## FW: eionet dataset, N&P data



## JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE

Tue 09/02/21 17:08



1 attachments (13 KB)

MS\_NP\_Netherlands\_EUROSTAT\_method.xlsx;

From: Art. 4(1) Sent: 09 February 2021 17:07:08 (UTC+01:00) Amsterdam, Berlin, Bern, Rome, Stockholm, Vienna To: JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: eionet dataset, N&P data

Dear JRC Nitrates Team,

Please find attached the excel file with long time series of annual data of N and P mineral fertilizers, manure and surplus.

The figures are calculated according to the EUROSTAT protocol.

Data for 2018 and 2019 is not yet available. Data on 2018 and 2019 will become available and delivered according to schedule to EUROSTAT later this year.

We will upload an update of the 2016-2019 data set and send you our comments on the fiche in the beginning of next week.

Kind regards,



From: Nitrates_Directive_JRC@ec.europa.eu <nitrates_directive_jrc@ec.europa.eu></nitrates_directive_jrc@ec.europa.eu>
Sent: donderdag 4 februari 2021 10:23
To: Art. 4(1)
Cc: Art. 4(1)
Subject: Re: check eionet dataset



The JRC will not use any new datasets but the official data sent for the different reporting periods. As such we will not consider any correction for the previous reporting periods.

Concerning the graph for the long term analysis, please fell free to add a sentence explaining that the observed shift is due to a change in methodology.

Best regards,

JRC Nitrates Directive Team

From: Art. 4(1) Sent: 04 February 2021 09:32 To: JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: RE: check eionet dataset

Dear JRC Nitrates Team,

We will do all we can to respond to your requests as soon as possible.

We have two questions:

1. Does your response mean that if we provide the new datasets, you will use them for the update of the country fiche and report?

It cost quite some effort to realize the request output, but it is relatively easy to provide it for the three periods

2. Why can we not provide water quality data in a similar way as you request us to provide the nutrient use data?

As we stated in our previous email there have been and will be changes in the data networks and improvements in the databases. In addition, in 2008 the EC request to provide for the Nitrates report also data on rootzone leaching. Therefore the data for 'groundwater' for the period 2004-2004 are significantly different from those provided in the past for earlier periods. This is why you see such a strange structural break in the groundwater nitrate long term trend series on the last page of your Fiche. If you intend to make such long term trend analyses, you should in our view use the most recent database.

Kind regards,

Art. 4(1)	
11. 4(1)	
From: Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu < Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu>	
Sent: woensdag 3 februari 2021 17:21	
To: Art. 4(1)	
Cc: Art. 4(1)	
Subject: Ke: check eionet dataset	



we consulted our DG colleagues, and we point out that the JRC will do the current assessment (country fiche/report) using the official data provided in the past reporting periods. You can send the new versions of previous RP datasets providing also a detail assessment of the changes, but the JRC will not do checks.

We kindly ask you to provide as soon as possible and by Wednesday 10 February the corrected dataset on Eionet, so we can proceed with the check and analysis.

However, based on the provided dataset we produced your Country Fiche document, here attached. Please read it carefully and provide us with your comments in track change mode.

Concerning the Figure 1 of this document (pag.2), if it is possible, we kindly ask you to provide long time series of annual data of N and P mineral fertilizers, manure and surplus so we can update the plots with more recent years (in attachment a template that you can use). In addition, it would be very much appreciated if you could provide your feedbacks on the Action Programme section.

Best Regards

JRC Nitrates Team

From: Art. 4(1) Sent: 02 February 2021 08:59 To: JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: FW: check eionet dataset

•

Dear JRC Nitrates Directive Team,

Please let us know if you want us to create and upload updated files for the three reporting periods as proposed in my email of two weeks ago (see below).

Kind regards,

Art.

From: Alt 4(1) Sent: maandag 18 januari 2021 11:50 To: 'Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu' <<u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u>> Cc: Art. 4(1)

Subject: RE: check eionet dataset

Dear JRC Nitrates Directive Team,

Thank you for your response. Most issues can now be solved (see attached file). There is only one

exception which is issue [2].

Due the large amount of changes, in both our own data set as in the data sets provided to the EC the last

decade, it is an impossible task (very time consuming and very liable to errors as this has to be done by hand) to provide corrections in the provided excel file.

We propose to send you 3 Excel files with updated information, one for each reporting period (2008-2011, 2012-2015, and 2016-2019). Then all files will comply with your rules. Many problems you have encountered with the latest file, will also occur in the older ones. By providing updated files these problems will be solved and in all errors in data, e.g. NO3-N in stead of NO3, will be fixed.

