



# **EU-Groundwater Directive**

## **Position of German Environmental NGO's on Amendments No. 1-227 of the Draft Report by Christa Klaß, 29.10.2004 and 20.12.2004**

Date: 02-02-2005

### **Contact**

---

Michael Bender / Tobias Schäfer  
GRÜNE LIGA e.V. + DNR-GK Wasser  
Bundeskontaktstelle Wasser  
Prenzlauer Alle 230  
10405 Berlin, Germany  
Tel: (+49) 30 / 44 33 91 – 44 Fax:: –33  
E-Mail: [wasser@grueneliga.de](mailto:wasser@grueneliga.de)

Doris Eberhardt/ Christian Schweer  
Politics of nature conservation and WFD  
National Office of BUND e.V.  
Am Kölnischen Park 1  
10179 Berlin, Germany  
Tel: (+49) 30 / 27 58 64 -51/ 65 Fax: -40  
E-Mail: [Doris.Eberhardt@bund.net](mailto:Doris.Eberhardt@bund.net)



***EU-Directive on the Protection of Groundwater against Pollution –***

**Position of German environmental NGOs on Amendments No. 1 – 227 of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (Report by Christa Klass, 29.10.2004 and 20.12.2004)**

Prepared for the ENVI-Committee meeting in March/April 2005

2.2.2005

	<b>No.</b>	<b>Yes/no</b>	<b>reference</b>	<b>content</b>	<b>justification/discussion points</b>
	<i>1-8</i>			<i>amend recitals</i>	
	<b>1</b>	Yes	1 (1)	take into account the prevention of deterioration, edits German translation	more appropriate
	<b>2</b>	Yes	2 a new	level of groundwater protection must be at least comparable to that for surface waters	minimum; in general, groundwater needs better protection, pristine groundwater should be considered linked with 36
	<b>3</b>	Yes	3	consider all pollutants	
	<b>4</b>	Yes	4	"indicative" provisions instead of "extensive"	
<b>!</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>"community must make a financial contribution" to achieve goals</b>	<b>no such provisions in the existing legislation. Could set a very dangerous precedent and undermine polluter pays principal.</b>
<b>(!)</b>	<b>(6)</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>5 a</b>	<b>replaced by Am. 73</b>	<b>(original version of Am. 6 introduces compensation payments and undermines polluter pays principle and the existing Nitrates Directive)</b>
	<b>7</b>	Yes see comment	7	aims to clarify that old GWD is fully incorporated	The wording is accepted if it intends the following aim: The new Groundwater Directive should also integrate the requirements of 80/68/GWD <i>and</i> the obligations of WFD, if they are more strict.

	<b>8</b>	Yes	7a new	replaced by <b>Am. 75</b>	
	<b>9 - 28</b>			<i>Amend Articles 1 – 6</i>	
	<b>9</b>	Yes	2 (1)	"groundwater quality standards" (instead of "threshold values")	no need to introduce a new term
	<b>10</b>	No Second best if <b>Am. 80</b> fails	2 (3)	aims to clarify "indirect discharges" as including emissions and losses	<b>better option:</b> Am. 80 which substitutes "inputs" for "indirect discharges"
<b>!</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>2 (3) a new</b>	<b>defines "deterioration" as ""slight increase" (identical with Am. 99)</b>	
<b>!</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>no</b>  <b>yes only if 149/150 fails</b>	<b>2 (3) b new</b>	<b>defines "historical contaminated sites"</b>	<b>appears necessary in connection with insufficient regulation in Annex IV 1.4 (identical with Am. 42 of the Committee on Agriculture)</b>  <b>however: unclear term "historical contaminated sites" will cause delays; introduces a new option for derogations (WFD option for derogations is sufficient)</b>
	<b>13</b>	Yes	3 Title	edits wording	
	<b>14</b>	No ?	3 Introduction	procedure of monitoring/classification only for groundwater bodies at risk	not sufficient enough
<b>!</b>	<b>(15)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>3 a</b>	<b>"naturally geologically determined levels" as quality standards</b>  <b>there are two differing Am. by C. Klass on this; 15 and 106</b>	<b>original Am. 15 is the better option than new Am. 106</b> <b>(in case of no: 107 is better option then 106)</b>
<b>!</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>3 (1) a new</b>	<b>clarifies that quality standards have to be based on human and ecotoxicological criteria</b>	<b>linked also to Am. 36</b>  <b>editorial mistake: cross reference not correct (WFD Art. 2 paragraph 33, not 3)</b>

