Notes EG WS&D Meeting 26-27 April 2012

The main conclusions of the EG Meeting are listed below:

1. Regarding water accounts, the EG takes note of the request of EEA/ETC to MS to submit still (streamflow) data in the requested format to the water accounts, as some data are still pending to be included and the system is flexible enough to include them. The consultation of MS on data and interpretation of the water accounts will occur in a formal procedure at the highest appropriate level.
2. Regarding the WS&D indicators, WDs will be asked to endorse WEI+ factsheet and to support the further work to be done by the EG.
3. EG asks WDs to endorse the Working Definitions on Water Scarcity and Drought.
4. The EG agrees on providing input for the study on Pressures & Measures in the next 2 weeks, and a second round of consultation will be realized once the document has been finished (possibly end May).
5. EG will provide a round of first comments of the Eflows discussion paper in the next 2 weeks, in particular of including EU experiences. In parallel, the paper will be presented to SCG/WDs to discuss on decide which other EGs should be involved in the further discussion.
6. Several actions have been agreed (see below under "9. Next steps") for the rest of the Mandate.

Two more meetings have been agreed. The next meeting (September, proposed for Athens, dates will be proposed by ETC/COM) should discuss all the current development, and another one after the Blueprint's launch to wrap-up activities and eventually suggest for future developments.

Furthermore, please find below complementary notes from the meeting:

COM welcomes EG members and asks for a tour du table.

1. Water accounts

At recent meetings it was considered very useful to receive information on the water accounts project (based on SEEAW), which is presented by Jacques Delsalle (COM) and Beate Werner (EEA), including information on aims, concepts, data and current status. The presentation is uploaded at CIRCA, and the main discussion points were the following:

- FR Q about concept river discharge = is similar to discharge at gauging stations.
- IT a) which data are used (not all IT is appearing), what's the relation to Competent Authorities. ETC: EEA is collecting data on an annual basis through the WISE-SoE#3 reporting in water quantity, where daily streamflow is also requested, through the EIONET and the NFPs, on a voluntary basis. In summer 2011 an ad-hoc request for a collection of streamflow data to support the water accounts has been sent to the MSs with a timeframe until November. Additionally, in this effort to support the water accounts, data have also been downloaded from weblinks in case used, and some MSs had them available online. Obtaining data from some MSs was difficult (e.g. IT, BG) in

the expected timeframe, and some info had constraints (e.g. financial provision, publication constraints etc.), and other cases where it needed to be paid. Info reporting of data even at the current time is very welcome, as the water accounts system is flexible, and there is a great possibility that streamflow data coming even at the current time could be integrated. Currently some 80% of Europe is covered; b) how were Climate Change data "adapted" to needs. EEA: Collected precipitation data on forecasts were recalculated and brought to the level of water accounts. Evapotranspiration has been calculated using a special developed module. c) This ad-hoc data collection was outside the "regular" WISE-SoE data collection, yet it was formally requested to the MSs; Current exercise is different from future use: there should be a formal request (MoU) for these data; it should be clear for MS what is the future use of these data; request to use EIONet. COM: Currently it is a prototype, launched because previous data were not adequate for the requested aims of policy assessments on WS&D. Blueprint is currently assessing what is needed for the knowledge strategy improving the current system, and we are learning much about data quality, use, accessibility, etc. Blueprint modeling helps showing the problems and defining a strategy. EEA: EIONet is fully involved in this exercise.