In addition, the updated files for earlier reporting periods, especially the 2008-2011, will contain more monitoring locations, since more (existing) monitoring locations of the water boards have been added to the national network in recent years.

Kind regards,

Art.

From: <u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u> <<u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u>> Sent: woensdag 16 december 2020 14:55 Tor: <u>Art. 4(1)</u>

Cc: Art. 4(1)

Subject: Re: check eionet dataset

Dear 4(1)

Thank you for the provided document. We responded to your comments point by point in the file in attachments.

Please let us know if you have other doubts, and as soon as you upload the datasets on Eionet we will do the checks and provide our observations.

Best regards,

JRC Nitrates Directive Team

From: Art. 4(1) Sent: 08 December 2020 21:25 To: JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: RE: check eionet dataset

Dear JRC-team,

Thank you for your comments on our data delivery. Some of the comments that you make can be easily adopted in the new dataset. Others are more thorough and have undesirable consequences. Some of the comments we are not sure we understand it correctly. We want to propose to first agree about the way the data is further processed, before we supply the whole dataset in the new proper way. We are convinced that this is the most efficient (and rapid) way. In the attached document, for each of your comments, we propose the way to process the data with the consequences and/or an additional question.

I hope we can come to the proper dataset soon in this way. If you got any additional questions, we are happy to answer them.

### Art. 4(1)

From: <u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u> <<u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu></u> Sent: woensdag 25 november 2020 12:30

Cc: Art. 4(1)	
Subject: Re: check eionet dataset	

## Dear colleagues

Thank you for having provided a second version of dataset and explanations in the Word document. However, we would like to clarify some doubts on the answers you provided in the Word document. We also have some observations that seem not solved in your last update.

Given that, it is mandatory to provide all the information in the requested tables and report as explained in detail in the guidelines, (we don't use or integrate them with separate excel or information in document files) we would clarify that:

- As explained clearly in the annex of guidelines, see table in section 4.1 (methodology): "The combination of the fields CountryCode, ND\_NatStatCode and ND\_StationType must create a unique report in the table. No duplicate records should exist with this combination". As a consequence, we kindly ask you to respect this rule since we cannot use a different combination.
- You must provide the stations that changed names with respect to the previous period as requested in the guidelines using ND\_NatStatCodeND. As explained in the Annex of guideline, section 4.3.1, the ND\_NatStatCodeND should be filled in if another code for this station has been used for the previous

reporting period of ND. Please note that we cannot integrate your dataset using additional files like "N\_NiD2020NL\_List of revised national station names.xlsx", as well as we cannot integrate/change the previous reporting period. You need to provide a clear NiD excel file with all the tables and the information as requested in the guidelines.

you need to provide the coordinates and/or information in GW\_stat and SW\_stat for all stations for which
you provide values of concentration and status. We understand your explanation, but for all the stations
provided in "NiD\_SW\_EutroState" you must provide the corresponding row in the "NiD\_SW\_Stat". We
cannot use/integrate the information provided in the doc SurfaceWaterBody\_NL and
SurfaceWaterBodyLine\_NL provided in 2016, or the file

"M\_NiD2020NL\_List\_of\_NiR2016\_SW\_locations\_at\_2020\_WFD\_units.xlsx" (not fully understandable for us), but you should integrate them in SW\_stat . See section 4.3.1 in the annex of guidelines. As explained here, you can add Water Body ID, Water Body Name, WFD station code etc. About coordinates, you can report the centroids of your unit.

- Can you confirm that the stations reported in NiD\_SW\_EutroMeasare are not used for the definition of trophic status of the current period?
- About our observation: "In the "NiD\_SW\_Conc" table, the maximum NO3 value (field "ND\_MaxValue") is lower than the average annual concentration of NO3 (field "ND\_AvgAnnValue") for station NL12\_BDV048". We have carefully read your response, but as explained in the Annex of guidelines, table 4.3.2.2, the maximum value is the maximum concentration of NO3 for the measurement period, thus "ND\_MaxValue" is not related only to winter periods as you instead remarked.
- The problem is the same for the interpretation of "ND\_NoOfSamples" both in AnnConc and Conc tables. As explained in the annex of guidelines (see 3.3.2.1 and 4.3.2.2 tables) the ND\_NoOfSamples is the total number of samples taken within the measured period and for the AnnConc tables this means by each year. As a consequence, also for the years for which the samples are not taken over all seasons, the number of samples must be reported, as well as the corresponding values of concentration.
- About our observation: "The following stations are reported in the "NiD\_SW\_Stat" and "NiD\_SW\_Conc" tables, but are missing in "NiD\_SW\_AnnConc": 59\_8SELP30, NL05\_37\_300, NL36\_OWM\_009m, NL60\_OBAAB900, NL60\_OBBME300, NL60\_OKWIS600, NL60\_OMIDD800, NL60\_OOOST300, NL60\_OTIEL500". The file AnnConc and Conc must be comparable, and in AnnConc you should report all the stations with measurements albeit they have less than 9 measurements, since they are used then for the calculation of average concentration of the whole period in Conc table.

