

# Procedure file

Basic information	
COD - Ordinary legislative procedure (ex-codecision procedure) Directive	1997/0067(COD) Procedure completed
Framework for Community action in the field of water policy. Water Framework Directive	
Amended by <a href="#">2006/0129(COD)</a> Amended by <a href="#">2006/0297(COD)</a> Amended by <a href="#">2008/0015(COD)</a> Amended by <a href="#">2011/0429(COD)</a> Amended by <a href="#">2013/0192(COD)</a>	
Subject 3.70.04 Water control and management, pollution of waterways, water pollution	

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	<b>DELE</b> EP Delegation to Conciliation Committee		27/03/2000
		PSE <a href="#">LIENEMANN Marie-Noëlle</a>	
	Former committee responsible		
	<b>ENVI</b> Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection	PSE <a href="#">WHITE Ian</a>	21/05/1997
	<b>ENVI</b> Environment, Public Health, Consumer Policy		27/07/1999
		PSE <a href="#">LIENEMANN Marie-Noëlle</a>	
	<b>ENVI</b> Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection	PPE <a href="#">JACKSON Caroline</a>	01/05/1999
	Former committee for opinion		
	<b>AGRI</b> Agriculture and Rural Development	PPE <a href="#">CUNHA Arlindo</a>	18/03/1998
	<b>BUDG</b> Budgets		
	<b>ENER</b> Research, Technological Development and Energy	PSE <a href="#">IZQUIERDO COLLADO Juan de Dios</a>	08/10/1997
	<b>PECH</b> Fisheries		
Council of the European Union	Council configuration	Meeting	Date
	<a href="#">Justice and Home Affairs (JHA)</a>	<a href="#">2251</a>	27/03/2000
	Social Affairs	<a href="#">2208</a>	22/10/1999
	<a href="#">Environment</a>	<a href="#">2165</a>	11/03/1999
	<a href="#">Environment</a>	<a href="#">2106</a>	16/06/1998
	<a href="#">Environment</a>	<a href="#">2076</a>	23/03/1998
	<a href="#">Environment</a>	<a href="#">2062</a>	16/12/1997
	<a href="#">Environment</a>	<a href="#">2033</a>	16/10/1997

[Environment](#)[2017](#)

19/06/1997



[Environment](#)[1990](#)


03/03/1997

[Environment](#)[1905](#)

04/03/1996

## Key events

04/03/1996	Debate in Council	<a href="#">1905</a>	
26/02/1997	Legislative proposal published	COM(1997)0049	Summary
03/03/1997	Debate in Council	<a href="#">1990</a>	
14/05/1997	Committee referral announced in Parliament, 1st reading/single reading		
19/06/1997	Debate in Council	<a href="#">2017</a>	
16/10/1997	Debate in Council	<a href="#">2033</a>	
16/12/1997	Debate in Council	<a href="#">2062</a>	
23/03/1998	Debate in Council	<a href="#">2076</a>	
16/06/1998	Debate in Council	<a href="#">2106</a>	
24/06/1998	Vote in committee, 1st reading/single reading		Summary
24/06/1998	Committee report tabled for plenary, 1st reading/single reading	<a href="#">A4-0261/1998</a>	
10/02/1999	Debate in Parliament		
11/02/1999	Decision by Parliament, 1st reading/single reading	T4-0114/1999	Summary
17/06/1999	Modified legislative proposal published	COM(1999)0271	Summary
26/07/1999	Vote in committee, 1st reading/single reading		
26/07/1999	Committee report tabled for plenary confirming Parliament's position	<a href="#">A5-0004/1999</a>	
16/09/1999	Decision by Parliament, 1st reading/single reading	<a href="#">T5-0013/1999</a>	Summary
22/10/1999	Council position published	<a href="#">09085/3/1999</a>	Summary
28/10/1999	Committee referral announced in Parliament, 2nd reading		
25/01/2000	Vote in committee, 2nd reading		Summary
25/01/2000	Committee recommendation tabled for plenary, 2nd reading	<a href="#">A5-0027/2000</a>	
15/02/2000	Debate in Parliament		
16/02/2000	Decision by Parliament, 2nd reading	<a href="#">T5-0054/2000</a>	Summary
27/03/2000	Parliament's amendments rejected by Council		
23/05/2000	Formal meeting of Conciliation Committee		Summary
28/06/2000	Final decision by Conciliation Committee		

18/07/2000	Joint text approved by Conciliation Committee co-chairs	<a href="#">3639/2000</a>	
21/08/2000	Report tabled for plenary, 3rd reading	<a href="#">A5-0214/2000</a>	
06/09/2000	Debate in Parliament		
07/09/2000	Decision by Parliament, 3rd reading	<a href="#">T5-0369/2000</a>	Summary
14/09/2000	Decision by Council, 3rd reading		
23/10/2000	Final act signed		
23/10/2000	End of procedure in Parliament		
22/12/2000	Final act published in Official Journal		

### Technical information

Procedure reference	1997/0067(COD)
Procedure type	COD - Ordinary legislative procedure (ex-codecision procedure)
Procedure subtype	Legislation
Legislative instrument	Directive
	Amended by <a href="#">2006/0129(COD)</a> Amended by <a href="#">2006/0297(COD)</a> Amended by <a href="#">2008/0015(COD)</a> Amended by <a href="#">2011/0429(COD)</a> Amended by <a href="#">2013/0192(COD)</a>
Legal basis	EC Treaty (after Amsterdam) EC 175-p1
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	CODE/5/12662

### Documentation gateway

Legislative proposal		<a href="#">COM(1997)0049</a> <a href="#">OJ C 184 17.06.1997, p. 0020</a>	26/02/1997	EC	Summary
Committee opinion	<b>BUDG</b>	PE222.936/DEF	03/09/1997	EP	
Economic and Social Committee: opinion, report		<a href="#">CES0994/1997</a> <a href="#">OJ C 355 21.11.1997, p. 0083</a>	01/10/1997	ESC	Summary
Supplementary legislative basic document		<a href="#">COM(1997)0614</a> <a href="#">OJ C 016 20.01.1998, p. 0014</a>	26/11/1997	EC	Summary
Supplementary legislative basic document		<a href="#">COM(1998)0076</a> <a href="#">OJ C 108 07.04.1998, p. 0094</a>	17/02/1998	EC	Summary
Committee draft report		PE225.956/B	11/03/1998	EP	
Committee of the Regions: opinion		<a href="#">CDR0171/1997</a> <a href="#">OJ C 180 11.06.1998, p. 0038</a>	12/03/1998	CofR	
Committee draft report		PE225.956/A	13/03/1998	EP	
Committee opinion	<b>ENER</b>	PE224.671/DEF	15/06/1998	EP	
Committee opinion	<b>AGRI</b>	PE226.554/DEF	23/06/1998	EP	

