relevant in this element. This element should only be reported if the pressure type is not included in the enumeration list underswSignificantPressureType. Quality checks: Conditional check: Report if '7 Other anthropogenic pressures' is selected from	Guidance corrected to bring it in line with the enumeration lists in Annex 1a and Annex 1b	Done in version 6.0.1 (annotatio n corrected)	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				the enumeration list under swSignificantPressureType. '7 Other anthropogenic pressures' should be '7 – Anthropogenic pressure – Other' 'Unknown impact' should be 'UNKN - Unknown impact type' 'No significant impact' should be 'NOSI - No significant impact' 'Not applicable' should be 'NOTA - Not applicable (Territorial Waters)' 'Other Significant Impacts' should be 'OTHE - Other significant impact type'					
20150818 10000361	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	18/08/20 15	SWB	Inconsistency between SchemaElement Duidance and lists in Annex 1a and 1b Please check yellow marked text (page 42/43) against lists in Annex 1a or Annex 1b. Schema element: swSignificantImpactType Field type / facets: SignificantImpactType_Enum (see Annex 1b) Properties: maxOccurs =unbounded minOccurs = 1 Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. Indicate the impact type(s) from theenumeration list. If the ecological status or potential of the surface water body is less than good, at least one significant impact type or the option 'Unknown impact' must be reported. The option 'No significant impact' is not valid. If the chemical status of the surface water body is less than good, at least one significant impact	Guidance corrected to bring it in line with the enumeration lists in Annex 1a and Annex 1b	Done in version 6.0.1 (annotatio n corrected)	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				type or the option 'Unknown impact' must be reported. The option 'No significant impact' is not valid. Quality checks: Within-schema check: the option 'No significant impact' is not compatible with any other. Within-schema check: the option 'Not applicable' is not compatible with any other option and must be selected if and only if surfaceWaterBodyCategory is 'TeW' (not compatible with any other surfaceWaterBodyCategory). Within-schema check: If SWB/SWEcologicalStatus/SwEcologicalStatusOrPotentialValue is '3', '4' or '5', at least one significant impact type or the option 'Unknown impact' must be selected from the enumeration list . The option 'No significant impact' is not a valid selection. Within-schema check: If SWB/SurfaceWaterBody/swChemicalStatusValue is '3', at least one significant impact type or the option 'Unknown impact' must be selected from the enumeration list. The option 'No significant impact' is not a valid selection. '7 Other anthropogenic pressures' should be '7 – Anthropogenic pressure – Other' 'Unknown impact' should be 'UNKN - Unknown impact type' 'No significant impact' should be 'NOSI - No significant impact' 'Not applicable' should be 'NOTA - Not applicable (Territorial Waters)' 'Other Significant Impacts' should be 'OTHE - Other significant impact type'					

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	**Guidance**	**GIS guidance**	**QA/QC**
20150818 10000361	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	18/08/2015	SWB	Inconsistency between SchemaElement Duidance and lists in Annex 1a and 1b Please check yellow marked text (page 42/43) against lists in Annex 1a or Annex 1b. Schema element: swSignificantImpactOther Field type / facets: String01000Type Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0 Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. If 'Other Significant Impacts' is selected from the enumeration list under swSignificantImpactType, provide details of any other impact types which are relevant in this element. This element should only be reported if the impact type is not included in the enumeration list under swSignificantImpactType. Quality checks: Conditional check: Report if 'Other Significant Impacts' is selected from the enumeration list under swSignificantImpactType '7 Other anthropogenic pressures' should be '7 – Anthropogenic pressure – Other' 'Unknown impact' should be 'UNKN - Unknown impact type' 'No significant impact' should be 'NOSI - No significant impact' 'Not applicable' should be 'NOTA - Not applicable (Territorial Waters)' 'Other Significant Impacts' should be 'OTHE - Other significant impact type'	Guidance corrected to bring it in line with the enumeration lists in Annex 1a and Annex 1b	Done in version 6.0.1 (annotation corrected)	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	Done in version 6.0.1
20150819 10000207	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	19/08/2015	SWB	Schema Element swChemicalStatusExpectedGoodIn2015 please check text in Guidance on completion of	Corrected in the Guidance	Done in version 6.0.1 (annotati	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				schema element: Schema element: swChemicalStatusExpectedGoodIn2015 Field type / facets: YesNoCode_Enum: Yes, No Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 1 Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. Indicate whether it is expected that this surface water body will achieve good chemical status by the end of 2015. This may differ from the data reported under swChemicalStatusValue because the assessment of status included in the second RBMP will most likely be based on monitoring data from the period 2010-2014, given that the second RBMP will be prepared in 2014 for public consultation. Therefore, the status communicated in the second RBMP may not necessarily reflect the expected status in 2015. The methodology of this assessment should be clearly explained in the RBMP or background documents (reference reported under classification methodologies (see Section 7.3)). If an Article 4(4) or 4(5) exemption for chemical status is applied then 'No' should be selected. It should be Section 7.4 .		on corrected)			
20150820 10000357	OUVRARD Elsa (FR)	20/08/20 15		Comments and questions regarding WFD reporting guidance and schemas v6.0. Regarding Annex 9 and the reporting of background documents : We couldn't find any « Reference schema element » (i.e. schema element for which it is	The 'ReferenceType' table contains the data about the reference document itself (subject, filename, hyperlink…) The 'ReferenceType_Link' table is used to link those reference documents in the	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				required to provide references or hyperlinks to RBMPs or background documents) in the Access database v6.0. How do we report these schema elements? Could you describe how the ReferenceType class is linked to other tables ? How should we fill the 'ReferenceType_Link' table ? Can you give us any examples on how to report the schema element bookmark ? How do we report this schema element when information can be found in several sections of a same document ?	'ReferenceType' table with the corresponding tables. This is how it must be filled: • source: it has a predefined list to select elements from. This list contains the tables/fields in which a reference document should be reported. • sourceID: in this field an ID from the table selected in the 'source' field must be filled. This ID may vary from table to table. • ReferenceTypeID: the ID of a reference document in the 'ReferenceType' table.				
20150820 10000357	OUVRARD Elsa (FR)	20/08/20 15	GWB	Comments and questions regarding WFD reporting guidance and schemas v6.0. The schema element gwQuantitativeStatusExpectedAchievementDate is clearly described in the Reporting Guidance v6 (on page 79) but we can't find it in the Access Database or in the GWB schema available on EIONET.	gwQuantitativeStatusExpectedAchievementDate added to the GWB schema	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150820 10000357	OUVRARD Elsa (FR)	20/08/20 15	GWMET	Comments and questions regarding WFD reporting guidance and schemas v6.0. Enumeration lists for the schema elements diminutionDamage, needsTerrestrialEcosystems and availableGroundwaterResource in the database are different from the ones proposed in the GWMET schema or in the guidance document. For the diminutionDamage schema element, we can only select 'Not applicable' in the database. For the two others, we can select 'Yes' or 'No'	There was an error in the generation of some of the lookup tables of the Access DB. These issues will be fixed on the next DB delivery.	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				but not 'Partially'.					
20150820 10000357	OUVRARD Elsa (FR)	20/08/20 15	GWB	Comments and questions regarding WFD reporting guidance and schemas v6.0. Concerning the schema element gwBackgroundLevelUnit, there is an inconsistency between what is written in the reporting guidance ("the reporting unit of Conductivity is milli Siemens per metre") and the relevant units proposed in the database ("S/m").	Changed to uS/cm (this is the unit used in the Eionet data dictionary)	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150820 10000357	OUVRARD Elsa (FR)	20/08/20 15	RBMPPoM	Comments and questions regarding WFD reporting guidance and schemas v6.0. Shouldn't the table SignificantSubstanceFailing be linked to the table SignificantPressure OrSubstanceFailingType ? The schema element 'description' (from table SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType) does not appear in the reporting guidance. How do we report this schema element ?	The following tables will disappear from the next Access DB delivery since they are not referenced/used anymore: • SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailin gType • SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailin gType_pressureTypes • SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailin gType_prioritySubstances • SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailin gType_rbdSpecificPollutants	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150820 10000357	OUVRARD Elsa (FR)	20/08/20 15		Comments and questions regarding WFD reporting guidance and schemas v6.0. We have also noticed that several quality checks have disappeared in the new guidance document. What does it mean ?	The quality checks that are embedded in the XML (e.g. whether a string is reported in a string field, or a number in a decimal number field) should be obvious and therefore have been removed in order to reduce the size of the document.	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150824 10000144	Mikel Santamari a	24/08/20 15	SWB	Typos found in shema Schema: SWB. FaillingRBSP element should	Schema corrected	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation	No impleme ntation	No impleme ntation