!	17	No	3 (1) b new	introduces "expert verification" to judge whether single measuring point are representative for the body of groundwater	it should be guaranteed that measuring points within a monitoring program are representative  all data have to be included in status classification  Am. 30 introduces a derogation clause for small areas which fail to meet quality standards
	18	Yes	4 Title	deletes "threshold values"/edits wording	
EEB Briefing!	19	Yes	4 (1)	deletes "economic and social costs" as criteria for national quality standards	linked to Amend. 46 (also yes)  problematic: 2005 as deadline for member states is deleted
	20	Yes	4 (2)	edits wording	reporting of both pollutants <u>and</u> measures should be mandatory
	21	Yes	Art. 4 (3)	deletes Art. 4 (3) Commission report on national standards and option for legislative proposal	
!	22	Yes	4 a (new)	introduces a revision timetable for quality standards	
(!)	(23)	No	5 (2)	now replaced by <b>Am. 148</b>  (aims to clarify that trend reversal has to start when starting points are exceeded and includes prevention of deterioration)	trend reversal always needs starting points, but there still are no clear provisions how to identify these
(!)	(24)	no	6 (1)	replaced by <b>Am. 158</b>	
EEB Briefing	25	No	6 (2)	Exempts small quantities from prevent obligation (linked to Am. 26)	
	26	no	6 (2) a new	linked to <b>Am. 25</b> requires that monitoring of groundwater be in place as a precondition for exempting (small scale) discharges from the program of measures	

!	27	No	6 (2) b new	suggests that pollution from historical contaminated sites should be assessed on the basis of national provisions; to be addressed in the program of measures;  must at least prevent any further spread of pollution	Am. 149 is the better option!
	28	Yes	6 (2) c new	requires member states to report a list of exemptions	
	29 - 61			<i>amend Annexes</i>	
	29-30			<i>amend EU-wide quality standards</i>	
	29	Yes	Annex I Title	edits wording	
(!)	(30)	Yes	Annex I Part A new	preconditions for good status regarding results from measuring points, replaced by <b>Am. 185</b>	
	31	Yes	Annex I Table Title (new)	edits wording	
	32	Yes	Annex I Table first line	edits wording	
!	33	Yes	Annex I Table lines 2a –i new	new table of EU-wide quality standards for pollutants, mostly drinking water standards	positive: EU-wide quality standards  negative: identical with drinking water standards and thus too weak  better option: standards for good status should generally be set at 50% of drinking water standards (buffer)  especially 50 mg/l Nitrates should not be "good status"

!	34	Yes	Annex I Table 1 a new	list of quality standards for man-made substances	positive: list EU-wide standards  negative: list is insufficient standards too weak, no buffer towards drinking water standards better option: 1. add Vinylchlorid and Dichlorethan 2. set standards at 50% of drinking water standards
	35	Yes	Annex I Footnote 22	linked to amendment 17; footnote concerning averaging, has been moved to Art. 3 (1)	text should be moved into the main text, but not be expanded as in Am. 17
!	36	Yes	Annex II (2)	human and ecotoxicological findings as sole basis for setting national quality standards deletes consideration of dilution and effect on dependent ecosystems	in connection with Am. 16
	37-46			amend the procedure for national quality standards (Annex III)	EEB suggests deleting the entire Annex III
	37	No	Annex III Title	edits wording	
	38-39	No	Annex III part A	deletes	only if Am. 33 and 34 are accepted
	40	Yes	Annex III B Introduction -	considers pollutants for which national standards are established	
	41	Yes	Annex III B (1.1)	considers pollutants for which national standards are established	
	42	Yes	Annex III B (1.2)	considers pollutants for which national standards are established	
	43-45	Yes	Annex III B (2)	edits wording – deletes threshold value	
EEB Briefing	46	Yes	Annex III B (2.3)	linked to Am. 19; deletes reference to of social and economic costs	WFD already incorporates considerations of cost-effectiveness in Art. 10
	47-61			amend Annex IV (trend identification and reversal)	EEB suggests deletion of Annex IV
	47	Yes	Annex IV (1.1)	edits wording to ensure that all relevant pollutants are considered	