Committee report tabled for plenary, 1st reading/single reading		<a href="#">A4-0261/1998</a> <a href="#">OJ C 292 21.09.1998, p. 0004</a>	24/06/1998	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, 1st reading/single reading		T4-0114/1999 <a href="#">OJ C 150 28.05.1999, p. 0282-0419</a>	11/02/1999	EP	Summary
Non-legislative basic document		SEC(1999)0581	28/04/1999	EC	
Modified legislative proposal		COM(1999)0271 <a href="#">OJ C 342 30.11.1999, p. 0001</a>	17/06/1999	EC	Summary
Committee final report tabled for plenary, 1st reading/single reading		<a href="#">A5-0004/1999</a> <a href="#">OJ C 054 25.02.2000, p. 0010</a>	26/07/1999	EP	
Committee opinion	PECH	PE222.998/DEF	18/08/1999	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament confirming position adopted at 1st reading		<a href="#">T5-0013/1999</a> <a href="#">OJ C 054 25.02.2000, p. 0055-0076</a>	16/09/1999	EP	Summary
Council position		<a href="#">09085/3/1999</a> <a href="#">OJ C 343 30.11.1999, p. 0001</a>	22/10/1999	CSL	Summary
Commission communication on Council's position		SEC(1999)1706	26/10/1999	EC	Summary
Committee recommendation tabled for plenary, 2nd reading		<a href="#">A5-0027/2000</a> <a href="#">OJ C 339 29.11.2000, p. 0006</a>	25/01/2000	EP	
Follow-up document		COM(2000)0047 <a href="#">OJ C 177 27.06.2000, p. 0074 E</a>	07/02/2000	EC	
Text adopted by Parliament, 2nd reading		<a href="#">T5-0054/2000</a> <a href="#">OJ C 339 29.11.2000, p. 0062-0136</a>	16/02/2000	EP	Summary
Commission opinion on Parliament's position at 2nd reading		COM(2000)0219	05/06/2000	EC	Summary
Joint text approved by Conciliation Committee co-chairs		<a href="#">3639/2000</a>	18/07/2000	CSL/EP	
Document attached to the procedure		COM(2000)0477	26/07/2000	EC	Summary
Report tabled for plenary by Parliament delegation to Conciliation Committee, 3rd reading		<a href="#">A5-0214/2000</a> <a href="#">OJ C 135 07.05.2001, p. 0014</a>	21/08/2000	EP	
Committee draft report		PE287.574	29/08/2000	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, 3rd reading		<a href="#">T5-0369/2000</a> <a href="#">OJ C 135 07.05.2001, p. 0196-0252</a>	07/09/2000	EP	Summary
Follow-up document		<a href="#">COM(2007)0128</a>	22/03/2007	EC	Summary
Follow-up document		COM(2009)0156	01/04/2009	EC	Summary
Follow-up document		SEC(2009)0415	01/04/2009	EC	
Follow-up document		<a href="#">SEC(2009)1114</a>	03/08/2009	EC	
Follow-up document		<a href="#">COM(2011)0875</a>	31/01/2012	EC	Summary
Follow-up document		<a href="#">SEC(2011)1544</a>	31/01/2012	EC	
Follow-up document		<a href="#">COM(2012)0670</a>	14/11/2012	EC	Summary
Follow-up document		SWD(2012)0379	14/11/2012	EC	

Follow-up document		SWD(2015)0050	09/03/2015	EC	Summary
Follow-up document		SWD(2015)0053	09/03/2015	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2015)0054	09/03/2015	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2015)0055	09/03/2015	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2015)0056	09/03/2015	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2016)0178	18/05/2016	EC	Summary
Follow-up document		<a href="#">COM(2019)0095</a>	26/02/2019	EC	Summary
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0030	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0031	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0032	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0033	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0034	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0035	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0036	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0037	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0038	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0039	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0040	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0041	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0042	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0043	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0044	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0045	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0046	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0047	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0048	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0049	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0050	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0051	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0052	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0053	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0054	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0055	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0056	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0057	26/02/2019	EC	

Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0058	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0059	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0060	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0061	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0062	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0063	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0064	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0065	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0066	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0067	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0068	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0069	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0070	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0071	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0072	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0073	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0074	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0075	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0076	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0077	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0078	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0079	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0080	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0081	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0082	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0083	26/02/2019	EC	
Follow-up document		SWD(2019)0084	26/02/2019	EC	

#### Additional information

European Commission

[EUR-Lex](#)

#### Final act

[Directive 2000/60](#)  
[OJ L 327 22.12.2000, p. 0001](#) Summary

**OBJECTIVE:** The proposal for a directive aims to achieve three objectives no later than 2010: good surface water status in all surface water; good groundwater status in all groundwaters; compliance with all standards and objectives relating to the Protected Areas, including water used for the abstraction of drinking water. **SUBSTANCE:** The proposal responds to a request from the Council and from the European Parliament's Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, which in June 1995 called for a fundamental review of Community water policy. It establishes a Community framework for the protection of surface water and groundwater in the Community with a common approach and with common objectives, principles and common basic measures. The proposal for a framework directive establishes the overall objective of achieving good water status and it requires: - river basin management; - an assessment of the characteristics of the river basin; - monitoring of the status of the surface water and groundwater of the river basin; - the establishment of programmes of measures to achieve the objective; - the summarizing of all the above in a 'River Basin Management Plan'; and - public consultation on that plan. In addition, it contains requirements for: - a mechanism to ensure that water use is paid for at full cost recovery prices; - the collection of various bodies of data on the status of the aquatic environment and the constraints to which it is subjected; - a feedback mechanism to inform national authorities and the Commission of particular problems; - action to combat accidental pollution; - simplified reporting procedures; and - a procedure for the development of coordinated strategies for dealing with pollution by individual pollutants or groups of pollutants; - the establishment of a network for the exchange of information and experience between water professionals throughout the Community. The timetable envisaged for the implementation of the directive is as follows: - end of 1997: Council adopts directive; - end of 1999: Member States transpose directive; - Dec. 2000 Waters used for the abstraction of drinking water designated; - Dec. 2001 (a) Analyses of the characteristics of River Basin Districts completed; (b) reviews of the environmental impact of human activity completed; (c) economic analysis of water use completed; (d) Registers of Protected Areas completed; (e) monitoring programmes operational; - Dec. 2004 River Basin Management Plans published covering 2005-2010 (these plans will be revised every 6 years); - Dec. 2006 Commission publishes first report on implementation; - Dec. 2007: Programmes of measures fully operational; - Dec. 2010 Deadline for objective of meeting 'good status' and for the objective of charging for all uses of water (abstraction, distribution, consumption, collection, treatment etc.) to ensure full recuperation of costs; - Dec. 2013: Commission reviews directive. ?

---

## 1997/0067(COD) - 01/10/1997 Economic and Social Committee: opinion, report

---

The Committee endorses the proposed framework directive as a whole. It improves earlier legislation by clarifying the relevant rules through a total or partial repeal of those directives which have become obsolete in practice. At the same time it retains the *acquis communautaire* which has served to create the EU's water policy, as requested by the ESC in its opinion on the communication. The ESC takes the view that financial transfer mechanisms should be devised so that future increases in the cost of water can be reinvested in conservation measures and costs do not rise for those most affected. In order to provide guidance on the possible ways of complying with the objectives of transnational river basin management plans which include non-EU countries, the ESC urges the Commission to introduce and/or strengthen the following: - international institutional agreements covering both objectives and policies at a level higher than the Community; - action on more limited pollution problems, boosting voluntary agreements with non-Community productive sectors, official bodies, users, etc. ?

---

## 1997/0067(COD) - 26/11/1997 Supplementary legislative basic document

---

The amendments proposed by the Commission concern mainly Article 21 of the initial proposal regarding Community strategies against pollution by certain substances. The principal advantage of this article is that it is based on an approach including all sources of pollution, not only processes, and makes it possible to choose the appropriate measures and response. This approach is maintained in the amended proposal. The principal objective of the amendments to Article 21 may be summarized as follows: a) method of establishing priorities among the dangerous substances concerned b) establishing a framework for actions concerning priority substances including: - localizing major discharges of the substances concerned, including both processes and products - analysis to determine the appropriate level of regulation and the most cost effective measures for reducing pollution, use of the best available technology principle in the case of processes. in accordance with the combined approach and the existing provisionals of Directive 76/464/EEC. ?