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
	(Contractor)			be FailingRBSP			needed	needed	needed
20150824 10000144	Mikel Santamaria (Contractor)	24/08/2015	WFDCommon	Typos found in shema Schema: WFDCommon. YesNoUnclearReservoir_Enum enumeration. First element should be 'Yes, it is a reservoir and the water body was originally a river'	Schema corrected	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150825 10000188	Denward Måns (SE)	25/08/2015	All	Reporting schemas final version: Is the final draft version 6.0 of the reporting tools expected to undergo further changes or can it be regarded stabile? When is the finalized version expected to be published?	Version 6.0.1 is being published in the third week of September. After that, only correction of mistakes will happen in case any are found.	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150825 10000286	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	25/08/2015	RBMPPoM	Inconsistency with UML for RBMPPoM/Service: please check typing on page 287 for following SchemaElements: ServiceWaterUseHouseholds ServiceWaterUseAgriculture ServiceWaterUseIndustry ServiceWaterUseOther SchemaElement Names should start with "s" (in UML Schema it is correct).	Corrected in the Guidance	No implementation needed	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150826	Francesca	26/08/20	RBMPPoM	IT issue:	Article 4(5) concerns measures to be taken in	No	No	No	No

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
10000168	Piva (IT)	15		I have a question about Additional measure (article 11(5)): In the schema element MeasureType, the enumeration list has 2 records: Basic/Supplementary. Where is it possible to specify that a measure is planned under article 11(5)? Thank you	the middle of the planning cycle when monitoring shows that what was planned is not enough to achieve the objectives. If the measure is continued for the next cycle it should be included in the RBMPs as basic or supplementary. It should be noted that, in line with Annex VII, Member States are required to report in the RBMP on additional measures taken during the previous implementation cycle. This, however, is not part of the electronic reporting in WISE.	implementation needed	implementation needed	implementation needed	implementation needed
20150826 10000186	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	26/08/2015	RBMPPoM	SchemaElement wqAlternativeIndicator: please check name for SchemaElement wqAlternativeIndicator (remark: is consistent with UML). Shouldn't it be wqAlternativeIndicatorReference due to Field type/facets ReferenceType?	wqAlternativeIndicator was renamed to wqAlternativeIndicatorReference (guide & schemas) The same issue described on this ticket also happens with the element RBMPPoM / Costs / costExplanation20152021, which will be renamed to costExplanation20152021Reference. We have created a new ticket in this regards: Ticket#2015091010000151	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150826 10000248	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	26/08/2015	Reporting Guidance	Duplication in chapter numbers: Please check chapter no on page 128: 6.3.1. GIS information GIS information in GML file format should be reported for RBDs and Sub-units according to the specifications of the guidance for reporting spatial data (see Annex 5 GIS Guidance). 6.3.2. Guidance on the contents of the	Corrected in the Reporting Guidance	No implementation needed	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	**Guidance**	**GIS guidance**	**QA/QC**
				RBMPs/background documents There are already chapter 6.3.1 Schema sketch and 6.3.2 Information and data to be reported using the schemas.					
20150831 10000578	OUVRARD Elsa (FR)	31/08/2015	Reporting Guidance	-Schema element : indicatorGap The proposed list of indicators in Annexe 8p does not allow selecting quantitative pressure indicators. The option 'Number of water bodies not achieving objectives because of this pressure' which was available in Annex 8r of the WFD Reporting Guidance v4.9. is not available in Annex 8p of the new guidance document. We can't select any quantitative indicator for pressure : all PN indicators, in annex 8p, are defined for substances and not pressures.	Generic indicators such as the one mentioned were not kept, since there are specific indicators for individual pressures/drivers. In any case, Member States can select 'PO99 – Other indicator' and specify additional indicators if they use an indicator that is not listed.	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150831 10000578	OUVRARD Elsa (FR)	31/08/2015	Reporting Guidance	-Schema element : msfdAssessment	Changed in the Guidance	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				Could you correct the guidance document and replace 'in order to achieve relevant MSFD objectives in coastal and marine environments ' by 'in order to contribute' as discussed and agreed in WG DIKE.					
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		In the enumeration list of Annex 1a, the 2 elements: "not relevant" and "no significant pressure" are missing. Should we type them in the db access?	Same issue as in 2015081810000227 above				
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		In Annex 7, there is still a reference to section 9.2 instead of 9.3	Corrected in the Guidance	No impleme ntation needed	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		In Field type/facets: YearRangeType the example of a period of time is with 2 dash (e.g.2011--2013). It should be like this or it is possible to put only one dash?	Periods of time need to be indicated with two dashes (e.g. 2011--2013)	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		SWEcologicalExamptionType Max occurrence should be: unbounded	The multiplicity of the Class 'SWEcologicalExemptionType' is 1 to many. For each occurrence, only 1 schema element 'swEcologicalExemptionType' is to be reported.	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		In the enumeration list of SignificantPressureSubstanceFailing, there is not	In the schema element 'significantPressureOrSubstanceFailing' the	No impleme	No impleme	No impleme	No impleme

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	**Guidance**	**GIS guidance**	**QA/QC**
				the list of pressures of Annex 1a.	enumeration list is 'SignificantPressureOrSubstanceFailingType_Union_Enum', which includes the list of pressures in Annex 1a. There was a bug on the DB Access lookup table and will be fixed on the next DB release.	ntation needed	ntation needed	ntation needed	ntation needed
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		In the WFD reporting v6.0 table schema list.xls, the path of table InputInventory should be RBMPPoM/InputInventory and not RBMPPoM/InputInventory/InputPollutant	The WFD reporting table v6.0.1 schema list.xls that will be delivered with the next Access DB already has the correct path for the reported element.	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		In the DB access v.6.0 there is the table InputCategoryType. It should not be anymore since the information of this table are now in table InputCategory	As InputCategoryType was removed from the schemas, related tables will not appear anymore on the upcoming DB Access delivery.	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		In the DB access v.6.0, the table InputInventory has the euSubUnitCode not conditional as it should be	euSubUnitCode has been correctly defined as conditional and will correctly appear on the upcoming DB Access delivery.	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		In the following table there are schema elements that have a discrepancy in the name between the guidance and the DB access: schema element in the Guidance v.6.0: impactsGWAbstractionBalance	Element name will correctly appear on the upcoming DB Access delivery	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				Field name in the DB access v.6.0: impactGWAbstractionBalance in table "GWMethodologies"					
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		In the following table there are schema elements that have a discrepancy in the name between the guidance and the DB access: schema element in the Guidance v.6.0: impactsGWAbstractionSWObjective Field name in the DB access v.6.0: impactGWAbstractionSWObjective in table "GWMethodologies"	Element name will correctly appear on the upcoming DB Access delivery	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		In the following table there are schema elements that have a discrepancy in the name between the guidance and the DB access: schema element in the Guidance v.6.0: impactsGWAbstractionSWDiminutionStatus Field name in the DB access v.6.0: impactGWAbstractionSWDiminutionStatus in table "GWMethodologies"	Element name will correctly appear on the upcoming DB Access delivery	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		In the following table there are schema elements that have a discrepancy in the name between the guidance and the DB access: schema element in the Guidance v.6.0: impactsGWAbstractionDamageGWDE Field name in the DB access v.6.0: impactGWAbstractionDamageGWDE in table "GWMethodologies"	Element name will correctly appear on the upcoming DB Access delivery	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		In the following table there are schema elements that have a discrepancy in the name between the guidance and the DB access: schema element in the Guidance v.6.0: impactsGWAbstractionSalineIntrusion Field name in the DB access v.6.0: impactGWAbstractionSalineIntrusion in table "GWMethodologies"	Element name will correctly appear on the upcoming DB Access delivery	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/20 15		In the following table there are schema elements that have a discrepancy in the name	These are two different schema elements, the first one ('gwQuantitativeStatusExpectedAchievementD ate') was missing. See 2015082010000357 above.	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				between the guidance and the DB access: schema element in the Guidance v.6.0: gwQuantitativeStatusExpectedAchievementDate Field name in the DB access v.6.0: gwGoodChemicalStatusExpectedAchievementDate in table "GroundWaterBody"	'gwChemicalStatusExpectedAchievementDate' element name will correctly appear on the upcoming DB Access delivery				
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/2015		In the following table there are schema elements that have a discrepancy in the name between the guidance and the DB access: schema element in the Guidance v.6.0: inputCategoryUnit Field name in the DB access v.6.0: inputUnitCategory in table "InputCategory"	Element name will correctly appear on the upcoming DB Access delivery	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/2015		In the following table there are schema elements that have a discrepancy in the name between the guidance and the DB access: schema element in the Guidance v.6.0: inputUWWTPCoverage	Element name will correctly appear on the upcoming DB Access delivery	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				Field name in the DB access v.6.0: inputUWWTDCoverage in table"InputCategory"					
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/2015		In the following table there are schema elements that have a discrepancy in the name between the guidance and the DB access: schema element in the Guidance v.6.0: bqeMethodName Field name in the DB access v.6.0: qeCodeBQEName in table "BQEMethod"	Element name will correctly appear on the upcoming DB Access delivery	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/2015		In the following table there are schema elements that have a discrepancy in the name between the guidance and the DB access: schema element in the Guidance v.6.0: improvementsInStatusQuantitativeGWB Field name in the DB access v.6.0: improvementInStatusQuantitativeGWB in table "Progress"	Schema element corrected, from 'improvementInStatusQuantitativeGWB' to 'improvementsInStatusQuantitativeGWB'	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150901 10000257	Francesca Piva (IT)	01/09/2015		In the following table there are schema elements	Schema element corrected, from 'improvementInStatusChemicalGWB' to 'improvementsInStatusChemicalGWB'	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation	No implementation	No implementation