!	48	Yes	Annex IV (1.2 a)	<b>deletes averaging of arithmetic mean values; aims to prevent "massaging" of pollution trends, but leaves exact procedure open</b>	<b>better than original "mean values of mean values" "statistical procedure" leaves room for future discussion</b>
	49	Yes	Annex IV (1.2 b)	measurements below the quantification limit = value half the quantification limit	
!	50	Yes	<b>Annex IV (1.2 c) Introduction</b>	<b>max. time for trend identification 5 years (instead of 15)</b>	
!	51	Yes	<b>Annex IV (1.2 c) Table column 2</b>	<b>min. number of years 5 (instead of 10)</b>	
	52	No	Annex IV (1.2 c) Table column 3	identical with Am. 50; max. number of years 10 (instead of 15)	<b>Am. 223 is better option (only 6 years) Am. 52 as second best option.</b>
!	53	Yes	<b>Annex IV (1.4)</b>	<b>incorporation of old data;</b>	<b>positive and important: incorporation of existing data</b>  <b>negative: unclear wording , how to identify starting points remains unclear; also confuses "trend assessment" with "trend reversal"</b>
!	54	Yes	<b>Annex IV (2.1)</b>	<b>lists avoiding "harm to groundwater" as a focus point for reversal of pollution trends</b>	
	55	Yes	Annex IV (2.2)	linked to Am. 53	
	56	No	Annex IV (2.3) Introduction	max. time for analysis of trend reversal: 10 years (instead of 30)	<b>Am. 225 is the better option (6 years), Am. 56 as second best option</b>
	57	No	Annex IV (2.3) Table column 2	linked to Am. 56; min. number of years for analysis of trend reversal: 10 (instead of 14)	<b>Am. 226 is the better option (6 years) Am. 57 as second best option</b>
	58	No	Annex IV (2.3) Table column 3	max. number of years: 15 (instead of 30)	<b>Am. 227 is the better option (6 years) Am. 58 as second best option</b>
	59	Yes	Annex IV (2.4)	edits German translation	
	60	Yes	Annex IV (2.5)	75% limit (with regard to quality standards) as <i>minimum</i> starting point for trend reversal english translation does not include the main content!	second best if 2.5 is not entirely deleted  better than "recommendation" in the Com-proposal; more strict wording should also be considered in the English version of the Amendment  negative: starting points are in contrast to WFD-provision to reverse <u>any</u> significant upward trend
	61	Yes	Annex IV (2.6)	editing linked to Am. 53	

	No.	yes/no	Reference	Content	justification/discussion points
	62			<i>amends title</i>	
	62	Yes	Title	Title considers prevention of deterioration (strengthening precautionary principle)	
	63 -78			<b><i>amend recitals 1 – 7 (also with regard to amendments in Klass report )</i></b>	
	63	Yes	1	underlines the protection of groundwater dependent ecosystems and drinking water	
	64	Yes	1 a new	groundwater protection guarantees that good quality drinking water can be achieved by simple purification	
<b>EEB Briefing</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>1 a new</b>	<b>further research on groundwater ecosystems, future integration of criteria for ecosystem protection</b>	<b>An ecosystem approach is yet missing! It is in line with the approach for surface waters under the WFD! 1. Groundwater is an ecosystem with a specialised fauna and needs to be protected as such. 2. There are throughout Europe &gt; 2.000 animal species which are exclusively found in groundwater. 3. Groundwater fauna contributes to the quality of water. 4. Presence of real groundwater fauna is an indicator for good protection of groundwater</b>
	66	Yes	3	states the need for coherent regulations for all main sources of pollution (agriculture, air pollution, waste, traffic)	
	67	No	3 a new	groundwater protection as the basis for agriculture, which prevents desertification; protection of groundwater quality is related to quantity	agriculture per se does not help to prevent of desertification
	68	Yes	4	WFD requires that the new Directive introduce measures for groundwater protection, not just criteria for its assessment	Com-proposal does not fulfill a main requirement of Art. 17 WFD to introduce measures for protection
	69	No	4	calls for criteria for assessing groundwater quantity	WFD already includes strong and clear criteria for classifying the status groundwater quantity
<b>!</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>transparent EU-wide quality standards Where appropriate, EU funding mechanisms should provide assistance to those faced with additional costs</b>	<b>Am. 71 is the better option</b>