---

## 1997/0067(COD) - 17/02/1998 Supplementary legislative basic document

---

The proposal for a directive establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy contains in its Annex V a general outline for technical specification for definition, classification and monitoring of the ecological and chemical status of ground waters. The proposed directive empowers the Commission to lay down the required technical details in Annex V at a later stage, through a committee procedure. As the work has now progressed to a stage where a consolidated Commission position is required, this proposal for modification of Annex V has been submitted. The proposed measures mainly consist of a number of technical specifications concerning the monitoring and the presentation of the results of monitoring of the ecological and chemical status of surface waters and the quantitative and chemical status of ground waters. The burden of analysis, classification and reporting which they impose falls principally on the Member States. ?

---

## 1997/0067(COD) - 24/06/1998 Vote in committee, 1st reading/single reading

---

The Committee voted overwhelmingly to adopt a wide-ranging in-depth report on a Commission proposal - to which members had tabled nearly 300 amendments - for the first ever Community framework directive on water policy. The occasion was marred, however, by the knowledge that the Council appeared to have already reached "political agreement" on the legislation without waiting to receive Parliament's opinion. There was universal condemnation of the Council, which had already announced that on 16 June it reached "a considerable degree of common understanding" on the proposed directive. The rapporteur, Mr Ian WHITE (PES, UK), warned that the Council might have to reconsider its "political agreement". Mr White pointed out that the Commission proposal was to a large extent moulded by the views of Parliament, which had for a long time been pushing for overarching legislation on water. The initial Commission proposal had already been heavily influenced by a parliamentary hearing on water policy in June 1995 as well as by reports on the subject by Mr Karl-Heinz FLORENZ (EPP) and Mr Ken COLLINS (PES, UK). The overall aim of the proposal, after amendment by the committee (cooperation, first reading), is to

protect surface water, coastal and territorial waters and groundwater through a framework which prevents further deterioration, protects ecosystems, promotes sustainable water use, helps combat floods and drought, and phases out discharges of hazardous substances into the aquatic environment by the year 2020. Specific directives will subsequently be adopted within this framework. With the committee's agreement, the proposal singles out river basins as the basic unit for water management. River basin district management authorities will draw up management plans for their district containing a programme of measures for the achievement of environmental objectives. Measures designed to control pollution at source will involve setting emission limit values and environmental quality standards. Under the proposal, all water service costs must be recouped and the "polluter pays" principle must apply. In its amendments, the committee also stressed the importance of wetlands, the integration of tourism and water policies and the implications for coastal fisheries. Members were also concerned to avoid excessive concentrations of radioactive substances in water and they added endocrine disruptors to the list of pollutants annexed to the proposal. Standardized methods recognized by all Member States must be used to monitor water quality. Every two years a conference on water policy should be held including representatives of the EP, NGOs, the social partners, consumer bodies, academics and experts. Members also want the Commission to publish a biennial report on implementation of the directive. The timescale for the directive includes a preparatory phase (1999-2005), involving setting up the river basin authorities, collecting data and identifying problems, and an implementation phase (2006-2009).?

## 1997/0067(COD) - 11/02/1999 Text adopted by Parliament, 1st reading/single reading

---

The EP voted to endorse the heavily amended Commission proposals for an EU framework directive on water which aim to protect surface water, coastal and territorial water. Mr. Ian WHITE (UK, PES) was the Rapporteur. The following concerns of the Parliament were incorporated in the amendments : - The need to take account of the vulnerability of aquatic ecosystems located near coasts or estuaries or in gulfs or relatively closed seas, as their equilibrium is strongly influenced by the quality of the river basin water flowing into them. - Member States which have progressed further than the Community in limiting pollution through the discharge of all pollutants or groups of pollutants representing an unacceptable risk to the environment and/or to the population shall be allowed to have more stringent restrictions. - Goal to reduce the load of hazardous substances by 50% by 2010, by 75% by 2015 and by close to zero by 2020, taking 1995 as a reference year. - Where economic instruments are used properly as part of a programme of environmental protection measures, management can be improved and more rational use of resources encouraged. - The principle of sound water policy should not be permanently waived purely to promote the sustainable development of an economic region as a whole. - The need for a cost-benefit study : within five years from the date of implementation of this Directive, the Commission, with the assistance of the appropriate authorities in the Member States, shall carry out a cost-benefit study for the purpose of determining the amount of investment that has been required for the implementation of this Directive. - For each river basin district, an assessment of the impact of human activity on the adjoining maritime areas into which the waters of the river basin district flow should be completed within five years of the entry into force of this Directive. - The Member States shall present an action plan showing how they intend to achieve the status of each body of water identified under Article 8 (1), so that the treatment facilities can be minimised to meet the requirements of Directive 80/778/EEC. The action plan shall emphasise the measures required for pollution prevention at source and reduction of pollution from point sources and diffuse sources. - The Commission shall publish a report on the implementation of this Directive at the latest 12 years after the date mentioned in Art. 29, and every six years thereafter, and shall submit it to the European Parliament and to the Council.?

## 1997/0067(COD) - 17/06/1999 Modified legislative proposal

---

The Commission's amended proposal accepts, in total or partially, 88 amendments out of the 133 adopted by the European Parliament in its first reading. The Commission has, therefore, accepted amendments aiming to; - clearly indicate that the prevention and the deterioration of the state of water is an objective in itself; - add a protection reference and to improve humid zones; - improve transparency and public participation. Moreover, the Commission accepts the amendments making explicit reference to the inclusion of substances affecting endocrinal functions and radioactive substances in the Directive. Because the measures concerning dangerous substances were an essential problem, the Commission welcomed amendments that called for Community action with a view to continued reduction of the discharge of dangerous substances moving in the direction of their elimination, in conformity with the Esbjerg declaration on the occasion of the 4th Conference of the North Sea. The Commission has also inserted in its amended proposal the objective of achieving some concentrations in the marine environment which are close to natural values for the substances normally present in the marine milieu, and close to zero for artificial substances of human origin. The objective of an insignificant level of anthropogenic pollution in underground waters had been added as an ultimate objective. Therefore, the Commission has preferred to insert this objective as a supplementary objective to a good state of water, without specifying a date. The basic idea of the proposed amendment is to fix prices at a level that encourages the achievement of environmental objectives had been taken into account in the proposed Directive. The Commission has also accepted the amendments attempting to specify certain conditions for derogations, in particular, natural disasters, previous human activities or natural conditions. Moreover, the Commission has adopted the amendment adding a derogation, under certain conditions, for discharges into underground water resulting from exploration operations and oil extraction, as well as other extractive industries, the storage of gas and in the framework of certain scientific and related work. The Commission accepted in part the amendment clarifying the application of quality standards for surface water destined for water supplies. Lastly, the Commission accepts in principle a certain number of amendments concerning the combined approach and programmes of measures.?

## 1997/0067(COD) - 16/09/1999 Text adopted by Parliament confirming position adopted at 1st reading

---

The European Parliament confirmed its first reading in the context of the codecision procedure of the text that it adopted on 11.02.1999 concerning this amended proposal for a directive.?