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				that have a discrepancy in the name between the guidance and the DB access: schema element in the Guidance v.6.0: improvementsInStatusChemicalGWB Field name in the DB access v.6.0: improvementInStatusChemicalGWB in table "Progress"			needed	needed	needed
20150902 10000175	Iker Garcia Tierra (Contractor)	02/09/2015	All	WFD Common date types fix: GoodStatus_Enum The enumeration values have been updated accordinly to correctly specify the year ranges with double dashes. e.g 2016--2021, 2022--2027 YearMonthType The regular expression has been updated to correctly validate YYYY-MM values. Is it correct to have single dashes here, as it is specified on the guide?	Changes implemented on the schemas. The pattern is YYYY-MM for month (single dash) and YYYY--YYYY for a range (double dash).	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150902 10000237	Sara Pelegrin Mc Carthy (ES)	02/09/2015		We would like to know when will the updates related to the "XML transformation tool" (adaptation to v 6.0 {Including Annex0 structure and the "Shape to GML transformation tool" be available at the WISE website.	There is a decision to wait in order to publish the conversion tools as the v6.0 is being reviewed. We are currently finalising the v6.01, the publication of this new release will take place soon (before September 23rd). You will be informed through the COMMISSION when the transformation tools are ready. Access to XML and Shape to GML	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				(expeted 28/08/2015)					
20150903 10000173	Joaquim Capitao (DG ENV)	03/09/20 15	RBMPPoM	Enumeration list MSFDMeasuresNeeded_Enum: Please add one more option to the enumeration list MSFDMeasuresNeeded_Enum: "None". This is needed for the cases where the need for additional measures has been considered (so element msfdAssessment is "Yes") but the conclusion was that no additional measures were needed. The same change is being introduced in the reporting guidance.	The option "None" added to the enumeration list MSFDMeasuresNeeded_Enum	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150903 10000208	Joaquim Capitao (DG ENV)	03/09/20 15	GWMET	Enumeration list SignificantPressureType_Enum: In the enumeration list SignificantPressureType_Enum, in addition to the need to added 'No significant pressure' and 'Not applicable', mentioned in another request, the pressures identified with numbers 3.1 to 3.7 need to be changed from 'Abstraction' to 'Abstraction or flow diversion'.	'Abstraction' changed to 'Abstraction or flow diversion' in the enumeration list SignificantPressureType_Enum. (see also 2015081810000227 above)	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
20150903 10000217	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	03/09/2015	GWMET	Schema element: balanceRechargeAbstraction,BalanceRechargeAbstraction_Enum (chapter 8.3.3.2, page 179): please check Schema element balanceRechargeAbstraction, BalanceRechargeAbstraction_Enum (chapter 8.3.3.2, page 179) in terms of the wording 'has been reported to be calculated': Schema element: balanceRechargeAbstraction Field type / facets: BalanceRechargeAbstraction_Enum: Method 1: A comparison of annual average groundwater abstraction against 'available groundwater resource' has been reported to be calculated for every groundwater body Method 2: A comparison of annual average groundwater abstractions against 'available groundwater resource' in the groundwater body has been reported to be calculated for a subset of all groundwater bodies Method 3: Where reliable information on groundwater levels across the groundwater body is available, data can be used to identify the presence of a sustained long-term decline in water levels caused by long-term groundwater abstraction. Where such a decline is present it will indicate that the conditions for good status are not being met and the body will be of poor status.	Text in the guidance changed to "was calculated" instead of "has been reported to be calculated".	No implementation needed	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150903	Manuela	03/09/20	GWMET	SchemaElements for GW trendAssessment:	"No" does indeed mean that a formal	No	No	No	No

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
10000235	Pfeiffer (DE)	15		please check correlation of following Schema Elements on page 179: Schema element: trendAssessmentPerformed Field type / facets: YesNoCode_Enum: Yes, No Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 1 Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. Indicate whether trend assessment in groundwater pollutants been performed. Field type/facets and Guidance for trendAssessmentMethodology is not helpful (but maybe I don't understand text under Guidance, I guess "No" means "Expert judgment" = no method). Proposal for Field type / facets: it should be an enumeration with options for accepted methods (as for Schema Element balanceRechargeAbstraction and I guess one method would be "time series", which then should be added to Quality checks for Schema Element timeSeries). Alternative Field type / facets for trendAssessmentMethodology could be Reference Type.	methodology was not followed and, therefore, that the assessment was based on expert judgment. A reorganization of this information as proposed is not feasible at this stage.	impleme ntation needed	impleme ntation needed	impleme ntation needed	impleme ntation needed
20150903 10000235	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	03/09/20 15	GWMET	SchemaElements for GW trendAssessment: please check correlation of following Schema Elements on page 179: Schema element: trendAssessmentMethodology	"No" does indeed mean that a formal methodology was not followed and, therefore, that the assessment was based on expert judgment. A reorganization of this information as proposed is not feasible at this stage.	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

Ticket	Reporter	Date	Schema	Issue	Response	Implemented?			
						Schemas	Guidance	GIS guidance	QA/QC
				Field type / facets: YesNoCode_Enum: Yes, No Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0 Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. If trend assessment in groundwater pollutants was performed, indicate whether a methodology for identifying significant and upward trends in any pollutant's concentration has been applied. Quality checks: Conditional check: Report if trendAssessmentPerformed is 'Yes' Field type/facets and Guidance for trendAssessmentMethodology is not helpful (but maybe I don't understand text under Guidance, I guess "No" means "Expert judgment" = no method). Proposal for Field type / facets: it should be an enumeration with options for accepted methods (as for Schema Element balanceRechargeAbstraction and I guess one method would be "time series", which then should be added to Quality checks for Schema Element timeSeries). Alternative Field type / facets for trendAssessmentMethodology could be Reference Type.					

| 20150903 10000235 | Manuela Pfeiffer (DE) | 03/09/2015 | GWMET | SchemaElements for GW trendAssessment:

please check correlation of following Schema Elements on page 179:

Schema element: timeSeries
Field type / facets: YearRangeType
Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0
Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. If trend assessment in groundwater pollutants was performed, state the starting and finishing year for the assessment in the format YYYY--YYYY.
Quality checks: Conditional check: Report if trendAssessmentPerformed is 'Yes' andtrendAssessmentMethodology is "time series".

Field type/facets and Guidance for trendAssessmentMethodology is not helpful (but maybe I don't understand text under Guidance, I guess "No" means "Expert judgment" = no method).
Proposal for Field type / facets: it should be an enumeration with options for accepted methods (as for Schema Element balanceRechargeAbstraction and I guess one method would be "time series", which then should be added to Quality checks for Schema Element timeSeries).
Alternative Field type / facets for trendAssessmentMethodology could be Reference Type. | "No" does indeed mean that a formal methodology was not followed and, therefore, that the assessment was based on expert judgment.
A reorganization of this information as proposed is not feasible at this stage. | No implementation needed | No implementation needed | No implementation needed | No implementation needed |
| 20150903 | Manuela | 03/09/2015 | GWMET | Obligation of Schema Element | Corrected in the Guidance and Schemas. | Done in | Done in | No | No |

10000271	Pfeiffer (DE)	15		gwMethodologiesTransboundaryReference: Please check obligation for Schema Element gwMethodologiesTransboundaryReference. It should be "Conditional" Schema element: gwMethodologiesTransboundaryReference Field type / facets: ReferenceType Properties: maxOccurs =unbounded minOccurs = 0 Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. 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. Quality checks: report if 'transboundaryGWBPresent' is 'Yes'.		version 6.0.1	version 6.0.1	impleme ntation needed	impleme ntation needed
20150904 10000117	Joaquim Capitao (DE)	04/09/20 15	SWB	Enumeration list SWIntercalibrationType_Enum: Please add 'Not applicable' to the enumeration list SWIntercalibrationType_Enum. I have added it to Annex 8a of the Guidance.	'Not applicable' added to the enumeration list SWIntercalibrationType_Enum	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150904 10000153	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	04/09/20 15	RBMPPoM	Schema Element inputCategoryValue: Please check text and obligation Guidance and Quality check for Schema Element inputCategoryValue. Obligation "Conditional" seems to be not correct because obligation of Schema Element inputCategoryCode (in Version 5.0 name of Schema Element was "inputCategory") is "Required".	'inputCategoryValue' & 'inputCategoryUnit' elements multiplicity udpated to 1..1, and their corresponding 'Conditional' QA/QC check deletedThe schema elements inputCategoryValue and input CategoryUnit are required (while the class itself is not)	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

				Schema element: inputCategoryCode Field type / facets: InputCategory_Union_Enum (see Annex 8n) Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 1 Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. Allows apportionment of inputs between different sources/pathways. Schema element: inputCategoryScheme Field type / facets: InputCategoryScheme_Enum: CIS Inventory Guidance Principal Source CIS Inventory Guidance Pathways CIS Inventory Guidance Riverine Loads WISE SoE Categories WFD Pressures Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 1 Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. Identifies the type of emmissions apportionement being used. Schema element: inputCategoryValue Field type / facets: NumberDecimalType Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0 Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. Report input by source/pathway for each inputCategoryCode selected. Quality checks: Conditional check: report if InputCategory is reported Same for Schema Element inputCategoryUnit (Ticket#2015090410000171)					
2015090410000206	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	04/09/2015	RBMPPoM	Schema Element inputUWWTDCoverage: Please check or specify text in Guidance and	Quality check description clarified on the guidance & schemas.	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation	Done in version 6.0.1