!	71	Yes	5	transparent EU - quality standards, minimal standards in EU are necessary to guarantee fair competition	
	72	Yes	5	deletes "threshold values"	
!	73	No	5 a new	replaces Am. 6  The protection of groundwater may, in some areas require a change in farming/forestry practices and a consequent loss of income. This issue should be addressed in the development of the rural development plans under the reformed CAP.	better than original Am. 6
	74	No	6	deletes entire recital on criteria for identifying trends and starting points	
	75	Yes	7 a new	replaces Am. 8 aims to incorporate a reference to a EP-resolutions on endocrine disrupters – wording partly placed in a footnote	
	76	No	7 a new	groundwater storage and recovery should be considered as an allowable practice under permit	Unclear and very poorly worded. It is not groundwater that will be stored but rather surface water injected into aquifers.
	77	No	7 a new	identical as amendment 76, but appropriate with justification	
	78	Yes	7 a new	consider existing (national) statistical procedures where appropriate	
	79 - 184			<i>amend articles 1 – 8 (also with regard to amendments in Klass report)</i>	
	79	No	1 (last paragraph).	Edits wording	Better option: Am. 80
!	80	Yes	1 (1)	“input” instead of “indirect discharges”	in line with WFD, identical with Am. 83  new wording then has to be changed throughout the Directive
	81	No	1a	“free of unnecessary pollution”	

	82	No	1b	deletes trend assesment and “starting points”; focus on measures against pollution linked to Am. 90	This directive has to define significant and sustained upward trend.
!	83	Yes	1 (last paragraph)	identical with Am. 80	
	84	No	1 (last paragraph):	national programmes to prevent indirect discharges	no reference to WFD programme of measures
	85	No	1 (last paragraph)	lists the basic requirements for groundwater assessment according to WFD	unnecessary, reiterates WFD requirements
	86	Yes	2 No.1	deletes "threshold value"	
	87	Yes	2 No.1	definition of quality standard instead of threshold value	if definition under point 1 is not entirely deleted
	88	No	2 No.1	"based naturally occuring concentrations"	better include this aspect in Art. 4 (1), Am. 120
	89	No	2 No.1	refers to geological background	better include this aspect in Art. 4 (1), Am. 120
	90	No	2 No.2	defines "unnecessary pollution" delets def. for trends entirely linked to Am 82	This directive has to define significant and sustained upward trend.
!	91	Yes	2 No.2	Definition of upward trend	(editorial mistake: wrong justification)
	92	No	2 No.2	Similar to 91, maintain “statistical significant increase”	better option: Amen. 91
	93	No	2 No.2	Similar to 91, but no reference to WFD objective 4.1.; considers environmentally significant increase	German translation poorly worded – “ecologically significant increase” is more appropriate (groundwater is an ecosystem)
	94	No	2 No.2	Same as 93	
	95	No	2. No.2	Delete “threshold value”	not so strict as 91
EEB Briefing	96	Yes !	2 No.3	Definition of “high chemical status”	Essential for the protection of pristine groundwater
2	97	No	2 No.3	Identical with Am. 10 More precise definition of „indirect discharge“	Better option: Am 80
!	98	Yes	2 No.3	Definition of “input” instead of “indirect discharge”	Required to maintain consistency with some other amendments <u>! should not replace Am. 96. both- 96 &amp; 98 has to be integrated in the Directive!!</u>
!	99	Yes	2 No.3a new	defines deterioration as "slight increase" (identical with Am. 11)	see Amend. 11