Specific observations:

- For the GW station r95033, the number of station (sum of "ND\_NoOfSamples\_Year" field per each year) in the "NiD\_GW\_AnnConc" table is different from the number of stations ("ND\_NoOfSamples") in the "NiD\_GW\_Conc" table.
- For the following GW stations, the NO3 average annual value ("ND\_AvgAnnValue" field) in the "NiD\_GW\_Conc" table is different from the NO3 average annual value computed using the concentration values in "NiD\_GW\_AnnConc" (weighted mean of "ND\_AvgAnnValue" for the measurement period): r16044, r23662, r29576, r60210
- The following stations are reported in the "NiD\_SW\_AnnConc" and "NiD\_SW\_Stat" tables, but are missing in "NiD\_SW\_Conc":

 NL\_13\_ROP05101\_4,
 NL\_39\_S\_0402\_4,
 NL\_44\_21-202\_4,
 NL\_NL05\_01\_003\_4,
 NL\_NL12\_208015\_5,

 NL\_NL12\_315014\_5,
 NL\_NL12\_375103\_5,
 NL\_NL12\_431022\_5,
 NL\_NL12\_485302\_5,
 NL\_NL12\_675136\_5,

 NL\_NL12\_803002\_5,
 NL\_NL33\_4105\_5,
 NL\_NL33\_4218\_5,
 NL\_NL38\_oDE\_AA\_860\_4,

 NL\_NL38\_oGOORLO740\_4,
 NL\_NL38\_oGROOWE460\_5,
 NL\_NL38\_oHERTWE480\_5,
 NL\_NL39\_00041\_5,

 NL\_NL39\_00130\_5,
 NL\_NL39\_KOP0109\_5,
 NL\_NL39\_KOP0415\_5,
 NL\_NL39\_KOP0472\_5,

Please note that when submitting the new envelope, we kindly ask you to provide the whole dataset, correct the report if necessary and change the status of the envelope from draft to "end" status.

Best regards,

JRC Nitrates Directive Team

From: Art. 4(1) Sent: 18 November 2020 14:15 To: JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: RE: check eionet dataset

Dear JRC Nitrates Directive Team,

Sorry for the delay, but the response to your question was only finalized today as several organization are involved (see email with our response sent earlier today). Art will upload all remaining files and change the status to 'end' later today.

The following files will be available:

Revised Excel data file < I\_NiD2020NL\_Data\_2016-2019\_v20201106.xlsx>

Word document with response to your questions < P\_NiR2020 data delivery\_questions by JRC\_answers v20201103.docx>

The Netherlands article 10 report, Dutch version, as pdf < H\_2020-0121 Netherlands art10 rapport [NL].pdf>

The Article 10 report will be made public as soon as it is send to the members of parliament.

The Article 10 report will be translated to English. Given the size of the report and the Christmas and New Year holidays, this English version will be probably available not earlier than by February 2021.

Kind regards,

Art

vrt. 4(1)
rom: <u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u> < <u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu&gt;</u>
Art. 4(1)

Subject: Re: check eionet dataset



if the dataset with corrections is ready we suggest to close it ("end "status) so we can proceed with the checks and provide our obervations if necessary. You can create another for the report when ready.

Best regards,

JRC Nitrates Directive Team

From: Art. 4(1) Sent: 17 November 2020 08:06 To: JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: RE: check eionet dataset

Dear JRC Nitrates Directive Team,

We have indeed prepared a new dataset with corrections. The envelope also encloses the Netherlands article 10 report .

As soon as the all is finalised, Aft. will change the status to "end".

Kind regards,

Art.

Art. 4(1

Δ rt	(1)
-\ <b>ι</b> ι.	

From: <u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u> <<u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u>> Sent: maandag 16 november 2020 21:49 To: Art. 4(1)

Subject: Re: check eionet dataset



we have seen on Eionet that you uploaded a new envelope described as "new dataset with corrections". Could you please change the status from "draft" to "end" if it is completed?

Thank you very much in advance

Best regards,

JRC Nitrates Directive Team

From: Art. 4(1) Sent: 23 October 2020 13:15 To: JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE; Art. 4(1) Subject: RE: check eionet dataset

Dear JRC Nitrates Directive Team,

Thank you very much for your thorough analysis. We will react on your comments as soon as possible and keep you informed about our progress.