				Quality checks for Schema Element inputUWWTDCoverage. I guess '1.1' from Pressures means '1.1' from Annex 1a, 'U' from SoE means U12, U13, …, and 'P8' from CIS Guidance means CIS Guidance No. 28, but there 'P8' appears in Figure 2 only. Schema element: inputUWWTPCoverage Field type / facets: InputUWWTPCoverage_Enum[MP1] : U100 (> 100,000 p.e.) U10 (> 10,000 p.e.) U2 (> 2,000 p.e.) All (extrapolation to all treatment plants) Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0 Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. If categories for Urban Waste Water Treatment Plants are reported please indicate the coverage. Please note that under WISE SoE specific categories exist for this purpose (U11, U12, U13, U14, U21, U22, U23, U24). Quality checks: Conditional check: report if '1.1' from Pressures, 'U' from SoE or 'P8' from CIS Guidance.					needed	
20150904 10000251	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	04/09/20 15	RBMPPoM / SWB	Schema Element euSubUnitCode in Schema: RBMPPoM, PoM (page 2389): Please check text for Quality checks or add Conditional check. Schema element: euSubUnitCode Field type / facets: FeatureUniqueEUCodeType Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0 Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. If applicable, report the unique EU code of the Sub-unit. If there are no sub-units this element does not need to be	QA/QCs description updated for euSubUnitCode: Conditional. Report if sub-units are reported.Conditional check added in Classes SurfaceWaterBody, InputInventory and PoM	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	Done in version 6.0.1

				reported and the reporting of the information is done at RBD level. Sub-units are only relevant for surface water. Quality checks: Element check: First 2 characters must be the Member State's 2-alpha character ISO country code. Cross-schema check: Report if RBDSUCA/RBD/subUnitsDefined is 'Yes'. Cross-schema check: euSubUnitCode must be consistent with codes reported in RBDSUCA/RBD/SubUnit/euSubUnitCode[MP1]					
20150904 10000288	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	04/09/20 15	RBMPPoM	Typing error on page 244 and need for updating Guidance for Schema element: KeyTypeMeasure: Please check (page 244) in conjunction with Annex 8q (KTM99 – Other key type measure reported under PoM). Schema element: KeyTypeMeasure Field type / facets / relationship: KTM_Enum (see Annex 8q) Properties: maxOccurs = 1 minOccurs = 1 Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. Select each appropriate pre-defined Key Type of Measure (KTM) or OtherKeyTypeMeasure in turn from the enumeration list used to reduce significant pressures in the RBD. Quality checks: Element check: KeyTypeMeasure must be reported. A valid option must be selected from the enumeration list. More than one option can be selected.	Corrected in schemas & guidance	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	Done in version 6.0.1
20150904 10000341	Manuela Pfeiffer	04/09/20 15	RBMPPoM	Schema element: inputIndustryCoverage please specify text in Quality checks for Schema	Clarified in version 6.0.1 of the guidance & schemas & QA/QCs	Done in version	Done in version	No impleme	Done in version

	(DE)				Element inputIndustryCoverage.		6.0.1	6.0.1	ntation needed	6.0.1

(continued cell content)

Schema element: inputIndustryCoverage

Field type / facets: InputIndustryCoverage_Enum:

E-PRTR

National business registers

All manufacturing industries

Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0

Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. If categories for Industrial Waste Water Treatment plants are reported please indicate the coverage. "E-PRTR" means large facilities with releases to water reported in E-PRTR; "national business registers" means including also medium size facilities with emission data in registers; "all manufacturimg industries" means including also small size facilities with direct discharges based on economic activity extrapolations.

Quality checks: Conditional check: report if "I" from SoE or "P10" from CIS Guidance No. 28 (figure 2).

20150904 10000359	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	04/09/2015	RBMPPoM	please check diverse Schema Elements Page 262/263 Schema element: article113aInvestment20092015 Field type / facets: NumberDecimalType Properties: maxOccurs = 1 minOccurs = 1	Corrected in the Guidance and Schemas.	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

				Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. 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. Expenditure should not be annualised. The total investment expenditure should include, for example, expenditure on construction of waste water treatment plants. If disaggregated data is not available, then report '0' in this element and report the aggregated data in Article113al114115Investment20092015. Schema element: article113bl114115Investment20092015 Field type / facets: NumberDecimalType Properties: maxOccurs = 1 minOccurs = 1 Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. 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. Expenditure should not be annualised. Total investment expenditure should include, for example, expenditure on infrastructure to control over-abstraction. If disaggregated data is not available, then report '0' in this element and report the aggregated data in Article113al114115Investment20092015.					
20150904 10000359	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	04/09/20 15	RBMPPoM	please check diverse Schema Elements Page 282:	serviceArticle94Other is required if Article 9(4) is applied to any other water service or water service-use combination, as explained in the guidance on completion. It is therefore not	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

				Schema element: serviceArticle94Other	"conditional" in the same sense as used elsewhere. We have therefore modified the guidance and schema to make it required and included in the guidance a mention that if there are no other water services or water service-use combinations to which Art. 9(4) is applied the mention "None" should be entered.				
				Field type / facets: String1000Type					
				Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0					
				Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. Report if Article 9(4) is applied to any water service or water service-use combination not covered in the previous questions. More than one other water service or water service-use combination may be reported in the same string.					
				Conditional check is missing					
				Schema element: serviceArticle94Reference					
				Field type / facets: ReferenceType (see Annex 9)					
				Properties: maxOccurs =unbounded minOccurs = 0					
				Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. Provide references or hyperlinks to the documents and sections where justification on the use of Article 9(4) can be found. Guidance on what should be included in this document is provided in Section 11.2.3.					
				Quality checks: Conditional check: Report if any of the elements serviceArticle94... is 'Yes'.					
201509041 0000359	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	04/09/20 15	RBMPPoM	please check diverse Schema Elements	Same issue as 2015082510000286.	No impleme ntation needed	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
				Page 286/287:					
				Schema Element names should start with "s" instead of "S":	Corrected in the Guidance				
				Schema element: serviceWaterUseHouseholds					
				Field type / facets / relationship: YesNoNotApplicable _Enum: Yes, No, Not					

applicable

Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0

Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. Are households benefitting from this water service?

This element does not need to be reported if the Member State is reporting on the basis of a water service-use combination as indicated by reporting 'Other' in Service and providing further information in ServiceOther.

Quality checks: Element check: A valid option must be selected from the enumeration list.

Conditional check: Report if Service is not 'Other' and ServiceOther is not null.

Schema element: serviceWaterUseAgriculture

Field type / facets / relationship: YesNoNotApplicable _Enum: Yes, No, Not applicable

Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0

Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. Is agriculture benefitting from this water service?

This element does not need to be reported if the Member State is reporting on the basis of a water service-use combination as indicated by reporting 'Other' in Service and providing further information in ServiceOther.

Quality checks: Element check: A valid option must be selected from the enumeration list.

Conditional check: Report if Service is not 'Other' and ServiceOther is not null.

				Schema element: serviceWaterUseIndustry				

Schema element: serviceWaterUseIndustry

Field type / facets / relationship: YesNoNotApplicable _Enum: Yes, No, Not applicable

Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0

Guidance on completion of schema element: Conditional. Is industry benefitting from this water service?

This element does not need to be reported if the Member State is reporting on the basis of a water service-use combination as indicated by reporting 'Other' in Service and providing further information in ServiceOther.

Quality checks: Element check: A valid option must be selected from the enumeration list.

Conditional check: Report if Service is not 'Other' and ServiceOther is not null.

Schema element: serviceWaterUseOther

Field type / facets / relationship: String1000Type

Properties: maxOccurs =1 minOccurs = 0

Guidance on completion of schema element: Optional. If other use than households, agriculture and industry is benefitting from this water service please describe it. More than one other water use may be reported in this field.

Quality checks: Element check: String length must be a maximum of 1000 characters.