!	100	No (!)	2 No. 3a new	defines deterioration as "substantial change from good to poor status"	serious weakening WFD obligation to prevent any deterioration instead: Am. 11/99
!	101	No	2 No. 3a new	Water from drainage pipes an water above drainage pipes do not form part of the definition of groundwater, neither does surface water and water in the root zone.	in contrast to scientific definitions of groundwater  undermines the protection goals
	102	Yes	2 No.3a new	definition of background concentration, would replace definition of deterioration	Am. 99 (11) and 102 should be integrated in the Directive!
	103	No	2 No.3b new	definition of baseline concentration	not strict enough, consider data from at least 2006 on
!	104	Yes	2 (1) a new	<b>Clarify the application of the no-deterioration obligation and protects Europe's remaining unpolluted groundwater from new contamination and filling up.</b>	
	105	No	3 (1 new)	stress importance of groundwater as ressource for drinking water & agriculture	poorly worded, groundwater is also an ecosystem and essential for groundwater dependent ecosystems
!	106	No	3 a	replaces Am. 15  standards are added to natural geogenically determined levels of pollutants	
!	107	No	3 a	20% of standards are added to natural geogenically determined levels of pollutants	second best option if Am. 15 fails
	108	No	3 a	add "estimated"	Not clear enough - What is meant by estimate?
	109	No	3 (1a new)	identical with Am. 17	
!	110	Yes	3b a new	Member states fulfil existing standards; protection and improvement of quality in order to minimise the water purification treatment needed	
!	111	Yes	3 (1a new)	individual measuring points must comply with quality standards	
	112	No	3 (1a new)	measures regarding historical contaminated sites	weak

	113	Yes	3 (1 b a new)	refers to 7 (2) WFD and 80/778 & 98/83, protection of drinking water	
!	114 -117	, Yes, see comment	3 a new	aims to clarify criteria for the classification of groundwater with reference to Annex V WFD  Measuring results of each measuring point have to be considered for assessment	Point 1 positive: no double averaging, classification is based on values at each measuring point instead  Am. is accepted if Point 2 and 3 intend the following:  All EU and national quality standards to be established according to WFD, GWD and further relevant Directives must be included in the assessment/classification. Failure to meet any of these quality standard at any measuring point results in "poor status" classification.
	118 - 119	No	4 (1.1)	EU – framework for establishing threshold values	unclear deadline if 2005 is deleted here; positive: delete “social and economic costs”
	120	Yes	4 (1.1)	introduces a common Framework for setting national standards; considers natural background concentrations	good basis for CIS-activities on groundwater; deadline 2005 is kept for setting standards  (unclear: German translation still mentions economic and social costs)
	121	Yes	4 (1.1)	takes into account natural background concentrations; deletes "economic and social costs"	
	122	No	4 (1.1)	deadline for national standards 6 months	Second best if Am. 121 is rejected
	123-124	No	4 (1)	deletes "economic and social costs"	
	125	No	4 (1)	deadline 12/2006	
	126	Yes	4 (1)	if natural background values are higher, background values have to be considered as standards	
	127	No	4 (1) a new	protection of groundwater bodies in international river basins needs common approach	"on the basis of specific national and regional conditions" unclear
	128 - 129	No	4 (1.1a new)	Take into account natural background concentration	wording not strict enough ("naturally occurring in water" misleading)