## 1997/0067(COD) - 22/10/1999 Council position

---



The common position reached by the Council essentially aims at preventing deterioration of ecological status and pollution and restoring all bodies of surface water and groundwater with the aim of achieving good status at the latest 16 years after the entry into force of the Directive. Taking the identification of river basin districts as a basis, Member States are to provide management plans (containing inter alia the river basin's characteristics, monitoring of the water status and coordinated programmes of measures) which are subject to public consultation and aim to achieve good water status through a phased implementation of the measures they envisage. The common position takes into account the interaction between surface water and groundwater, the impact of human activity, e.g. industry, agriculture, energy production and transport, the quality and quantity aspects and contributes to mitigating the effects of floods and droughts, to providing a sufficient supply of good quality water for users, to protecting territorial and marine waters, to achieving the objectives of relevant international agreements (e.g. aiming at the prevention and elimination of pollution) and to progressively reducing the emissions of hazardous substances. The common position is very close in overall structure and approach of the Commission's initial proposal, and retains the majority of its provisions. Very few new elements are introduced in the text which incorporates either in their totality or in part, the 77 amendments put forward by the European Parliament. A new article specifies the requirements for application of the combined approach for control of point and diffuse sources. A number of definitions were reformulated in order to clarify their scope of application and their content. The former Annex II has been considerably improved and expanded in terms of technical and scientific detail, taking over also information requirements for analysis of human activity from the former Annex III. A new Annex III takes over the technical specification for the economic analysis from the former Annex III. The former Annex III has, consequently been deleted. The technical specifications of Annex III is considerably simpler than the Commission proposed but this simplification is complemented by the possibility for adaptation to technical progress through Committee procedure.?

## 1997/0067(COD) - 26/10/1999 Commission communication on Council's position

---

The Commission acknowledges that the Council's common position in particular in terms of technical specification further develops the original proposal. The Commission also welcomes the inclusion of a good number of the European Parliament's amendments inter alia on the inclusion of wetlands, public consultation, reporting, the role of Parliament in the further development of proposal on priority substances and a number of definitions or precision of existing definitions. The Commission nevertheless disagrees with the common position on a number of points as indicated above, in particular the provisions on timetable for implementation, charging, and the way reference is made to commitments under international agreements and in particular to the OSPAR, Barcelona and HELCOM conventions.?

## 1997/0067(COD) - 25/01/2000 Vote in committee, 2nd reading

---

The committee adopted the draft recommendation for second reading (codecision procedure) by Marie-Noëlle LIENEMANN (PES, F) amending the Council's common position with a view to making the Water Framework Directive more ambitious. The amendments introduced changes in a number of areas. Firstly, whereas the Council sought to achieve the target of good surface water status 16 years at the latest after the directive came into force, the committee wished to reduce this to 10 years. It also called for an end to discharges and losses of hazardous substances by 2020, the aim being to reach "levels close to zero by 2020". The Council also hoped to achieve good groundwater status after 16 years, but the committee wanted to halt the deterioration in the chemical and quantitative status of groundwater and achieve good groundwater status within 10 years. It also proposed that any standards and objectives relating to Protected Areas should be achieved within 10 and not 16 years. On the question of derogations, the Council had provided for the deadline for achieving the objective to be extended by up to three updates of the River Basin Management Plan, one update representing six years. The committee sought to limit any extension to two updates of the River Management Plan and called for stricter handling of such derogations. Another amendment adopted by the committee added radioactive substances to the list of pollutants. On the question of charging, the committee set the date of 2010 as a deadline by which Member States should ensure that water-pricing policies provided adequate incentives for users to use water resources efficiently. It also wanted to include a clear statement that the Commission would bring forward a proposal by 2012 to ensure that environmental and resource costs were reflected in the price of water use. Exemptions would be granted to allow a basic level of water use for domestic purposes at an affordable price. On the question of water transfers, the committee suggested that, in cases where an adequate water supply of wholesome drinking water could not be secured, the competent local authority would be empowered to reallocate water from uses in other water-use sectors. Lastly, in its common position, the Council had provided for detailed monitoring programs and a complete system of rating the ecological state but did not lay down measures to be taken where certain levels of pollutants are exceeded. The committee was more specific on this point, recommending various measures including a management plan to be implemented if nitrate concentrations exceed 25 mg/l in groundwater. ?

## 1997/0067(COD) - 16/02/2000 Text adopted by Parliament, 2nd reading

---

In approving the Council's common position, MEPs voted in favour of Mrs. Marie-Noëlle Lienemann's (PES, Fr) report which contains a number of amendments to the common position. The amended recitals draw attention to a number of concerns including : - water is not a commercial product like any other but, rather, a heritage which must be protected, defended and treated as such; - good water quality will secure the drinking water supply for the population; - environmental objectives should be set to ensure that good status of surface water and groundwater is achieved throughout the Community and that deterioration in the status of waters is avoided at EU level; - the ultimate aim is to achieve complete elimination of all anthropogenic pollutants and background concentrations of naturally occurring substances; - there is no natural right to discharge hazardous or radioactive substances into water; scientific and technical progress allows the application of progressively less polluting production technologies; - coastal fisheries, despite being located outside river basins, should be recognised as being one of the economic activities most affected by all forms of environmental deterioration within such basins. The Parliament sets a number of target dates to achieve particular objectives. It wants to see the goal of good 'surface water' achieved within 10 years of the Directive coming into force rather than 16 and a similar date for good 'groundwater'. Parliament voted to include 'radioactive substances' in the list of pollutants and also voted for levels close to 'zero discharge' by 2020 and for water-pricing policies to come into effect by 2010. However, another amendment provides for exemptions 'in order to allow a basic level of water use for domestic purposes at a more affordable price', while a further amendment allows for pricing policy 'to take account of the specific geographical and climatic characteristics of the various regions'.?

## 1997/0067(COD) - 23/05/2000 Formal meeting of Conciliation Committee

---

The Conciliation Committee reached agreement on a joint text for the framework directive on water policy. The main compromises were as follows: (1) strengthening the legal enforceability of the directive. As regards the binding nature of the objectives of the Directive, the Council accepted a wording very close to Parliament's second reading amendments; (2) the elimination of hazardous substances from surface waters (which was not included in the Council common position). The directive now includes an obligation to eliminate hazardous substances according to a procedure of establishing priority lists of substances to be ceased or phased out at the latest within 20 years of their identification as hazardous substances; (3) protection of groundwater: Parliament achieved its aim of guaranteeing existing protection levels for groundwater. An obligation and mechanism to reverse the upward trend in pollution was included in the Directive; (4) water pricing - a derogation to the provisions on water-pricing policies was agreed in order to solve the 'Irish problem' (Ireland is the only Member State which does not charge households according to water and sewage volume but finances these services via taxation).?

## 1997/0067(COD) - 05/06/2000 Commission opinion on Parliament's position at 2nd reading

---

The Commission accepted fully, in part or in principle, 47 of the 61 amendments adopted by the Parliament. Those rejected include: - the statement that water is a common heritage rather than a commercial product. The proposal does not treat water as a commercial product but protects water as an environmental and social good. - the statement that there is no natural right to discharge hazardous substances into water. The function of this amendment is unclear and the proposal does not make reference to any "rights" of polluting. - the definition of "hazardous substances" is not accepted. The proposal defines clear criteria for selection of "hazardous substances" and the definition is therefore unnecessary. Moreover, the proposed definition deviates in important detail from the generally recognised definitions of hazardous substances. The amendments accepted in part include that amendment requesting proposals for continuous reduction of discharge, emissions and losses one year after the adoption of the priority list. Reference to the aim of levels close to zero by December 2020 is accepted in redrafted wording which reflects the essentially aspirational and political nature of this amendment. The amendment requesting shortening of the timetable for implementation from 16 years to 10 is considered too strict. The Commission does agree that shortening is needed and suggests a global solution with a certain shortening of the deadline in combination with stricter conditions for achieving the environmental objectives. With the deletion of a six-year extension period, in combination with a no-deterioration clause, more stringent criteria for extensions, for less stringent environmental objectives and for compliance as requested by Parliament the Commission accepts the 16 years of the common position as an overall date for achieving the environmental objectives. Appropriate amendments have been made to this effect.?