20150908 10000306	Fiona O'Rourke (IE)	08/09/2015		Reporting of transboundary waterbodies I hope you can help clarify reporting of transboundary waterbodies for me, please? I can't seem to clarify this via the Guidance documents, I hope I am not overlooking	Option ii) should be used in the reporting of spatial data (note that the national part can be a one multipart polygon). The WFD reporting guidance will be updated accordingly and further explanation provided on the adequate	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

				anything. When we submit our GIS layers of waterbodies, which of the following is the correct approach for waterbodies that cross international borders (assuming our data submission will be for the national part of an international River Basin District): (i) To agree with our neighbouring Member state which waterbodies we are each to report and ensure that a waterbody is submitted in only one submission (ii) To clip the waterbody at national borders (creating 2 or more GIS features) and each report only our national parts (iii) To each report the entire waterbody in our submissions, so that it appears in 2 submissions (but ensuring co-ordination on the data that there are no conflicts)	use of the surfaceWaterBodyTransboundary attribute.				
20150908 10000477	GOYEN Jean-Philippe (FR)	08/09/20 15		Date null in shapefiles Some date information are optional (desigEnd for example in shp file corresponding to designationPeriodEnd in GML) Could please indicate us how to fill this in the shp file so that we wouldn't be obliged to edit the gml output file after transformation. Looks like shp format doesn't support NULL information for date field.	A conventional date should be used (9999-12-31). Version 6.01 of the GIS Guidance has been updated accordingly.	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed
20150909 10000206	GOYEN Jean-Philippe (FR)	09/09/20 15	SWB	surfaceWaterBodyIntercalibrationType, 'Not Relevant' value not present in WFDCommon_2016 or Access The guidance indicates that the value 'Not relevant' should be possible for the element	In an effort of harmonization, "not applicable" is used in all cases, while in the past "not applicable" and "not relevant" were both used. A few of these changes had been missed in the guidance, and have been corrected in version	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	Done in version 6.0.1

				surfaceWaterBodyIntercalibrationType But this value is not present in the list of WFDCommon_2016 nor in the Access database. Could you please indicate us which solution to adopt?	6.0.1.				
20150910 10000151	Iker Garcia Tierra (Contractor)	10/09/2015	RBMPPoM	SchemaElement costExplanation20152021 The same issue described on the ticket 2015082610000186 happens with the following element: RBMPPoM / Costs / costExplanation20152021 Should this element also be renamed to costExplanation20152021Reference ?	Schema element 'costExplanation20152021' renamed to 'costExplanation20152021Reference'. Schema element 'costExplanation20092015' renamed to 'costExplanation20092015Reference'.	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150910 10000301	Kleemola Sirpa (FI)	10/09/2015	SWB	Problem with Validating the SWB schema, missing values in the Enumeration list We have started preparing the XML files for WFD reporting, 2016. There are some problems with the validation (using XML Spy) The following element swSignificantPressureType needs 1 value, BUT if there are no 'Pressures' there is NO option for this, as 'No significant pressure types' is not available in the enumeration **(screenshots attached to the ticket)**	See above issue 2015081810000227. "No significant pressure" and "Not applicable" added to Annex 1a and enumeration list SignificantPressureType_Enum	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150910 10000301	Kleemola Sirpa (FI)	10/09/2015	SWB	The element swChemicalStatusExpectedAchievementDate,	Guidance and schema updated	Done in version	Done in version	No impleme	No impleme

				need to be changed to " minOccurs="0" AS otherwise I am not able to validate data which has <swChemicalStatusExpectedGoodIn2015>Yes<swChemicalStatusExpectedGoodIn2015> AND Obviously NO Date after it <xs:element name="swChemicalStatusExpectedAchievementDate" type="wfd:GoodStatus_Enum" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"> <xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>Conditional. If good chemical status will NOT be achieved by 2015 (swChemicalStatusExpectedGoodIn2015 is No), report the date by which it is expected that it will be achieved in full. The methodology of this assessment should be clearly explained in the RBMP or background documents (reference reported under classification methodologies). If good chemical status will not be achieved by 2015, exemptions should be applied. Please report the date by which it is expected that good chemical status will be achieved in full, not the date relating to individual exemptions. However, please note the following: Article 4(4) exemptions relate to the extension of deadlines. According to Article 4(4)c of the WFD, postponing the achievement of objectives beyond two further updates of the river basin management plan is only possible due to natural conditions. If Article 4(5) exemptions apply, report the date by when the less stringent objective is to be achieved. If the less stringent objective has already been achieved then select 'Less stringent objectives already achieved'. If good chemical status will be achieved by 2015		6.0.1	6.0.1	ntation needed	ntation needed

				(swChemicalStatusExpectedGoodIn2015 is Yes) this element should not be reported. Quality checks: Quality checks: Conditional check: Report if swChemicalStatusExpectedGoodIn2015 is 'No'. Within-schema check: 'Less stringent objectives already achieved' is only a valid entry if 'Article 4(5)…' is reported under swChemicalExemptionType.</xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:element>					
20150910 10000409	Somers, Gabrielle (EFTA)	10/09/20 15		Uploading reports: I represent an organisation called the EFTA Surveillance Authority, which has similar enforcement powers to those of the Commission in respect of the three EEA EFTA States, Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein. As an organisation, we receive environmental reports from our Member States, which are simultaneously sent on to you and uploaded onto your website. I have just received a query from the Icelandic Environment Agency. They are going through some restructuring and have a new person in charge of reporting under the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC). He is unfamiliar with your site and does not know what steps need to be taken in order that reports can be successfully uploaded. I am not sure that he has an accessible user account. Would it be possible to put me in touch with someone who can walk me/ him through this process?	We will be discussing the final version of the WFD reporting guidance, schemas and tools, including the interface with Reportnet for uploading the reports in the next meeting of the Working Group on Data and Information Sharing (WG DIS) of the WFD Common Implementation Strategy, on 13-14 October 2015. One of the issues that will be covered will be the rights of access needed to upload the reports. I would therefore suggest that the person in charge participates in that meeting. The Icelandic Environment Agency should provide DG Environment with the name and contact details for the person in charge of WFD reporting, so that he/she will receive all the relevant information. Furthermore, there will also be a specific workshop in Copenhagen, at the European Environment Agency, on 12-13 of November, on WFD reporting and the Reportnet interface, so this is also a meeting at which participation from Iceland would be very useful. Finally, any specific questions should be addressed to this Helpdesk, which will continue operating once the reporting tools	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

					are fully operational to address any difficulties that people may have in uploading the reports.				
20150911 10000069	Manuela Pfeiffer (DE)	11/09/20 15	Common	Annex 8b-f / Codelist for Substances - WFD // SoE Water Quality Review: Comments from Germany and Austria against the background of streamlining WFD/SoE we want to provide our comments already sent to wisesoe.helpdesk - especially about the use of CAS numbers in substance lists - also to WFD-Helpdesk - in terms of WFD these address Annex 8b-f. Please take note that Germanys comments about CAS-numbers for SoE content review are shared at least by Austria, Belgium and Slovenia. Document 2a_Content related SoE review_revised-v3-2015-07-20wtrch: Unfortunately the document still does not provide a detailed description of the products prepared to justify the huge list of substances to be reported. The list for groundwater covers now 249 substances to be submitted. We are wondering which kind of report and assessment could cover 249 substances in a meaningful way. CAS numbers: We fully support the comments from Germany about the use of CAS numbers due to the mentioned limitations. A4 Groundwater: - Dissolved oxygene, electrical conductivity,pH, Nitrate and Ammonium are core groundwater parameters according to WFD Annex II and all should be „Must".	CAS numbers will only be used in the situations where no issues have been identified by the content experts. "Ambiguous", generic or deprecated CAS numbers where replaced by other codes. With regard to the licensing aspects, please refer to section III.i of the CAS Information Use Policies – the number of CAS numbers used in the Wise code list is within the allowed limits, and is not expected to exceed them in a foreseeable future.	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

				- And then there are Chloride (Should) and sulphate (Should) in the current list of Annex II of the GWD and in 2 years we have additionally total phosphorous (Could) / phosphate (Missing) and finally Nitrite (Drop). - And for countries which do not have individual measurements for trichloroethylen and tetrachloroethylen but only the sum of both, this chould also be considered respectively. Units: We fully support the comments from Germany. Units should be multipurpose but not tailored to single substances. (e.g. mg N/L).					
2015091110000149	Joaquim Capitao (DG ENV)	11/09/2015	Common	Supporting QE_Enum Please add "QE3-1-2 – Thermal conditions" to the enumeration list Supporting QE_Enum. It was already added to the corresponding table in Annex 8h.	'QE3-1-2 – Thermal conditions' added to SupportingQE_Enum to the guidance and schemas	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
2015091110000158	Joaquim Capitao (DG ENV)	11/09/2015	Common	Enumeration list WQCalculationMethod_Enum Please delete the two last options ("Data not available" and "Not relevant") in the enumeration list WQCalculationMethod_Enum, as they duplicate the first two options in the same list.	Guidance & schemas updated	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
2015091110000167	Joaquim Capitao (DG ENV)	11/09/2015	Common	Enumeration list IndicatorPressure_Enum In the enumeration list IndicatorPressure_Enum, please replace the text for PA03 with "Area (km2) of forest land affected by pressures preventing the achievement of objectives". In the same enumeration list, replace the text for PN21 with "Number of water bodies failing EQS"	Guidance & schemas updated	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