	130	Yes	4 (1.1a new)	Permission for establishing more strict "threshold values" by regional authorities	
	131 - 133	No	4 (2)	List of substances "in accordance with the management plan"; later than 2006	2005 should be kept
	134	No	4 (2)	list of pollutants for which measuring requirements are established	wording unclear
	135 -137	No	4 (3.1)	Considers revision, revision of list by legislation, replace "Directive"	too weak
!	138	Yes	4 a new	<b>Considers Annex I substances of 80/68/EWG , set clear deadlines for revision</b>	<b>for anthropogenic substances, there should be EU-wide standards</b>
	139	Yes	4 a new	EU quality standards	<b>138 should not be deleted</b>
	140	Yes	5	deletes Commission's proposal for Article 5	
	141 - 142	Yes	5 Title:	"trend reversal" instead	
	143	No	5 Title	Consider quantitative aspects, maintain starting points	
	144	No	5 (1) new	refers to WFD	does not consider all WFD requirements; especially not Article 7 WFD
	145	Yes	5 (1)	"taking into account the review of the environmental impact of human activity as referred to in Article 5 of Directive 2000/60/EC."	
	146	No	5 (2)	refers to setting of national quality standards and classification; refers mainly to Art. 3	too weak, does not avoid double averaging
	147	Yes	5 (2)	deletes first sentence for strengthening protection of all groundwater bodies	
	148	No	5 (2)	Introduces "baseline concentration" for trend assessment without defining it	positive: "prevent a deterioration"
!	149 -150	Yes	5 2 a new	<b>specific trend assessment and reversal; contamination from historic sites/ point sources is monitored and further spread of the plume is prevented</b>	<b>emphasis on trend reversal and prevention of further deterioration</b> <b>(in case of no: Am. 27 is second best option)</b>
	151	No	5 2a new	Requirements for sustainable use of groundwater (quantitative aspects)	WFD provisions are sufficient
EEB Briefing !	152 - 155	Yes	6 Title	<b>Replace "indirect discharge" with "input"</b>	<b>In line with WFD</b>
EEB Briefing!	156	Yes	6	Establish duty to prevent input of hazardous substances; follow up EU action <b>MS prevent input of polluting substances; the EU identifies substances of EU concern and proposes appropriate measures to prevent input</b>	<b>Very important!</b> <b>makes prevention approach of old Groundwater Directive workable</b>

EEB-Briefing!	157	No	6	Introduces best environmental practice and environmental technology for limitation of inputs but: limited to measures which fulfill considerations of “appropriateness” and “cost – effectiveness”	Too weak No improvement of Com proposal; would still allow contamination with pesticides  instead: Am. 159
	158	Yes, if 159 fails	6 (1)	aims to specify the prevent and limit approach in connection with Annex VIII WFD and to integrate groundwater protection into the management plans/programs of measures  introduces prevention as a goal (substances 1-6) and best environmental practice and best environmental technology as means for limitation of inputs (of substances 7-9)	second best option to Am. 159  <u>should complement Am. 156, not replace it!</u>
!	159	Yes	6 (1)	Specifies prevent and limit approach; introduces BAT and BEP in order to limit input of pollutants	<u>Should complement Am. 156, not replace it!</u>
	160	No	6	Common approach to integrate in relevant EU-policies	Not strong enough
	161	No	6 (1)	Requirements with regard to participation	Weakens WFD
EEB Briefing!	162 and 163	No	6 (1)	Introduces obligation “to aim to prevent input of hazardous chemicals” and extends list of chemicals	Right direction, but Legally vague and not enforceable
EEB Briefing!	164	Yes	6 (1)	Extends prevention list	<b>Should not replace but complement Am. 156 and 159!</b>
EEB Briefing!	165	Yes	6 (1)	Extends prevention list in case of poor groundwater	Slight improvement, but late action <u>Should not replace but add Am. 156, 159 and 164!</u>
	166	No	6 (1)	Consider hydrogeological aspects	imprecise wording
EEB Briefing!	167	Yes		Extends prevention list	Ensures that heavy metal and pesticides must be prevented <u>Should not replace complement Am. 156, 159, 164 and 167!</u>
EEB Briefing!	168	No	6 (1a) new	Exempts small quantities from prevent obligation	Local deterioration possible, weakening of proposal and WFD  (if exemptions are introduced, AM. 25/26 is the better option)
	169	No	6 (2)	deletes 2nd paragraph	