## 1997/0067(COD) - 26/07/2000 Document attached to the procedure

---

Water is a major concern for environmental policies in the European Community and is one of the environmental priorities of the European Commission. The main pillar of water policies over the coming decades will be the proposed Directive establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy (or Water Framework Directive). In line with recent initiatives to give more weight to economic instruments in environmental policies, the proposed Water Framework Directive promotes the use of water charging to act as an incentive for the sustainable use of water resources and to recover the costs of water services by economic sector. This will contribute to meeting the environmental objectives of this Directive in a cost-effective way. Against this background, the Commission presents this Communication with the following objectives: - to clarify the main issues related to the use of water pricing for enhancing the sustainability of water resources; - to present the rationale behind the Commission's preference for a strict application of sound economic and environmental principles in water pricing policies; - to propose a set of guiding principles that will support the implementation of the proposed Water Framework Directive and more specifically its water pricing article. The key messages of the Communication are: 1) The sustainability of water resources is at stake in many river basins from both a quantitative and a qualitative point of view. Appropriate water pricing has a key role to play in the development of sustainable water policies. 2) To play an effective role in enhancing the sustainability of water resources, water pricing policies need to be based on an assessment of costs and benefits of water use and to consider both the financial costs of providing services as well as environmental and resource costs. A price linked directly to the water quantities used or pollution produced can ensure that pricing has a clear incentive function for consumers to improve water use efficiency and reduce pollution. 3) The integration of economic and environmental objectives into Member States' water pricing policies is highly diverse at present. Overall, the full recovery of financial costs is only partly achieved, and environmental and resource costs are rarely considered. The inadequacy of water pricing policies is striking for the agricultural sector, especially in Southern Europe where it is by far the largest consumer of water and where scarcity problems are the greatest. 4) Water pricing policies in countries where the EU has a particularly strong involvement rarely integrate economic efficiency and environmental objectives. This is true for accession countries, where pricing is an important issue in the context of enlargement, as well as in the developing countries. 5) Efficient water pricing policies have a demonstrable impact on the water demand of different uses. As a result of changes in water demand, efficient water pricing reduces the pressure on water resources. This is particularly true for the agricultural sector. The available evidence suggests that farming communities can be expected to adapt to certain price increases that would result from a stricter recovery of the costs of water services. Different levels of cost recovery among countries and economic sectors, such as agriculture and industry, are likely to influence the competitiveness of these sectors both in the internal market and international trade. 6) Pricing policies that better account for the environment will build on a firmer application of the principle of recovery of costs; a wider application of pricing structures that provide incentives and the promotion of metering devices; the assessment of major environmental costs and, where feasible, the internalisation of these costs into prices; a transparent policy development process with the participation of users/consumers; and a phased implementation of pricing policies that better integrate sound economic and environmental principles. 7) Water pricing needs to be integrated with other measures to ensure environmental and socio-economic objectives are met cost-effectively e.g. preparation of river basin management plans. 8) Other sectoral, structural and cohesion policies need to be designed and implemented so as to ensure consistency and coherence with, and effectiveness of, water pricing policies. The CAP should support the sustainable use of water resources in line with the economic and environmental principles promoted in the proposed Water Framework Directive and in this Communication. The Commission fully recognises the sensitivity of the pricing issues discussed in this Communication for a wide range of stakeholders and Member States. This sensitivity should not be reason for misreading the Commission's message as an advocacy for a 'pricing alone' policy. Clearly, pricing is not the sole instrument that can (and will) solve water resource problems in Europe and elsewhere. However, pricing should be given due consideration to ensure it promotes more efficient and less polluting use of our scarce water resources. Overall, the Communication seeks to promote a fruitful debate and sharing of

views that will lead to the identification of practical steps and development of guidelines for the implementation of the water pricing article of the proposed Water Framework Directive. It is hoped that it will play an information role for stakeholders who will actively participate in the preparation of the river basin management plans and programmes of measures provided for by the Water Framework Directive. It will also support the assessment of the role water pricing may play in the context of enlargement and the implementation of the environmental acquis in accession countries. Lastly, it will supplement the EU guidelines for development policy entitled 'Towards Sustainable Water Resources Management' by stressing the key components of sustainable water pricing policies.?

## 1997/0067(COD) - 07/09/2000 Text adopted by Parliament, 3rd reading

---

In approving the report drafted by Mrs Marie-Noëlle LIENEMANN (PES, Fr), the European Parliament adopts the legislative resolution on the joint text approved by the Conciliation Committee for a European Parliament and Council directive establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy.?

## 1997/0067(COD) - 23/10/2000 Final act

---

**PURPOSE** : to establish a framework for Community action in the field of water policy, notably the protection of inland surface water, transitional waters, coastal waters and ground water. **COMMUNITY MEASURE** : Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy. **CONTENT** : the framework Directive relating to water aims to prevent further deterioration and protects and enhances the status of aquatic ecosystems, and with regard to their water needs, terrestrial ecosystems and wetlands directly depending on the aquatic based ecosystems. In addition, it aims to combat pollution in a general way and foresees in this respect the phasing out or stopping altogether of discharges, emissions and losses of priority hazardous substances, with the ultimate aim of achieving concentrations in the marine environment. These substances should be ceased or phased out at the latest within 20 years of their identification as hazardous substances. Furthermore, the Directive aims to: - define the integrated policies and coherent in the field of water; - create a safety net which enables problems, which are not currently adequately dealt with, to be detected and which means that measures shall have to be taken in order to re-establish the situation; - create a solid base for the collection and the analysis of a large volume of information on the state of the marine environment in view of providing the essential information which would allow the competent authorities to define reasonable and sustainable policies; - establish transparency in this field thanks to the publication and the diffusion of information and public consultation. The Water policy shall be implemented on the basis on management plans of the river basin district. For each district, the Directive requests: - an evaluation of the characteristics of the district; - establishing a programme of measures aiming to make concrete the objectives of the Directive; - undertaking an analysis of the characteristics of a river basin in order to set up a management plan of the river basin district, and to consult the general public on this management plan. **ENTRY INTO FORCE** : 22/12/00. **DEADLINE SET FOR TRANSPOSITION** : 22/12/2003.?

## 1997/0067(COD) - 22/03/2007 Follow-up document

---

This Communication summarises the first report on progress with implementation of the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC ? WFD). It also makes recommendations for the next important milestone: the river basin management plans. These plans, which are due by December 2009, will bring further real improvements for the whole water system in the form of programmes of measures, which must be operational by 2012 and deliver the environmental objectives of the Directive by 2015.

Reports from the Member States on their initial obligations under the Water Framework Directive show some encouraging results, although there are major shortcomings in some areas. There is still time to remedy the gaps before 2010, when the first river basin management plans have to be adopted.