From: <u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u> <<u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu></u> Sent: donderdag 22 oktober 2020 22:44 To: Art. 4(1)

Subject: check eionet dataset



Thank you for submitting the Eionet database for the reporting period 2016-2019. We carefully analysed the received data and we would like to list you the following observations:

- In the "NiD\_GW\_Stat" table, a lot of stations have the same coordinates (same station type and same depth). This depends to the degrees of approximation used (number of decimals after the decimal place). For example, the coordinates long = 5.4 and lat = 51.5 are in common for 89 stations.
- In the "NiD\_GW\_Conc" table, the maximum NO3 value (field "ND\_MaxValue") is lower than the average annual concentration of NO3 (field "ND\_AvgAnnValue") for 122 stations.
- In the "NiD\_SW\_Stat" table, 64 stations have the same coordinates (same station type)
- In the "NiD\_SW\_Stat" table, there are some duplicated stations (same name, type and coordinates)
- In the "NiD\_SW\_Conc" table, the maximum NO3 value (field "ND\_MaxValue") is lower than the average annual concentration of NO3 (field "ND\_AvgAnnValue") for station NL12\_BDV048
- For 401 GW stations, the number of station (sum of "ND\_NoOfSamples\_Year" field per each year) in the "NiD\_GW\_AnnConc" table is different from the number of stations ("ND\_NoOfSamples") in the "NiD\_GW\_Conc" table
- For many SW stations, the number of station (sum of "ND\_NoOfSamples\_Year" field per each year) in the "NiD\_GW\_AnnConc" table is different from the number of stations ("ND\_NoOfSamples") in the "NiD\_GW\_Conc" table
- For many GW stations, the NO3 average annual value ("ND\_AvgAnnValue" field) in the "NiD\_GW\_Conc" table is different from the NO3 average annual value computed using the concentration values in "NiD\_GW\_AnnConc" (weighted mean of "ND\_AvgAnnValue" for the measurement period). For example: Station Img100d has field "ND\_AvgAnnValue" in "NiD\_GW\_Conc" = 52.5, but computing a weighted mean of concentrations in the "NiD\_GW\_AnnConc" table, the result is 0 because there is only a value for 2019 that is 0.
- For few SW stations, the NO3 average annual value ("ND\_AvgAnnValue" field) in the "NiD\_SW\_Conc" table is different from the NO3 average annual value computed using the concentration values in "NiD\_SW\_AnnConc" (weighted mean of "ND\_AvgAnnValue" for the measurement period). For example: Station 37\_20GZ-031-01 has field "ND\_AvgAnnValue" in "NiD\_SW\_Conc" = 23.5, but computing a weighted mean of concentrations in the "NiD\_SW\_AnnConc" table, the results get 25.7
- The following stations are reported in the table "NiD\_SW\_Stat", but are missing in "NiD\_SW\_AnnConc" and "NiD\_SW\_Conc": 59\_8SELP30, NL05\_37\_300, NL36\_OWM\_009m, NL60\_OBAAB900, NL60\_OBBME300, NL60\_OKWIS600, NL60\_OMIDD800, NL60\_OOOST300, NL60\_OTIEL500,
- In the "NiD\_SW\_EutroState" table, the two stations NL94\_4 and NL94\_5 have been duplicated

- In the "NiD\_SW\_EutroState" table, all the stations do not have the corresponding row in the "NiD\_SW\_Stat" table
- Concerning the station names that has been changed as explain in your general remarks, we kindly ask you to report the name of the stations that have been used in the previous RP and now are different in the field ND\_NatStatCodeND, as requested in the guidelines annex table 3.3.1 and 4.3.1.

National station code Nitrates Directive (ND_NatStatCodeND)	Nationally assigned, unique identifier of the groundwater/surface water monitoring station used for	Only to fill in if another code for this station have been used for the previous reporting period of ND.	Data type: string Min. size: 0
	previous ND reporting.		Max. size: 50

Would you be so kind to check the above-mentioned points and correct/update them?

Please note that when submitting the new envelope, we kindly ask you to provide the whole dataset, correct the report if necessary and change the status of the envelope from draft to "end" status.

Thank you very much for your collaboration

Best regards,

JRC Nitrates Directive Team

From: Art. 4(1) Sent: 15 October 2020 08:12 To: JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: RE: change status envelope in Eionet

Dear all,

Both datasets are final and can be used for analysis.

However, as has been announced at the workshop in Ispra in January this year, the report will be finalized next month.

Please let us know if we should change the status from "released" to "end" so you can proceed with the dataset, even though the report is not finalized yet.