<b>EEB Briefing !</b>	<b>170-171</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>6 (2)</b>	<b>Extends limitation of input to all pollutants</b>	<b>Clarifies and strengthens protection Should complement, not replace Am. 156!</b>
	<b>172</b>	No	6 (2)	reduces protection to the "limit" approach for substances of Annex VII WFD	not strict enough; prevent and limit needed
<b>EEB Briefing!</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>6 (2)</b>	<b>Adds soil protection and monitoring requirements as conditions for allowing discharges</b>	<b>Useful additional environmental protection condition Should complement, not replace Am. 156, 170 and 171!</b>
<b>EEB-Briefing!</b>	<b>174 – 176</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>6 (2) a new</b>	<b>Applies technical feasibility condition for preventing hazardous chemicals input</b>	<b>Ineffective end-of-pipe thinking. Substitution with safer alternatives is not considered.</b>
	<b>177</b>	No	6 (2) a (new)	Requirements for permission of indirect discharges – also take into account diffuse sources	wording too weak
	<b>178-179</b>	No	6 (2) b new	An input may only be exempted from the requirements when, because of its quantity or concentration, it presents no current or future risk of causing deterioration in the quality of the receiving groundwater.	there should be no exemptions from 6 (2), also too imprecise (if necessary, Am. 25 and 26 are the better option)
	<b>180</b>	No	6 a new	"include examination of the hydrogeological conditions of the area concerned, the possible purifying powers of the soil and subsoil and the risk of pollution and alteration of the quality of the groundwater" (from Dir. 80/68 EEC)	weak; does not relate to "good status" or prevention of deterioration; "satisfactory solution from the point of view of the environment" instead
<b>EEB Briefing !</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>6 a new</b>	<b>Request use of financial measures –national/ EU initiatives to prevent harmful substances by financial measures (polluter pays principle)</b>	<b>Cost-effective measure to reduce pollution</b>
	<b>182</b>	Yes, see comment	6 a new	further research; assistance for spreading and developing methods, technologies and practices	
	<b>183</b>	No	6 b new	Special requirements for protection of groundwater bodies as resource for bathing waters and (curative) springs – to be taken into account in urban planning	all groundwater bodies should be protected and improved
	<b>184</b>	No	8 (1a) new	Requirements regarding "Inspire"	All existing data have to be considered
	<b>185 – 227</b>			<b><i>Amend annex I – IV (also with regard to amendments in Klass report)</i></b>	

	<b>185</b>	Yes if better options fail	Annex I	at least 70% of a body of groundwater must meet quality standards to be classified as "good" and/or a maximum of 30km <sup>2</sup> may fail to meet quality standards (without causing "bad status" for the entire body of groundwater)  replaces Am. 30	second best if <b>Am. 219, 111, 114-114</b> fail  Positive: limits the effects of "double averaging" which otherwise could cause even larger bad portions to be classified good  (It becomes obvious that a minimum number of measuring points per body of groundwater is necessary in order to be able to make such a judgement)
	<b>186</b>	No	Annex I Part A (new)	at least 70% of a body of groundwater must meet quality standards to be classified as "good"	(see Am. 185)
	<b>187</b>	Yes	Annex I, 1st row, second column	Quality standard for nitrate: 0 – 10 mg/l	ambitious standard, in line with precautionary principle; 50 mg/l (in other proposals) is too high, there should be a buffer
	<b>188</b>	No	Annex I, Table 1, line 1	deletes reference to requirements regarding Nitrate Directive (quality standard not valid for nitrate-vulnerable zones)	
	<b>189</b>	Yes	Annex I, 1 <sup>st</sup> row, third column Com.	Obligation to introduce measures for agriculture if Nitrate concentrations increase or exceed 10mg/l Linked to Am. 187	Very ambitious and in line with the precautionary principle, it is more strict/precise than the requirements in the Nitrate Directive
<b>!</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Annex I, 2<sup>nd</sup> row, second column</b>	<b>(Pesticide standard) instead of 0.1 microgram/l at least the minimal measurable level</b>	
	<b>191</b>	Yes	Annex I, 2nd row, third column Com. New	prevention of any further input if "active substances" are found	imprecise wording
<b>!</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>Yes, if 190 fails</b>	<b>Annex I, 2nd row, third column Com. new</b>	<b>pesticides – applying drinking water standards if stricter than 0.1 microgram/l–</b>	<b>second best if 190 fails</b>
	<b>193</b>	<b>Yes, if 190 fails</b>	<b>Annex I 2<sup>nd</sup> row (a) (new)</b>	<b>total pesticide concentrations 0.5 microgram/l</b>	<b>Also in Klab – Report Am. 33</b>