				and delete PN22 and PN23. These changes have already been introduced in the guidance.					
20150911 10000229	GOYEN Jean-Philippe (FR)	11/09/20 15	SWB / SWMET	sWPrioritySubstance filling In the Access database v6.0, there isn't any list of value appearing when filling the table sWPrioritySubstanceID. If this is effectively a problem will it be solved in the next database edition?	Access DB tables that do not have a thematic element which could act the table primary key, provide an autoincrement/autonumber ID field that is used to link elements on these tables with other tables. For example, 'SWB_SWPrioritySubstance' table primary key is the mentioned 'sWPrioritySubstanceID' field. Which is automatically filled by access (1, 2, 3,...) as soon as new rows are being inserted.	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150610 10000192	Stalsberg Lars (NO)	10/06/20 15	Common	Please see Annex 8j in the reporting guidance version 6.0. "Nor" is not a valid option for language enumeration here.	Norwegian language 'nor' added to the language lists.	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150915 10000203	Iker García Tierra (Contracto r)	15/09/20 15	RBMPPoM	Schema elements: inputCategoryValue, inputCategoryUnit The multiplicity of the whole Class InputCategory is 0 to many. If the class is reported, this schema element must be included. Therefore these elements muitiplicity should be udpated to 1..1, and their corresponding 'Conditional' QA/QC checks deleted.	See above issue 2015090410000153: Changes implemented on the guidance & schemas.	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150916 10000112	Iker García Tierra (Contracto r)	16/09/20 15	Common	Since it is required to validate following QA/QC checks regarding ReferenceType: fileName: Conditional check: Must be reported if element "Hyperlink" is not reported. Must not be reported if "Hyperlink" is reported. Only one	Change implemented on the schemas	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

				value can be reported for each DocumentName. hyperlink: Conditional check: Must be reported if element "FileName" is not reported. Must not be reported if "FileName" is reported. Only one value can be reported for each DocumentName We can avoid implementing specific QA/QC rules for each ReferenceType element if we modify the it and define 'fileName' and 'hyperlink' as a choice element. This way, the XSD itself will enforce that one or the other is filled but not both of them.					
20150921 10000077	Iker García Tierra (Contracto r)	21/09/20 15		The description of the following schema elements are required to be updated: surfaceWaterBodyTransboundary: Required. The Directive requires coordination among Member States for the management of transboundary Water Bodies. Transboundary water bodies are those crossing the border between countries or constituting part of the border between two countries for a certain length. For reporting purposes in the case of water bodies that cross the border between countries, and for the sake of clarity, each Member State should report on its own part of these trans-boundary Water Bodies. Geographic information should therefore be provided for the part of the Water Body within the reporting Member State and likewise for all elements which have a clear geographical reference (e.g. size, monitoring stations). Each Member State should also report on all elements that apply to the whole water body (status, pressures, etc). For the latter the	Changes implemented on the guidance & schemas.	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

Commission expects that the information provided by each of the Member States concerned will be identical, as a result of the coordinated management required by the Directive.

Similarly, for water bodies which constitute part of the border between two countries the same principles apply. In the case of rivers represented as lines, the same line will have to be reported by both Member States concerned, instead of reporting different but adjacent areas, as is the case, for example, for a lake that extends across the border.

Not applicable for territorial waters.

groundwaterBodyTransboundary:

Required.

The Directive requires coordination among Member States for the management of transboundary Water Bodies. Transboundary water bodies are those crossing the border between countries or constituting part of the border between two countries for a certain length.

For reporting purposes in the case of water bodies that cross the border between countries, and for the sake of clarity, each Member State should report on its own part of these trans-boundary Water Bodies. Geographic information should therefore be provided for the part of the Water Body within the reporting Member State and likewise for all elements which have a clear geographical reference (e.g. size, monitoring stations). Each Member State should also report on all elements that apply to the whole water

				body (status, pressures, etc). For the latter the Commission expects that the information provided by each of the Member States concerned will be identical, as a result of the coordinated management required by the Directive.					
20150921 10000095	Stephan Hofmann (DE)	21/09/20 15	Access DB	At http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/help/WFD/WFD_52 1_2016 (retrieved on 21/09/2015) it's stated clearly: (…) The excel provides a field called "logical" that provides the order to follow in the reporting of the Access DB tables. Find also this "logical" order in the following diagram (…) But the logical order of various elements in the linked documents Excel [1] and diagram [2] doesn't match	Changes to be included in the WFD reporting webpage	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150918 10000396	Jean-Philippe Goyen (FR)	18/09/20 15	GMLs	Here is a question about successorsIdentifier element: We will report current spatial objects, so we don't see any case for filling this element. Can you please explain more precisely in which case this element is expected?	You are correct: if the spatial object is currently valid and has not been replaced, it is does not have any successor (so there is nothing to be reported). Cf. GIS guidance pg.41: Again, these attributes are conditional: successors only need to be reported if they exist. Successors must be identified even if their geometry (or other information) has never been reported.	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150922 10000191	Iker García Tierra (Contracto r)	22/09/20 15	All schemas	Even though it is totally correct to have the 'special' characters on the Schemas / XMLs, since we are specifiying a UTF-8 encoding, to avoid potential issues with some users not using the correct encodings (Ticket#2015040710000111) we have replaced those characters according to the following list:	Implemented in the UML/SchemasNorwegian ('nor') added to Annex 8j and Common schema	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

				Former character New character – - , ' ' ' " ' " ' € Euros					
20150923 10000135	Iker García Tierra (Contractor)	23/09/2015	Common	KTM_Enum 'KTM6 - ....' current value is too long (255+) and cannot be allocated in Enterprise Architect UML & Access DB. Therefore the value must be updated to: **KTM6 - Improving hydromorphological conditions of water bodies other than longitudinal continuity**	Implemented in the UML/Schema	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150923 10000233	Timothy Doran (UK)	23/09/2014	Common	I would like to point out a spelling mistake in enumeration list wfd:SWExemption46 . 'Yes (prolonged drougths)' should probably read 'Yes (prolonged droughts)'	Implemented in the UML/Schema	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150917 10000291	Lars Stalsberg **(NO)**	17/09/2015		Finland, Sweden and Norway now have a meeting to ensure that our transboundary data are without gaps and overlaps. We also harmonize our EU-coding. According to the guidance the transboundary waterbodies the EU_CD has to be the same on both sides of the border except for the national prefix. For this reason, the MS_CD and the EU_CD will not be identical. Because of this it will not be easy for the public to understand which national waterbody in our systems the EU_CD relates to. For example, if a waterbody runs from Norway to Sweden, we have decided that the downstream MS_CD should be used on both	Schema elements are being added in version 6.0.1 of the GIS guidance and GML schemas for Member States to indicate a commonly agreed "transboundary code" for transboundary Surface Water Bodies and Ground Water Bodies. This will be further discussed in the October meeting of the WG DIS.				

				sides, as the EU_CD with each country's national prefix. If the Norwegian river MS_CD is 002-122-R and the Swedish 231531-741213 and it runs to Sweden, the EU_CD will be NO231531-741213 for Norway and SE231531-741213 for Sweden. When we report the NO231531-741213 to WISE, it will not be easily recognized by the users in our local system. Do have a solution for this connection problem between MS_CD and EU_CD? Where to we mark the waterbody as transboundary? I know the national waterbodyIDs have been taken away to simplify the reporting. Is it possible to take it into the feature dataset again? Maybe others have pointed this out as a problem?					
20150921 10000148	Jean-Philippe Goyen (FR)	21/09/2015	GMLs	Could you indicate us if QA/QC specification document will include QA/QC regarding the GML files, and especially regarding the geometry/topology controls ? We would like to know if constraints expressed in the GIS guidance will be described somewhere more precisely?	The QA/QC rules are defined in the GIS Guidance at the Data Content section for each of the schemas to be reported (http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/help/WFD/WFD_521_2016/GIS_Guidance_v6.0_2017-07-31.pdf). The contractor will analyse how to technically implement them. At this moment there are nor QA/QC rules implemented at GML level.	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	To be done
20150923 10000288	Fernanda Néry (EEA)	23/09/2015	RBMPPoM	Wrong name: it's not "inputUnitTotal" it's "inputTotalUnit" Please correct in the schema and guidance.	Changes implemented on the guidance & schemas.	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20150923 10000297	Fernanda Néry (EEA)	23/09/2015	RBMPPoM	Besides the correction in the name, in the Reporting Guidance (and the QC) it should be	Changes implemented on the guidance, schemas and the QA/QC.	Done in version	Done in version	No impleme	Done in version

				clear that the valid units are t/a or kg/a. Please correct the reporting guidance, and quality checks	@Joaquin: We implemented the new QA/QC, and this is how we updated the 'inputTotalUnit' description on the UML. Quality checks: Conditional check: report if inputTotalValue is reported. Element Check: Only the options 't/a' or 'kg/a' are a valid selection.	6.0.1	6.0.1	ntation needed	6.0.1
20150923 10000304	Fernanda Néry (EEA)	23/09/20 15	RBMPPoM	In the Reporting Guidance, please clarify the way to report periods: "A period of up to six years within the relevant RBMP period may be indicated by two numbers." "A period of up to six years within the relevant RBMP period may be indicated by a start and end year, separated by a double hyphen (yyyy--yyyy)."	Changes implemented on the guidance & schemas.	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150924 10000161	Iker García Tierra (Contracto r)	24/09/20 15	RBMPPoM	Similar as what it was done in Ticket#2015092310000297, the element 'inputCategoryUnit' type should be defined as 'UnitOfMeasure_Enum'. And a new QA/QC implemented to check that only 't/a' or 'kg/a' are selected. Element Check: Only the options 't/a' or 'kg/a' are a valid selection.	Changes implemented on the guidance & schemas.	Done in version 6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	Done in version 6.0.1
20150923 10000377	Timothy Doran (UK)	23/09/20 15	GML schemas	We are starting to gather together the reporting data for the River Basin Management Plans. With regards to the GIS data is there a document that details the description and qa/qc for each data field, in a similar format to the non spatial data. The GIS guidance contains lots of information on the creation of the spatial data but not the attribute descriptions.	It is still being addressed.	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	A documen t will be provided with the GIS data QA/QC rules

				I have been examining the xsd files, however these are of no help to other colleagues without xml experience and xmlspy. In the xsd it does not state in the description is it required, conditional or optional. At present shall I assume that all optional elements are indeed optional and not conditional?					
20150923 10000377	Timothy Doran (UK)	23/09/20 15	GML schemas	there might be some enumeration list missing, for example wiseEvolutionType and zoneType. Please could you confirm if, I have made a mistake, or that they are missing	It is still being addressed	Under assessme nt	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20150928 10000171	Stephan Hofmann (DE)	28/09/20 15	SWMET schema	The value "Not applicable" is missing in SWIntercalibrationType_Enum of http://dd.eionet.europa.eu/schemas/WFD2016/ SWMET_2016.xsd.