Kind regards,

Art. 4(1)		
_		

From: <u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u> <<u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u>> Sent: woensdag 14 oktober 2020 17:28 To: Art. 4(1)

Subject: change status envelope in Eionet

we have seen that the envelopes "Upload dataset 2016 new data" and "Upload dataset 2020 NO3 Netherlands" are in Released status in Eionet. We kindly ask you to change the status from "released" to "end" if the dataset and report are final in order to proceed with the analysis.

Thank you very much in advance

Best regards,

## JRC Nitrates Directive Team

Dit bericht kan informatie bevatten die niet voor u is bestemd. Indien u niet de geadresseerde bent of dit bericht abusievelijk aan u is verzonden, wordt u verzocht dat aan de afzender te melden en het bericht te verwijderen. Het RIVM aanvaardt geen aansprakelijkheid voor schade, van welke aard ook, die verband houdt met risico's verbonden aan het elektronisch verzenden van berichten. www.rivm.nl De zorg voor morgen begint vandaag

This message may contain information that is not intended for you. If you are not the addressee or if this message was sent to you by mistake, you are requested to inform the sender and delete the message. RIVM accepts no liability for damage of any kind resulting from the risks inherent in the electronic transmission of messages.

www.rivm.nl/en Committed to health and sustainability

# FW: Nitrates Directive, Netherlands country fiche, draft for comments

## JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE

Sun 14/02/21 20:25

To <mark>Art. 4(1)</mark>
Importance: High
1 attachments (2 MB) Fiche_Netherlands_v10_envx7vcyw_20210203_NL-20210214.docx;
From: Art. 4(1) Sent: 14 February 2021 20:22:32 (UTC+01:00) Amsterdam, Berlin, Bern, Rome, Stockholm, Vienna To: JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: Nitrates Directive, Netherlands country fiche, draft for comments
To <u>Nitrates_Directive_JRC@ec.europa.eu</u> Cc <mark>Art. 4(1)</mark>

#### Dear JRC Nitrates Team,

Thank you for sending us the draft version of the country fiche for comments. We appreciate that you offer us this chance to give feedback. We like to bring to your attention some concerns, related to the data used in the NL country fiche. Please find attached the Country Fiche document for the Netherlands with some comments. We understand that it is not an easy task to combine and report results of monitoring networks from 27 member states. We hope that our comments may assist in further improving current and future reporting.

**Our main concern** is that in our view JRC does not have the data and informatie to provide an overview (1) of the status at the country level with the current details and

(2) on trends that go beyond the time frame of the current period (2016-2019) and the previous period (2012-2015).

The data and information only allow for a brief overview for the current period. For an in depth analyses of status and trends in our waters a reference can be made to our national article 10 reports. The Dutch version of our report has been published (<u>https://www.rivm.nl/publicaties/landbouwpraktijk-en-waterkwaliteit-in-nederland-toestand-2016-2019-en-trend-1992-2019</u>) and the English version will be available within a month. We explain our concern in more detail below.

## **1.** Country level

As we wrote in a previous email and explained in our report, the monitoring network locations in the Netherlands are not a 'random sample'. Networks are stratified random samples and there can be a large difference in the amount of area that is represented per monitoring location in different strata. For example,

in our early warning monitoring programme (LMM) we have 50 farms in the Loess Region that represent 1.5% of the agricultural area in the Netherlands, while there are 60 farms in LMM in the Peat Region that covers 9% of the agricultural area. Also within regions there is overrepresentation of strata. Therefore, in our article 10 report we provide area-weighted means and distributions.

## 2. Trends

As we mentioned in earlier emails, our monitoring networks for groundwater and surfaces waters have been improved much since the first report and data delivery in 2000. For example the number of farm participating in LMM increased and more focus has been put on problem areas. For surface waters, a special network was developed in the 2010s for agricultural specific regional waters. Also networks other regional and national surface waters were rearranged so they could be used for both the Nitrates Directive and Water Framework Directive. The data from the new and rearranged networks were reported for the first time in the frame work of the Nitrates Directive in 2016. In addition, due to improved data control also the current data base is more reliable than previous ones.

This means that data provided for earlier report are incomparable with current data. Therefore we have offered to provide updates of data files for earlier reporting periodes to ensure that trends shown in your reports are correct. Current figures in the Netherlands country report show structural *breaks* as a consequence of network improvements and *data problems* as a consequence of errors in the data files in the past.

## 2a Structural breaks

One very clear example of a structural break, can be seen in your long term trend in groundwater nitrate (Figure 19). On request of the European Commission, we have provided data on our early warning monitoring programme (LMM) from 2008 (data 2004-2007) onwards. Data for earlier reporting periods do not contain LMM data. As LMM monitors root zone leachate at farms, nitrate concentrations are much higher than in shallow groundwater. As a consequence, nitrate concentrations in grondwater show a sharp increase ins 2004-2007.