The poor transposition and the lack of economic analysis are the biggest gaps in WFD implementation so far. While international cooperation needs to be enhanced in many cases, significant improvements have been observed in some regions, such as the Danube.

Further progress is needed in areas such as:

1) Recommendations to the Member States: Member States have to complete the first river basin management plans by the end of 2009, and they have to put a water pricing policy in place in 2010. Learning from experience with implementation to date, there is still ample time to improve the situation and close gaps on data. Moreover, the obligation to inform and consult the public when preparing the management plans will require more transparency and justification on what measures are necessary and cost-effective, and what exemptions can be justified. The Commission therefore urges the Member States to focus especially on the following three areas:

- Overcoming the current shortcomings: Member States are encouraged to: (i) fully implement other relevant EU legislation, in particular on urban wastewater and nitrates; (ii) put in place all the economic instruments required by the Directive (pricing, recovery of costs of water services, environment and resource costs, and the polluter pays principle). Full exploitation of these economic instruments will contribute to truly sustainable water management; (iii) put in place a comprehensive national ecological assessment and classification system as the basis for implementing the Directive and meeting its 'good ecological status' objective. The deficiencies of the current intercalibration exercise must be remedied as soon as possible. Only complete, robust and reliable ecological assessment will generate faith in the WFD and ensure its credibility; (iv) improve the methodologies and approaches on some key issues (such as designation of heavily modified water bodies, criteria for assessing risk or addressing groundwater quantitative status) and enhance comparability between the Member States, in particular in international river basins; (v) considerably reduce the existing data gaps and shortcomings of the analysis as part of preparation of the river basin management plans;
- Integrating sustainable water management into other policy areas: Member States are encouraged to: (i) make sure that infrastructure and sustainable human development projects undergo an appropriate environmental impact assessment; (ii) ensure the allocation of the appropriate funding. To reach this objective, it is important to make the best use of the potential of national funds and EU financing instruments, such as the Common Agricultural Policy and the Cohesion Policy;
- Making the best use of public participation: public participation should be seen as an opportunity. The ongoing work on voluntary reporting and the Water Information System for Europe will assist in informing the public in a transparent way.

2) Commission actions: it is clear that the Member States still have an ambitious and challenging task ahead if they are to make WFD implementation successful. The Commission realises that it has an important role to play. In this respect, the Commission is planning the following actions, which are in line with the WFD and, in some cases, have a wide-reaching aim.

- Action 1: Renewing the partnership with the Member States: the Commission is committed to continuing the successful cooperation under the Common Implementation Strategy. This joint work programme together with the Member States and other countries, and with the involvement of stakeholders and NGOs, promotes common understanding, best practice and information exchange on some of the key issues. The Commission is convinced that this approach has already delivered better results than a more formalistic approach to implementation. However, if it should become evident that it is likely to fail, the Commission will not hesitate to use its powers under the Treaty. In addition, the Commission will continue helping the EU-12 Member States to implement EU water policy and being involved in international river conventions;
- Action 2: Ensuring integration into other EU policies: considerable progress has already been made in integrating water policy into other EU policy areas, in particular agriculture, energy, transport, research, external relations and regional development. The joint and open discussions between the different competent authorities at EU and Member State level involving all relevant stakeholders and NGOs have produced valuable results and conclusions. The Commission is committed to continuing its leadership role in this area by exploring further ways of strengthening the integration of water-related considerations into other EU policies and legislation. The aim is to make other policy areas contribute even more effectively to protecting the water environment and achieving the objectives of the WFD, the Flood Risk Management Directive and other Community water legislation. There is a window of opportunity in the upcoming discussions on the future of the Common Agriculture Policy of further integrating water policy and agricultural policy. On cohesion policy, the Commission will continue efforts to ensure that assistance from the Funds is consistent with water policy. Transport (navigation) and energy (hydropower) policies will continue to be implemented in a way that reduces negative impacts on the aquatic environment. Moreover, implementation of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research will need to maintain a water focus;
- Action 3: Promoting the use of economic instruments: the Commission will make the use of economic instruments a priority in the context of implementation and stimulate further exchanges of information with and between Member States on best practices, including more use of the existing guidance documents. Moreover, the Commission is also looking at promoting benchmarking between water operators;
- Action 4: Addressing climate change in water management: climate change impacts, including increased flooding and droughts, could enhance the risk of non-attainment of the objectives of the WFD. The increased risk on extreme events is partly addressed by the proposal for a Directive on floods. The results of an in-depth analysis on water scarcity and droughts will be included in a Communication planned for mid-2007. The Commission will also encourage full use to be made of existing possibilities for including climate change into river basin management plans, and will encourage further integration of climate change, mitigation and adaptation strategies, into the implementation of EU water policy;
- Action 5: Setting up an ambitious Water Information System for Europe (WISE): the Commission and the European Environment Agency are committed to developing WISE by 2010. WISE will serve as the focus for wider efforts to modernise and streamline the collection and dissemination of information for European water policy. It is an integral part of wider initiatives such as the Shared Environmental Information System (SEIS) and INSPIRE.

In conclusion, this first report on the implementation of the WFD illustrates that we have made significant steps forward 'Towards Sustainable Water Management in the European Union'. Together with the water-related directives that are still under negotiation, the WFD provides all the tools needed to achieve truly sustainable water management in the EU for years to come. However, there is still a long and challenging road ahead for Member States to implement these tools in the best possible way. Member States have to deploy considerable efforts to achieve this.

## 1997/0067(COD) - 01/04/2009 Follow-up document

---

The Commission presents a report in accordance with article 18.3 of the Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC on programmes for monitoring of water status.

The EU Water Framework Directive (WFD), adopted in 2000, laid the foundation for a modern, holistic and ambitious water policy for the European Union and defined a clear implementation calendar to achieve its objectives, with intermediate deadlines for the achievement of specific tasks, among them:

- December 2003: transposition of the WFD into national law, identification of river basin districts and set up of administrative arrangements;
- December 2004: pressure and impact analysis of river basin districts, and economic analysis of water uses;
- December 2006: establishment of the monitoring programmes for the assessment of water status;
- December 2008: publication of the draft river basin management plans for consultation;
- December 2009: adoption of the river basin management plans;
- December 2012: programme of measures operational at the latest;
- December 2015: achievement of good status for surface and groundwater and first update of the river basin management plan.

The first Commission communication gave, in March 2007, an overview of the aims of the Directive and summarised the results of the implementation of the first two steps identified above (see [COD/1997/0067](#) in the follow up documents).

This Report and the accompanying Commission Staff Working Document responds to WFD Article 18(3) which requires the Commission to publish a report on the progress of implementation of the WFD related to Article 8 on monitoring of water status. This report is based on the information submitted by Member States in accordance with WFD article 15(2), due on 22 March 2007.

1) Reporting: all Member States have reported on the establishment of monitoring programmes in accordance with Article 8 and Annex V WFD, with the exception of Greece which has not reported and Malta, which has not reported on surface water monitoring programmes. In addition, gaps were detected in individual river basin districts or individual water categories.

For the first time ever, Member States have reported electronically through WISE, the Water Information System for Europe. The electronic submission of reports through WISE has proven to be successful with a total of 24 Member States having reported through this channel to

date. WISE provides for a more effective and streamlined reporting and is already bringing benefits in terms of avoiding double reporting of monitoring stations.

However, there are still some improvements needed to ensure that the reports submitted are clear and comprehensive. Clear and comprehensive reporting is a pre-requisite to enable the Commission to carry out a proper analysis of the implementation. Good practice examples of clear reporting include the reports of Austria, the Czech Republic, Hungary and the Netherlands.