	194	no	Annex I Foot-Note 22	Deletes Footnote 21 which requires MSs to set stricter standards if they are required for environmental objectives.	
	195	Yes	Annex I Foot-note 22	footnote is moved to 3 c new	
	196	No	Annex I foot-note 22	deletes one- out-all-out approach	
!	197	Yes	Annex I Table 1 line 2a bis 2i (new)	replace amendment 33 of Klass Report – edits wording: chlorid, sulfur and aluminium as indicators	See comment on Am. 33  <b>Am. 190, resp. 192 should be considered</b>
	198	No	Annex II	Aims to strengthen and simplify procedure for deriving threshold values	“threshold value” should be replaced, positive: provides a simple approach for a common procedure negative: it is not precise enough, common quality standards are necessary and should not be neglected
	199 - 200	No	Annex II (f) (a) (new)	take into account the function as drinking water source by assessment	Not comprehensive enough groundwater is an ecosystem and its peculiarity and interactions with other factors should also be considered
	201-202	No	Annex II, (f) (b) (new)	the measured or calculated quantities and concentrations of pollutants in the sources for the public drinking water supply;	See above
	203	No	Annex III	Delete Annex III	There must be national quality standards for relevant pollutants and a common procedure, also for revision
	204 -205	No, if Am. 197 fails	Annex III, Part A.1 - Table, 4th row	no national quality standard for chloride	Deletion ok, will be part of Annex I - list, if Am. 197 is approved; justification not accepted Chloride is a problematic substance in many groundwater bodies.
	206-208	No, if Am. 197 fails	Annex III, Part A.1 – Table, 7th row	No quality standard for sulphur	Justification not accepted. Sulphur is a problematic pollutant, especially in urban areas
	209	Yes	Annex III, Part A.1 - Table, 7th row (a) (new)	adds phosphor	Should be considered, at least for national quality standards

	<b>210</b>	Yes	Annex III, Part A.1 - Table, 7th row (a) (new)	adds copper	Should be considered, at least for national quality standards
	<b>211</b>	Yes	Annex III Part A.1 - Table, row 7 (b) (new)	adds zink	Should be considered, at least for national quality standards
	<b>212</b>	Yes, if Am. 197 fails	Annex III Part A.1 - Table, row 7 (c) (new)	adds aluminium	still integrated in the list of common quality standards (see Am. 197)
	<b>213</b>	Yes	Annex III part B 1, 2	considers use as drinking water	
	<b>214</b>	Yes	Annex III, part B 2, 2.2	Background concentration on the basis of best expert judgement if there are no data Available	
	<b>215 - 216</b>	No	Annex III, part B 2, 2.3	economic and social costs	(second best if Am. 46 fails)
<b>EEB-Briefing!</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Annex III (a) (new)</b>	<b>Establish criteria for identifying hazardous chemicals to be prevented from input</b>	<b>Necessary clarification to make prevention approach workable</b>
	<b>218</b>	No	Annex IV		not strict enough  "natural variation"; "at least mitigate"
<b>!</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Annex IV, paragraph 1.2, point (a)</b>	<b>replace averaging samples by taking account of each measurement point</b>	
	<b>220</b>	No	Annex IV 1.2, point (a)	comparable measuring points	
	<b>221 - 222</b>	Yes, if Am. 50 and 51 fails	Annex IV (1.2c Introduction & Table col. 2, 1.row)	determine trend in 6 instead of 8 or more years	
	<b>223</b>	Yes	An. IV (1.2c Table col. 3)	6 instead of 15 years	
	<b>224</b>	No	Annex IV, 1.6 a (new)	Requirements regarding quantitative aspects	Too weak Positive: historical data to be considered
	<b>225-227</b>	Yes	Annex IV (2.3ff)	determine trend in 6 instead of 8 or more years	