## 2b Data problems

One very clear example of a past data problem shows in all surface water figures. As we informed the European Commission in 2018 that the data set provided in 2012 contained NO3-N concentrations for surface waters in stead of NO3. On request of Mr Debeuckelaere we uploaded a revised 'data set 2012' in 2018. This revised data set has not been used. Therefore, nitrate concentrations in surface waters in 2008-2011 are unrealistic low in the figures in your draft Fiche.

The publication of the overview in the current country fiche will certainly lead to new discussion in the Netherlands, as they provide an incorrect picture of status and trends.

## **Other remarks:**

A. *Trophic status reporting.* We provided data on trophic status both in 2020 and in 2016. There have been no problems with using this data in 2016 as they were published in the country fiche Even though we provided the data in 2020 in the same way as in 2016, they were not in the current Country Fiche. Both times we provided a detailed description on the link between the monitoring locations in the STAT sheet and the WFD surface water bodies in the EuroStat sheet. The new instructions from JRC means that the link between monitoring locations and surface water bodies in no longer available in the new upload.

The fact the JRC (1) will not use a revised version of data sets for earlier periods and (2) is not able to retrieve information on trophic status from the file provide in 2016 (or update 2017), means that information on trophic status will also be absent in the next version of the Counttry Fiche. However, data are presented in our national article 10 report.

- B. *Missing data resulting in missing stations*: on request of JRC we have removed almost 40 surface water stations because we could only provide annual nitrate concentrations or winter nitrate concentration for these stations because of our quality criteria. The data have been used in our national article 10 report.
- C. Why are data on agriculture reported as averages per year and not per (4-year) period, just like water quality data?

Thank you for your attention. We are looking forward to your reply. If there are any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Kind regards,

Art. 4(1)								
Erom	Nitratoc	Directive	IPC@ac	ourona ou	<nitratoc< th=""><th>Directive</th><th>IRC @ac aurona aus</th><th></th></nitratoc<>	Directive	IRC @ac aurona aus	

From: Nitrates\_Directive\_JRC@ec.europa.eu <Nitrates\_Directive\_JRC@ec.europa.eu> Sent: woensdag 3 februari 2021 17:21

To: Art. 4(1)	
Cc: Art. 4(1)	
Subject: Do	chack aignot datasat

Subject: Re: check eionet dataset

Dear Art. and Art.

we consulted our DG colleagues, and we point out that the JRC will do the current assessment (country fiche/report) using the official data provided in the past reporting periods. You can send the new versions of previous RP datasets providing also a detail assessment of the changes, but the JRC will not do checks. We kindly ask you to provide as soon as possible and by Wednesday 10 February the corrected dataset on Eionet, so we can proceed with the check and analysis.

However, based on the provided dataset we produced your Country Fiche document, here attached. Please read it carefully and provide us with your comments in track change mode.

Concerning the Figure 1 of this document (pag.2), if it is possible, we kindly ask you to provide long time series of annual data of N and P mineral fertilizers, manure and surplus so we can update the plots with more recent years (in attachment a template that you can use). In addition, it would be very much appreciated if you could provide your feedbacks on the Action Programme section.

Best Regards JRC Nitrates Team

# FW: Revised NL\_RP6 dataset available at Eionet in envelope "Dataset 2012-2015 corrections 2020 v01"

## JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE

Sat 20/02/21 10:24

Art. 4(1) To

From: Art. 4(1) Sent: 20 February 2021 10:24:25 (UTC+01:00) Amsterdam, Berlin, Bern, Rome, Stockholm, Vienna To: JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE Cc: Art. 4(1)

Subject: Revised NL\_RP6 dataset available at Eionet in envelope "Dataset 2012-2015 corrections 2020 v01"

Dear JRC Nitrates Directive Team,

As announced on Monday, we have uploaded the updated RP6 file you provided in December last year at EIONET.

This is done according to your instructions in a new envelope called "Dataset 2012-2015 corrections 2020 v01" and rename the adjusted file as "NL\_RP6\_update2020\_v01.xlsx".

We have addressed as far as possible all the issue that we also solved in the RP7 file.

Specifics are given below.

If there are any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Kind regards,

Art.

#\_\_\_\_\_\_

No new monitoring locations are added. Data missing for reported monitoring locations in 2016/2017 have been added if available.