2) Monitoring: in general terms, there is a good monitoring effort across the European Union.

- more than 107 000 monitoring stations were reported for monitoring of surface water and groundwater under the Water Framework Directive. On surface waters, by far the largest number of monitoring stations is located on rivers (75%), followed by lakes (13%), coastal waters (10%) and transitional waters (2%);
- in general, it appears that the provisions of Annex V to the WFD and the existing guidance documents on monitoring of surface water and groundwater have been applied, although there is room for improvement in some Member States to improve the understanding and application of the basic concepts of surveillance, operational and investigative monitoring;
- the reports from Austria, Czech Republic and Hungary can be cited as examples of good practice, showing a clear approach to the development of WFD monitoring programmes. In addition, the reports from Ireland and the United Kingdom show a significant monitoring effort to ensure confidence in the monitoring results. Finally, the efforts of the countries joining the EU in 2007 should also be acknowledged. Whilst the development of methods to assess ecological status is far from being completed in Bulgaria and Romania, the monitoring programmes have been established in accordance with the concepts of the WFD and, particularly in Romania, provide for comprehensive monitoring;
- one of the key elements of the WFD is that it sets a framework to take into account all pressures and impacts in the aquatic environment and integrates the requirements of other key existing EU water legislation as minimum basic measures. The WFD requires specific monitoring of protected areas, in particular in water bodies used for the abstraction of drinking water and in water dependent habitat and species protection areas. However, in many cases these specific requirements have not been clearly incorporated into the WFD monitoring programmes. The programmes adopted in Ireland can be cited as a positive example of an approach to meet these requirements through specific monitoring sub-nets. The integration of monitoring requirements from other Directives into the monitoring programmes under the WFD should bring benefits for planning and allocating resources for monitoring more efficiently;
- despite international coordination mechanisms being in place in many international river basin districts, only a few Member States such as Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Romania and United Kingdom have reported using them in establishing their monitoring programmes. In order to ensure a targeted and sound planning of the programme of measures in international river basin districts, Member States need to coordinate monitoring programmes within the river basin district in order to provide an integrated assessment of the existing pressures and impacts;
- the main aim of monitoring is to assess the status of water with the assessment of ecological status of surface waters being of central importance. As has already been seen in the intercalibration exercise, there remain quite a number of gaps in the development of biological assessment methods for determining ecological status. The analysis of the information provided on monitoring programmes shows that there are still many river basin districts where the necessary assessment methods for biological quality elements are not yet in place. This is particularly true in the countries that joined the EU in 2004 and 2007;
- little information was delivered on the levels of confidence and precision of the overall monitoring programmes and in particular of the assessment methods for ecological status. It is therefore difficult to assess whether the monitoring programmes will deliver a sufficient level of confidence and precision for the purpose of providing a coherent and comprehensive overview of the status of water bodies across the river basin districts and to inform the decision making in relation to the programme of measures.

The river basin management plans due at the end of 2009 will provide the whole picture of the river basin districts in terms of pressures, impacts, status assessment and measures and this will enable the Commission to assess comprehensively the results delivered by the monitoring programmes.

## 1997/0067(COD) - 31/01/2012 Follow-up document

---

In accordance with Article 16(4) of Directive 2000/60/EC (the Water Framework Directive or WFD) the Commission presents a report on the outcome of the review of Annex X which contains the list of priority substances in the field of water policy, identified among those posing a significant risk to or via the aquatic environment.

The existing list of 33 priority substances was established by Decision No 2455/2001/EC

and amended by Directive 2008/105/EC on environmental quality standards in the field of water policy (EQSD). The latter also established environmental quality standards (EQS) for all the 33 priority substances and for 8 other pollutants that were already regulated at EU level under existing legislation.

The EQSD requires the Commission to consider, within the framework of the review of WFD Annex X, the substances set out in Annex III to that Directive for possible identification as priority substances or priority hazardous substances, and present proposals to identify new substances and to set corresponding EQS for surface water, sediment or biota, as appropriate.

This report is accompanied by a Commission proposal for a Directive amending Directives 2000/60/EC and 2008/105/EC as regards priority substances in the field of water policy.

Review of existing priority substances: taking into account newly available information, the following changes are proposed to existing EQS:

(i) The water EQS of the following existing priority substances are proposed for update:

- Anthracene, Fluoranthene, Naphthalene, Polyaromatic hydrocarbons, Polybrominated diphenyl ethers, Lead and Nickel;
- biota EQS have been developed and are proposed for Fluoranthene, Polyaromatic hydrocarbons and Polybrominated diphenyl ethers, because due to their properties these substances are more easily and reliably measurable in this matrix;

- existing biota EQS for Hexachlorobenzene, Hexachlorobutadiene and Mercury are maintained, but the water EQS and footnote 9 in Part A of Annex I to Directive 2008/105/EC are deleted because those EQS do not afford adequate protection.

The updated EQS represent, according to the latest scientific knowledge, an adequate level of protection of the aquatic environment and of human health via the aquatic environment.

(ii) As regards the status of existing substances, and according to the latest information, the substances Di-(2-ethylhexyl)-phthalate (DEHP) and Trifluralin are proposed to be classified as priority hazardous substances.

Identification of new priority substances: it is proposed to identify the following substances

- as priority substances: Aclonifen, Bifenox, Cybutryne, Cypermethrin, Dichlorvos, Terbutryn, 17alpha-ethinylestradiol, 17beta-estradiol and Diclofenac;
- as priority hazardous substances: Dicofol, Perfluorooctane sulfonic acid and its derivatives (PFOS), Quinoxifen, Dioxins and dioxin-like compounds, Hexabromocyclododecane (HBCDD) and Heptachlor/heptachlor epoxide.

Water EQS are being proposed for all the new substances except for Dioxins and dioxin-like compounds. Biota EQS are proposed for Dicofol, PFOS, Dioxins and dioxin-like compounds, HBCDD and Heptachlor/heptachlor epoxide.

Review of substances in Annex III to Directive 2008/105/EC: four substances/groups of substances listed in Annex III to Directive 2008/105/EC are being proposed for inclusion in the priority substances list: Dicofol, Dioxins and dioxin-like compounds, PFOS and Quinoxifen. The inclusion of a fifth, the Dioxin-like PCBs, is covered by the inclusion of Dioxins and dioxin-like compounds. The toxicity data for non-dioxin-like PCBs are not sufficient to derive a reliable EQS and therefore these PCBs are not proposed for inclusion.

For the other substances in Annex III to Directive 2008/105/EC, the review concluded that there was not enough evidence of significant risk to or via the aquatic environment at EU level to include them at this stage in the list of priority substances.

Identification of control measures at EU level: since 2006, the legislation to control the authorisation and placing on the market of chemicals has been substantially improved, in particular with the adoption of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 (REACH) and of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market

This and other existing EU legislation (e.g. biocides and veterinary medicines legislation) contains mechanisms suited to controlling the uses and emissions of most of the priority substances at EU level and should in principle be sufficient to achieve the objectives of the WFD.

The report sets out other outcomes of the review and notes particularly:

- the update of the Technical Guidance for deriving Environmental Quality Standards, which contains expanded and updated sections on sediment and biota standards. This has allowed the derivation of standards for biota for those substances that, due to their intrinsic properties and their fate in the aquatic environment, are best regulated in that matrix. This will significantly improve the protection offered by the EQSD;
- the identification of problematic substances that, due to their persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic behaviour, will continue to cause exceedances of the EQS for a long time, even though very stringent measures to limit emissions have already been taken. Because of their characteristics, they merit separate treatment in terms of their monitoring and the presentation of their impact on chemical status;
- the need for a mechanism to improve the collection of targeted and high-quality monitoring data from across the EU to support future prioritisation exercises.