Furthermore, schema and documentation differ:

In http://dd.eionet.europa.eu/schemas/WFD2016/ SWMET_2016.xsd it's stated:

<xs:simpleType name="SWIntercalibrationType_Enum"><xs:ann otation><xs:documentation>2016 Required. List of common intercalibration types (see Annex 8a) plus option 'Not relevant'

But neither this value nor 'Not relevant' is contained in the list, as mentioned above.

The use of "Not applicable" instead of 'Not relevant' is based on the documentation: In http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/help/WFD/WFD_52 1_2016/WFD_ReportingGuidance_v6.0_2015-08-04.docx it is stated:

Schema element: | Changes already implemented in ticket#2015090410000117 | Done in version 6.0.1 | No impleme ntation needed | No impleme ntation needed | No impleme ntation needed |

surfaceWaterBodyIntercalibrationType

Field type / facets / relationship: SWIntercalibrationType_Enum (see Annex 8a)

Properties: maxOccurs = unbounded minOccurs = 1

Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. If the surface water body type corresponds with an intercalibration type, report the intercalibration type code (not name).

The intercalibration type reported in this element must be appropriate to the surface water body's Category.

If there is no corresponding intercalibration type, select 'Not applicable'.

Report 'Not applicable' for territorial waters.

| 2015092810000331 | Fernanda Néry (EEA) | 28/09/2015 | Common | Updated version of the Monitoring Purpose code list with the changes provided by ETC-ICM (Water Quantity) and NSV4 (Marine) was uploaded to https://taskman.eionet.europa.eu/attachments/download/15979/Codelist_MonitoringPurpose_2015-09-28.xlsx

Has implications in the GML and spatial schemas. | | Done in version 6.0.1 | No implementation needed | No implementation needed | No implementation needed |
| 2015092810000224 | Stephan Hofmann (DE) | 28/09/2015 | GWB schemas | The element gwChemicalExemptionType is currently set to maxOccurs="1" in the Schema.

This isn't in sync with the documentation element: (…)Report which type(s) of exemption(s) apply if good chemical status is not expected to be achieved by 2015 for that pollutant or indicator (…). | There is a complex type named 'GWChemicalExemptionType' which contains an element named also 'gwChemicalExemptionType'.

On the guidance & schemas the complex type is defined as '1 to N' whereas the element is defined as '1 to 1' . This will allow member states to report more than one 'exception | No implementation needed | No implementation needed | No implementation needed | No implementation needed |

				http://dd.eionet.europa.eu/schemas/WFD2016/GWB_2016.xsd: <xs:element name="GWChemicalExemptionType" type="GWChemicalExemptionType"/><xs:complexType name="GWChemicalExemptionType"><xs:sequence><xs:element name="gwChemicalExemptionType" type="wfd:GWChemicalExemptionType_Union_Enum" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"><xs:annotation><xs:documentation>Required. Report which type(s) of exemption(s) apply if good chemical status is not expected to be achieved by 2015 for that pollutant or indicator. Quality checks: Within-schema check: The option 'No exemption' is not compatible with any other. Therefore, if reported, no more instances of 'gwChemicalExemptionType' should be reported. The options 'Article4(7) - New modification' and 'Article4(7) - Sustainable human development' are not valid for groundwater chemical status and therefore cannot be reported.</xs:documentation></xs:annotation></xs:element> There isn't any information found regarding this issue in http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/help/WFD/WFD_521_2016/WFD%202016_Helpdesk_Log.pdf, yet.	type' if required.				
20151001 10000263	Kleemola Sirpa (FI)	01/10/20 15	Monitoring schemas	It seems that the Enumeration lists for chemicalMatrix are fairly different in the 'Reporting Guidance 2016, August 4 2016 version' and in the Schemas. Which one is correct and	Schemas updated. The available values on the schemas will be the same as in the guidance: Water Biota	Done in version 6.0.1	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

				what am I supposed to report e.g. if the original is Biota – Fish is the new version just Biota (and info about fish disappears)	Biota - fish Biota - other Sediment Sediment - suspended sediment Sediment - settled sediment				
20151001 10000263	Kleemola Sirpa (FI)	01/10/2015	GWB Schemas	A problem on the GW side (similar as earlier reported by us for SW) – gwSignificantPressureType this element should be optional OR "No significant pressure" and "Not applicable" NEEDS to be added on the Enumeration list	Changes already implemented in ticket 2015081810000227	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		RBMPPoM/InputCategory/InputCategoryUnit: The list of enumeration is not working for this element	The access db lookup table is properly working for this field in v6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		RBMPPoM/Progress/statusImplementationPoM: In the database the enumeration list for this element, there is the value 'some planned measures completed' whereas in the guide the value is 'some measures completed'	Indeed, the schemas/access db enumeration list doesn't match the guide and will be udpated for v6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		SWB/SWAssociatedProtectedArea GWB/GWAssociatedArea: For these elements : protectedAreaHabitatsBirdsObjectivesMet, protectedAreaDrinkingWaterObjectivesMet and protectedAreaShellfishObjectivesMet (only for SW), there are no enumeration lists available in the database.	The access db lookup tables are properly working for these fields in v6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		SWMET/SWChemicalStatusClassificationRBD/approachSWBNotMonitoredChemical. The value 'Multiple approaches' available in the enumeration list of the database is not in the	Indeed, the schemas/access db enumeration list doesn't match the guide and will be udpated for v6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		GWMET/GWMethodologies/gwCharacterisation Reference: This element appears bot in the table GWMethodologies and in the table ReferenceType_Link	We detected and fixed this issue and it is already correct in access db v6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		GWMET/GWMethodologies: For these elements: impactsGWAbstractionBalance impactsGWAbstractionSWObjective impactsGWAbstractionSWDiminutionStatus impactsGWAbstractionDamageGWDE impactsGWAbstractionSalineIntrusion The enumeration list YesNoCode_Enum is not working	The access db lookup table is properly working for this field in v6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		SWB/SurfaceWaterBody GWB/GroundWaterBody: swSignificantPressureOther swSignificantImpactOther gwSignificantPressureOther gwSignificantImpactOther Why these elements are not in the SurfaceWaterBody_swSignificantPressure, SurfaceWaterBody_swSignificantImpact or GroundWaterBody_gwSignificantPressure and GroundWaterBody_gwSignificantImpact tables instead of the SurfaceWaterBody and GroundWaterBody. It would be more coherent	We will analyse it with DG-ENV and see if this change will be applied or if it will remain as it is now.				

20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		éléments de type YearRangeType: In the YearRangeType elements, there is an empty dropdown list.	There is no lookup table (dropdown list) for 'YearRangeType' types in access db v6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		SWMET_SWPrioritySubstance: SWPrioritySubstance filling In the Access database v6.0, there isn't any list of enumeration appearing when filling the table SWPrioritySubstance (for example there isn't the yes/no list for the element psStatusAssessment…)	Indeed, 'SWMET_SWPrioritySubstance' and 'SWB_SWPrioritySubstance' are badly generated. Their fields should be correctly defined now with proper dropdown lists / descriptions in v6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		UnitOfMeasure_Enum: I'd like to know how to use the value {other} in the UnitOfMeasure_Enum list as there is no element to precise the unit. For example, we use the unit µg/kg for substances in biota.	We will analyse it with DG-ENV / EEA and to clarify the doubts about {other} UnitOfMeasures.				
20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		SWRBSP: For Zinc we have two values of the standard depending on the water hardness. How should we fill this table?	We will analyse it with DG-ENV / EEA and to clarify the doubts about SWRBSP.				
20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		SwTypeCategory: There is still the value TeW whereas it is not in the guide	Indeed, the schemas/access db enumeration list doesn't match the guide and will be updated for v6.0.1	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		Range value: To report a range of value (for example in rbspValue) should we use 2 dashes as for dates?	We will analyse it with DG-ENV / EEA and to clarify the doubts about 'range values'				
20151002 10000351	BLARD-ZAKAR Adeline (FR)	02/10/2015		UnitOfMeasure_Enum: To express pH, should we other {other} in the enumeration list?	We will analyse it with DG-ENV / EEA and to clarify the doubts about {other} UnitOfMeasures.				