## NiD\_SW\_AnnCon

The following changes are made if possible

- · Annual means and number of measurement are now in accordance with totals in NiD\_SW\_Conc
- Some monitoring location occurred in SW\_AnnConc, but not in SW\_Conc. These fields are emptied and are shaded yellow. The location code and year are still available but other informations is removed.
- For some locations data for one of more years have been added (shaded yellow)

• For some locations, data are removed for particular years (shaded yellow, fields are empty)

## NiD\_SW\_Conc

As far as possible, data are replaced by data from the new database. If not, data were check and some of the following fields may have been adapted:

- Start data / end date.
- Number of measurement; is now equal to the sum of number given in SW\_AnnConc
- Maximum value is now maximum over entire period and not only winter period
- Average is now equal to average of annual averages in SW\_AnnCon

## NiD\_SW\_Euromeas

- As far as possible, data are replaced by data from the new database.
- The measurement unit for Chlorophyll in the file is "µg/l. We did not change this.

## NiD\_SW\_EutroState

- The eutrophication status was originally based on data 2011-2014, this is replace by the status based on 2012-2015 data
- Data for surface water bodies that were not in the file uploaded in 2017, have been added
- Surface water bodies for which no status assessment is available for the 2012-2015 period, but had a status for the 2011-2014 period are shaded yellow without value
- Number of samples is set to 1 and date is changes to 2012-01-01 / 2015-12-31

## SW\_stat

- Surface water bodies are added as 'monitoring location' and are shaded yellow.
- Monitoring locations without data in sheets in SW\_AnnCon, SW\_Con and Euromeas are marked "TRUE" in column "ND\_WasRemoved" and cell "TRUE" are shaded yellow.

## From: Art. 4(1)

Sent: maandag 15 februari 2021 11:00

To: 'Nitrates\_Directive\_JRC@ec.europa.eu' <Nitrates\_Directive\_JRC@ec.europa.eu>

Cc: Art. 4(1)

Subject: Revised NL\_RP7 dataset available at eionet today; revised NL\_RP6 dataset follows later this week

## Dear JRC Nitrates Directive Team,

Last friday, we have uploaded a new dataset for the RP7 (2016-2019) with revisions as requested. Art. will change the status from 'Draft' to 'End' today.

My colleague from the surface water department is still working on the revisions of the file <NL\_RP6\_v0.xlsx> you sent us. This should enable you to also publish trophic status for 2012-2015. This file will be uploaded at the end of this week. As we stated before, this takes time as it has to be done manually.

Kind regards,

## Art.

# FW: NL check envelope envycvpa

## JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE

Wed 24/02/21 15:42

From: Art. 4(1) Sent: 24 February 2021 15:42:24 (UTC+01:00) Amsterdam, Berlin, Bern, Rome, Stockholm, Vienna To: JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE; Art. 4(1) Subject: RE: NL check envelope envycvpa
Dear Nitrates Directive team, I'm sorry I was confused with the different datasets. The data is now in "Upload dataset 2020 NO3 Netherlands corrections v4"
Unfortunately I cannot delete the other folder since the status is "end". Best regards, <mark>Art.</mark>
From: Nitrates_Directive_JRC@ec.europa.eu <nitrates_directive_jrc@ec.europa.eu> Sent: woensdag 24 februari 2021 15:25</nitrates_directive_jrc@ec.europa.eu>
To: Art. 4(1) Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: Re: NL check envelope envycvpa
To: Art. 4(1) Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: Re: NL check envelope envycvpa Dear $\frac{\text{Art.}}{4(1)}$ and $\frac{\text{Art.}}{4(1)}$ ,
To: Art. 4(1) Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: Re: NL check envelope envycvpa Dear $\frac{\text{Art.}}{4(1)}$ and $\frac{\text{Art.}}{4(1)}$ , the name of the envelpe is wrong. It must refer to 2016-2019.

This should follow that of 15 Feb.

"Upload dataset 2020 NO3 Netherlands corrections v3"

Best regards,

JRC Nitrates Directive Team

From: Art. 4(1) Sent: 24 February 2021 15:19 To: JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: RE: NL check envelope envycvpa

Dear JRC Nitrates Directive Team,

Thank you for your quick response.

Art. has uploaded the complete excel file with all the requested tables (see <u>Dataset 2012-2015 corrections 2020 v02</u> with status is END).

With regard to your point 7 'The following SW stations have the same coordinates. Is it correct?'

Yes, that is correct. The first mentioned station is a single measurement point in an agriculture-specific water, the second mentioned (WFD) station a mixed sample of several (neighboring) measurement points in (part of) a water body.

Kind regards,

Art.

From: <u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u> <<u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u>> Sent: woensdag 24 februari 2021 13:20 To: Art. 4(1) Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: Re: NL check envelope envycvpa



we intend that you upload the complete excel with all the requested tables.