Outlook: future prioritisation exercises will take advantage of the wealth of information provided by the REACH registration process, whose first deadline was in November 2010. Furthermore, the expertise on risk assessment at EU level is being concentrated in the European Chemicals Agency and other agencies that deal with risk assessment of other chemicals, such as the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) for pesticides and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) for pharmaceuticals. For future reviews of the priority substances list, the Commission will explore the possibilities of exploiting the expertise on risk assessment existing at EU level. This should also ensure that there continues to be a high degree of coherence and consistency between the WFD and related policies such as chemicals, biocides, pesticides and pharmaceuticals.

## 1997/0067(COD) - 14/11/2012 Follow-up document

---

This Commission report on the implementation of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) (2000/60/EC) concerns an evaluation by the Commission of river basin management plans (RBMPs) submitted by the Member States. The reports conclusions were used to prepare the policy proposals presented in the Commissions communication on the Blueprint to Safeguard Europes Water Resources and will be examined in the context of the Common Implementation Strategy (CIS).

The main points of the report as are follows:

State of play: the report shows that 23 Member States have adopted and reported all their Plans. 4 Member States (BE, EL, ES and PT) have either not adopted Plans or only adopted and reported some plans. In total, the Commission has received 124 RBMPs (out of an expected 174). 75% of these concern transboundary river basins.

The report underlines that there are good examples of implementation of all aspects of the WFD. Therefore, Member States lagging behind in the approval and implementation of their RBMPs have the chance of learning from others with a view to remedy their delays.

Objective of achieving good status for all water bodies by 2015: the assessment of the RBMPs indicates that progress towards the objective is expected, but good status will not be reached in 2015 for a significant proportion of water bodies. The information provided in the RBMPs on chemical status for surface waters is not sufficiently clear to establish a baseline for 2009.

The chemical quality of water bodies has significantly improved in the last 30 years, but the situation as regards these priority substances introduced by the WFD is below the objectives. All too often, in the RBMPs, exemptions are used to justify existing water uses and

management practices showing no plan to achieve WFD objectives.

Monitoring and assessment: despite considerable progress, some countries show important gaps in the development and application of assessment methods. A clear gap in monitoring emerges from the information reported to the Commission. This shows that around 15% of surface water bodies in the EU are in unknown ecological status and 40% in unknown chemical status.

Chemical monitoring is insufficient in many Member States, where not all priority substances are monitored or the number of water bodies where monitoring takes place is limited.

Legal framework and governance: although progress has been significant, this has not taken place in most Member States, where there is a continuation of the status quo. The WFD environmental objectives appear to have been included as additional goals but not really integrated into policy decisions.

Appropriate coordination in decision making across sectors is essential. Cross-border cooperation and coordination of implementation processes is also essential to implement the WFD principle of management at the river basin scale, in particular considering that transboundary river basins cover most of the EU. Moreover, transparency on how the results of the consultation processes are considered is important, and there are some good examples in this respect.

Integration of quantitative and qualitative aspects in water management: shortcomings have been identified in the RBMPs in relation to the quality and availability of datasets and lack of coherent measures. Information on the impacts of climate change is included in a number of RBMPs, but in most cases it does not influence the selection of measures and it is planned to be addressed more thoroughly in the next RBMP planning cycle.

Promoting rational use through adequate water pricing: the assessment of the RBMPs shows the poor quality of the assessment of costs and benefits. A strong improvement in this area and the definition of a shared methodology for the calculation of costs (including environmental and resource costs) and benefits (including ecosystem services) is necessary. Otherwise, it will be possible neither to ensure the implementation of effective pricing policies nor to avoid disproportionate and inadequate measures.

Funding of measures: decisions on funding have to match the priorities set in the RBMPs. Most of the RBMPs do not contain precise information on how much it will cost to implement the measures and how they are going to be financed. Financing mechanisms and availability of funds are to be identified when selecting the measures. Otherwise, the feasibility of implementation is uncertain.

In conclusion, the assessment undertaken by the Commission shows that a more determined effort is needed to ensure achievement of WFD objectives in 2015, 2021 and 2027 cycles.

Implementation of RBMPs should ensure that water management is based on a better understanding of the main risks and pressures in a river basin founded on proper monitoring. This will result in cost effective interventions to ensure the long-term sustainable supply of water for people, business and nature.

The Commission:

- will continue to seek and promote a fruitful informal cooperation with Member States and stakeholders in the context of the CIS;
- will also follow-up bilaterally with the Member States on the implementation of the recommendations that it is putting forward in this implementation report and in accompanying documents, while keeping on enforcing WFD obligations as necessary.

## 1997/0067(COD) - 09/03/2015 Follow-up document

---

This Commission staff working document concerns the progress in implementation of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) Programmes of Measures (PoMs).

The Water Framework Directive establishes a framework for sustainable water management through the development of River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs) and Programmes of Measures (PoMs), with the objective of preventing deterioration of the aquatic environment and of achieving good status of all water bodies by 2015.

The WFD PoMs are made of basic and supplementary measures. Basic measures are the minimum requirements to be included in the PoMs and supplementary measures may be of a very diverse nature which Member States may tailor to the situation in their River Basin Districts (RBDs) as long as the objectives are met.

The main findings of the report may be summarised as follows:

Progress so far: Member States were asked to report on the main achievements made in delivering the Programmes of Measures:

- For the majority of Member States (19), some but not all measures have been started and some but not all measures have been completed. No Member State reported having completed all measures and only one Member State (AT) reports that the status of water bodies is improving.
- The majority of Member States (17) reported that new legislation or regulations have been adopted as a requirement to fulfilling certain measures.
- 23% of WFD-specific basic measures were reported as completed, 66% on-going and 11% not started. The figures reported for supplementary measures were 29% completed, 54% on-going and 17% not started.
- Two thirds of the RBDs reported that the basic measures (Nitrates Directive plus the WFD basic measures) are not sufficient to tackle diffuse pollution from agriculture, indicating a need to take supplementary measures.
- The type of basic measures more often reported as significantly delayed are those related to water abstraction.
- The majority (75% or more) of supplementary measures have been completed only in 2 Member States. 11 Member States have significant percentages (more than 20%) of supplementary measures not started.

Funding/financial obstacles is the most common reason indicated for delays in implementing supplementary measures, affecting 7% of the supplementary measures at EU level.

Hydropower is the most commonly cited driver responsible for interruption of river continuity, followed by water supply and flood protection. Progress in implementation is slow, with 80% of the measures either not started or still on-going in 8 Member States.

Measures related to waste water treatment beyond the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive have progressed significantly, with 7 Member States showing more than 75% of the measures either completed or under construction, although situation is very diverse. 5 Member States indicated more than 75% of the measures have not started or are on-going.

Reporting of drinking water protection measures shows good progress with 9 Member States above 60% completion.

Shortcomings and proposed changes: a variety of obstacles to delivery of the Programmes of Measures has been reported by the Member States, the most common of which is a lack of finance and monitoring. Many Member States reported unexpected planning delays and some reported governance issues that cause delays or problems in implementing the PoM.

It is reported by Member States that there are planned changes and improvements in the second cycle.