20151002 10000289	Fernanda Néry (EEA)	02/10/20 15	GML Common	Final version of the PurposeOfCollection codelist for the WISE Spatial data reporting.	Code list applied	Done in version 6.0.1	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20151014 10000141	Alberto Telletxea (Contractor)	14/10/20 15	RBMPPoM	rbmpgeneralprogress element stated as String1000type needs to be String4000type	Change implemented	Done in version 6.0.2	???	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20151009 10000356	Timothy Doran (UK)	09/10/20 15		Whilst using the access templates I have noticed that the attributes that are based on enumeration lists do not have the "limit to list" option set. This means that it is very easy to bypass the picklist and make invalid data.	Access DB v6.0.2: 'Limit to list' set to 'Yes' for every dropdown / lookup table	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20151014 10000159	Alberto Telletxea (Contractor)	14/10/20 15	SWB	The element 'qeStatusOrPotentialChange' is now defined as: Schema element: qeStatusOrPotentialChange Field type / facets: ValueQEX_StatusOrPotentialChange_Enum: +2, +1, 0, -1, -2, Unknown2010, No information Properties: maxOccurs = 1 minOccurs = 1 Guidance on completion of schema element: Required. If the information is available and if there has been a change in classification since the first RBMP was reported, report that change. Otherwise, report 'No information'. This covers all cases in which it is not possible to identify a change between 2010 and 2016, for example, new Water Bodies, for which there is no correspondence in the 2010 reporting or new reporting (as is the case for Norway): '+2' = Improvement by 2 or more classifications. '+1' = Improvement by 1 classification. '0' = No change of classification (select as the	Change implemented	Done in version 6.0.2	???	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

				default).					
				'-1' = Deterioration by 1 classification.					
				'-2' = Deterioration by 2 or more classifications.					
				'Unknown2010' = Status or potential was unknown in 2010.					
				'No information' = No information available and/or impossible to compare current status or potential with status or potential in 2010.					
20151016 10000128	Kleemola Sirpa (FI)	16/10/20 15	SWB	It seems that swPrioritySubstance has min occurs 1 instead of 0: I have problems again validating the SWB files, it seems that swPrioritySubstance has min occurs 1, BUT I have no Mixing zones and Mixing Zone is 'No' WHEN I changed the min occurs to 0, problem is solved	If you are refering to 'swPrioritySubstanceExceedanceInMixingZone' element. You are right and on the guidance the element is defined as Optional with a minOccurs = 0. We will update the schemas for the upcoming v6.0.2.	Done in version 6.0.2	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20151019 10000168	Fernanda Néry (EEA)	19/10/20 15	Common	Update to PS_ENUM, RBDM_ENUM, and ADDITIONALPOLLUTANT_ENUM: Please find the updated codes for the PS_ENUM, RBDM_ENUM, and ADDITIONALPOLLUTANT_ENUM in https://taskman.eionet.europa.eu/attachments/ download/16962/Codelists_QualityElementsAnd Determinands_2015-10-19.xlsx (columns A to G in the DeterminandCodes_2015-10-19 sheet).	PS_Enum, RBSP_Enum, and AdditionalPollutant_Enum Enumeration lists updated.	Done in version 6.0.2	???	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20151019 10000202	Fernanda Néry (EEA)	19/10/20 15	Common	Update to SoEEmissionsCategory_Enum: Please find the updated codes for the SoEEmissionsCategory_Enum in https://taskman.eionet.europa.eu/attachments/	SoEEmissionsCategory_Enum enumeration list updated.	Done in version 6.0.2	???	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

				download/16963/Codelists_EmissionsInventory_ 2015-10-07.xlsx (column C to F in the SoEEmissionsCategory sheet).					
20151020 10000147	Iker García (Contractor)	20/10/2015	Common	UnitOfMeasure_Enum update: According to 'Codelist_UnitsOfMeasure_2015-10-19.xlsx' at https://taskman.eionet.europa.eu/issues/25852 #change-123600 the following changes have to be applied to UnitOfMeasure_Enum: New values to be added: umol/L ug{TEQ}/kg Value update: %{saturation} to %{oxygenSaturation} {psu} to {PSU}	UnitOfMeasure_Enum enumeration list updated.	Done in version 6.0.2	???	No implementation needed	No implementation needed
20151019 10000481	Fernanda Néry (EEA)	19/10/2015	Common	To facilitate the edition (if so decided), the units lists in version 4.9 of the Guidance are: - gwPollutantBackgroundLevelUnit - 'mg/L' 'ug/L' 'ng/L' 'S/m' - thresholdValueUnit - 'mg/L' 'ug/L' - rbspUnit - 'ug/L' 'ug/kg' - psUnit - 'ug/L' 'ug/kg'	New element descriptions updated on the schemas / Access DB and new QA/QCs implemented for: • gwPollutantBackgroundLevelUnit • thresholdValueUnit • rbspUnit • psUnit	Done in version 6.0.2	???	No implementation needed	Done in version 6.0.2
20151021 10000314	Iker García (Contractor)	21/10/2015		Tag attributes as 'required' as specified on the guidance: • creationDate • creator • description • email • fileName	Change implemented.	Done in version 6.0.2	No implementation needed	No implementation needed	No implementation needed

- generatedBy
- language

| 20151019 10000221 | Polonca Mihorko (SI) | 19/10/2015 | | I have started to fill in the tables in Access but I found some discrepancies between Guidance, Schemas and Access database.

For instance:

Class SurfaceWaterBody

There are some elements, which can be found only in guidance and not in matching Access table:

hmwbWaterUse,

hmwbPhysicalAlternation,

surfaceWaterBodyIntercalibrationType,

swSignificantPressureType,

swSignificantImpactType,

SwChemicalStatusGrouping

and one element,which is only in Access table (euRBDCode) | In particular for the issues you commented (which can be applied to every schema):

The elements hmwbWaterUse, hmwbPhysicalAlternation, etc. are not present in the SurfaceWaterBody table cause their cardinality is 0 to N or 1 to N, So in order to be able to specify more than one element and relate them to a single SurfaceWaterBody there are tables named SurfaceWaterBody_hmwbWaterUse, SurfaceWaterBody_hmwbPhysicalAlternation, etc. on the Access DB.

Most Access DB tables has a Foreign Key to be able to relate/link it with its parent table. This element is retrieved from the parents table and therefore are not present on the schemas/guidance as elements as such. e.g euRBDCode on the SurfaceWaterBody is there to be able to link the table with its parent table SWB. | No implementation needed | No implementation needed | No implementation needed | No implementation needed |
| 20151021 10000341 | Fernanda Néry (EEA) | 21/10/2015 | | On the use of xs:sequence:

is it necessary to use xs:sequence?

Please check if a consistence approach is used both in the XSD and in the GML. | It is technically NOT possible according to XSD 1.0. Inside a 'xs:all' clause you cannot specify 'maxoccurs=unbounded' elements.

Sadly there is no way to explicitly indicate that XSD 1.1 is being used (approved W3C standard in April 2012 which allows 'xs:all' with 'unbounded' elements), it depends solely on the processor used to validate the XMLs.

So for the time being we are leaving the 'xs:sequences' in the schemas. | No implementation needed | No implementation needed | No implementation needed | No implementation needed |

					References: • http://www.w3schools.com/schema /schema_complex_indicators.asp • http://stackoverflow.com/questions/ 14622677/xml-schema-maxoccurs-unbounded-within-xsall • http://searchsoa.techtarget.com/def inition/XSD					
20151021 10000172	Jurgita Vaitiekuni ene (LT)	21/10/20 15		Protected Areas problem: The problem regarding Protected Areas was already reported in 04/06/2015 by Ramona Curelea (RO), however seems that it has not been fixed in v.6.0.1: Path: SWAssociatedProtectedArea Problem: schema element prohibits dublicate values of euProtectedAreaCode and hence we cannot report association of PA with more than one water body	We are fixing this issue in Access DB v6.0.2. There will be an autonumeric / autoincrement field as Primary Key on those tables that at the moment (v6.0.1) have a code acting as Primary Key but should be able to allocate the same code more than once. See the ticket below 2015101610000173.	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed
20151016 10000173	Iker García (Contracto r)	16/10/20 15		Access DB v6.0.1 primary keys error: In some tables such as, SWAssociatedProtectedArea, GWAssociatedProtectedArea, Programme, MonitoringSite, the primary key is the entity code itself (euProtectedAreaCode, euProgrammeCode, euMonitoringSiteCode) which means that it is not possible to link the same entity (same code) with different parent	The following Access DB tables have been updated (v6.0.2) in order to allow users to reuse the same codes (euProgrammeCode, euProtectedAreaCode) for different associations: • Programme • GWAssociatedProtectedArea • SWAssociatedProtectedArea	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed	No impleme ntation needed

				tables. In order to fix these issues an Autonumeric ID should be added to these tables as the primary key in the Access DB. The whole access db should be checked and not only the tables described on this issue.					