Best regards,

JRC Nitrates Directive Team

Dear JRC Nitrates Team,

We have made the requested change. However it is not clear what you mean by: "we kindly ask you to provide the whole dataset"

Do you want us to include the report and other documents we uploaded in a previous envelope in the new envelope as well?

Kind regards,

Art.

From: <u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u> <<u>Nitrates Directive JRC@ec.europa.eu</u>> Sent dinsdag 23 februari 2021 08:51 To: Art. 4(1)

Subject: NL check envelope envycvpa



Thank you for having provided new version of RP7 dataset (envycvpa, file I\_NiD2020NL\_Data\_2016-2019\_v2021211). We would like to check and fix these last observations, which seems not resolved from the previous check:

- 1. For the following GW station, the field "ND\_WasRemoved" is set to TRUE. However, in the previous reporting period file, no station with the same station code was found: r14794, r15544, r15630, r17869, r29128, r77474, r98537.
- 2. For the following SW station, the field "ND\_WasRemoved" is set to TRUE. However, in the previous reporting period file, no station with the same station code was found: 38\_140256, 38\_oAFSLSC500,

38\_oLUISWE300, NL18\_BATHOOST, NL18\_ZUIDWATERING, NL99\_PEK, NL99\_VechtZwarteWater.

 In the "NiD\_SW\_Stat" table, the station code 09\_BOMW0005 is duplicated and the ND\_WasRemoved is set in one row as FALSE and in the other as TRUE. Please provide only a row with the correct ND\_WasRemoved.
 In the "NiD\_SW\_Conc" table, the following stations have been inserted in replicates:

NL25\_910220

NL27\_244151

NL42\_MPN1135

NL42\_MPN1239

NL42\_MPN1468

NL42\_MPN1499

NL42\_MPN7141

NL42\_MPN9930

NL86\_NIEUWGN

NL89\_OESTDM

NL91\_BELFBVN

NL93\_LOBPTN

NL93\_VURN

NL94\_KEIZVR

5. In the "NiD\_SW\_EutroState" table, the following stations have been inserted in replicates: NL94\_4

NL94\_5

- 6. The SW station NL18\_SCHORE is listed in the "NiD\_SW\_EutroState" table, but is missing in all other tables, including "NiD\_SW\_Stat" where spatial references should be reported (Lat, Long).
- 7. The following SW stations have the same coordinates. Is it correct? NL\_37\_26DZ-001-01\_5, NL\_NL37\_00256KRW\_5 NL\_37\_26BZ-057-01\_5, NL\_NL37\_00003KRW\_5 NL\_37\_26FZ-045-01\_5, NL\_NL37\_00526KRW\_5

 The following 21 SW stations have inverted coordinates: NL\_NL34\_2120\_4,NL\_NL60\_ODIJK900\_4,NL\_NL60\_OPANH040\_4,NL\_NL60\_OVISS700\_4,NL\_NL81\_BOCHTV WTM\_6,NL\_NL81\_DANTZGT\_7,NL\_NL81\_DOOVBWT\_7,NL\_NL81\_GROOTGND\_6,NL\_NL81\_HUIBGOT\_7,NL\_ NL89\_SCHAARVODDL\_6,NL\_NL89\_VLISSGBISSVH\_6,NL\_NL89\_WISSKKE\_7,NL\_NL94\_BEERKNMDN\_6,NL\_NL 94\_BRIENOD\_6,NL\_NL94\_HARVSS\_6,NL\_NL94\_MAASSS\_6,NL\_NL95\_BOOMKDP\_7,NL\_NL95\_GOERE2\_7,NL\_ NL95\_NOORDWK2\_7,NL\_NL95\_WALCRN2\_7,NL\_57\_OOOST300\_4

Would you be so kind to check the above-mentioned points and correct/update them?

We kindly ask you to provide the updated dataset by Friday 26 February.

Please note that when submitting the new envelope, we kindly ask you to provide the whole dataset and change the status of the envelope from draft to "end" status.

Best Regards

JRC Nitrates Team

From: Art. 4(1) Sent: 15 February 2021 10:59 To: JRC NITRATES DIRECTIVE Cc: Art. 4(1) Subject: Revised NL\_RP7 dataset available at eionet today; revised NL\_RP6 dataset follows later this week

Dear JRC Nitrates Directive Team,

Last friday, we have uploaded a new dataset for the RP7 (2016-2019) with revisions as requested.

Art. will change the status from 'Draft' to 'End' today.

My colleague from the surface water department is still working on the revisions of the file <NL\_RP6\_v0.xlsx> you sent us. This should enable you to also publish trophic status for 2012-2015. This file will be uploaded at the end of this week. As we stated before, this takes time as it has to be done manually.

Kind regards,

Art.