- AT: usage of water accounts data for the WEI+ - that was the request for more information. are there already results/maps? Are there "surprising" results? EEA: some data have been presented in the ppt, It is a tricky exercise, but there is no data available until June for the WEI+, and then the data can be checked.
- IT (Po) was asked for the data series, provided data and got no feedback on information request and asks for stronger involvement in the water accounts development, so to be part of the initiative.
- IT: If this will be a formal document for the Blueprint, IT asked for a review previous to launch. Similar comment from SK, and ES. EEA and COM: There is a process with information in place, and COM is preparing a data assessment for further discussion, linking it to the data we need for our purposes. The Ecrins units are being used, and summed up to the catchment level. Be aware that Blueprint is not a regulation, but a communication to improve situation.
- BE a) is aware about data problems but also asks for attention of the usage/interpretation of the data done after the calculations. b) concern regarding the review of data and results: will there be a chance for MS to review data and interpretation? c) Blueprint will be very important (though it is not a regulation), and it can lead to regulation – therefore it is very important which data are being used and how they are interpret.
- IT complains that there is a current process of water balances being calculated by RBA, and fears a replacement of this activity by the EEA initiative. Requires being very specific with data requests. Supported by SK and AT (also for formal review: procedures?, groups to be consulted?). JRC: some of the data requirements could be solved, if minimum requirements for all MS are established (represented as "grey area" where no sufficient data are available for the assessment). EEA: this dataset is useful, comparable and available for indicators (as an input e.g. for the WEI+), trying to get data right from a hydrological point of view. UK asks for clarifying comments on data requests

and problems. NL: gain trust in water accounts is difficult under time pressure: maybe it is worth to start with a disclaimer. Goal is not data optimization. Is there any link to other blended data sources. COM: Objective is to prepare SEEAW data, and further use is not water accounts issue, but issue of other EGs, e.g. related to WEI+. COM aims to make data available by WISE. IT concerned about use of water accounts for WEI+, water balances are a sensitive issue which requires explanations to and interaction with stakeholders. More discussion is needed for the final aim of the water accounts. BE wants to clarify the review of data and interpretation at the same time and suggests to do everything at the same time, which is OKed by EEA.

- JRC: COM does not want to do this process on its own, because MS do know their basins and can provide positive criticism and solutions to lack of data and analysis. ES raises concern about data released in the Blueprint and their appearance in media; and informs that the data are produced on a weekly level (similar to IT).

<u>Conclusions</u>: The EG takes note of the request of EEA/ETC to MS to submit still (streamflow) data in the requested format to the water accounts, as some data are still pending to be included and the system is flexible enough to include them.

COM informs the EG that the consultation of MS on data and interpretation of the water accounts will occur in a formal procedure at the highest appropriate level.

2. Indicators

- General aspects

UK: General: Indicators are for awareness raising, and this should be clear in the document. EUROSTAT: Definition of an indicator is one issue, but data availability, reliability and sustainability is another one. Be aware of this before agreeing on more indicators. AT raises the issue of use of indicators where no info/data/interest is available for all EU. EEA/ETC informs on data collections. COM wants indicator set as good as possible to represent EU situation, but not all are relevant for all situations. This is an exercise of identifying useful indicators, not of obligation. We do a previous testing.

- fAPAR

FI had some problems with the fAPAR indicator, and this should be mentioned in the factsheet (FI will provide a short text on it).

- Snowpack

FI Snowpack: there has been some work on the Globsnow and discussions have been held with CH, this is not an easy task. FI is still trying to figure out how accurate the GlobSnow data are and can be used. The indicator is not ready yet, and FI suggests maintaining it in the lists of indicators that are under development. Snowpack is not crucial for the Blueprint, but is a relevant issue to be recognized for drought issues. AT checked data availability, that fails on the

water m^3 included in the snow (water equivalence), because it depends much on the snow density. FI is checking this issue, in particular for mountain areas. COM proposes to inform WDs that the indicators should be prepared by end 2012. SK is working also on snowpack, and can work together.

BE proposes to include in text a mention that some indicators are still pending, and that they might be useful. NL: added value of combination of indicators, this needs to be reflected. COM Consultants responds that still some indicators are required to reflect some types of droughts, aspect supported by ES. The ERHIN program was mentioned like as alternative option for snowpack indicator (it is an example applied in Spain).

- Runoff

ES Runoff/SRI was presented last meeting with a definite factsheet, and asks for testing. The CZ indicator is similar/complementary, but SRI is more contrasted. Streamflow data shouldn't be so complicate. FI tested and it works well, IT similar. SK wants to see the results of the index and to group them. Agreed: Formal testing exercise based on the latest version of the factsheet lead by ES. Interested RBs/MS contact COM consultant for setting up the exercise group.

ES will take the lead for this exercise, asking pilot Rivers Basins for testing the indicator.

- Groundwater

FR informs on groundwater, there hasn't been a discussion for a year and we still stay at the previous version, but the issue is very important. COM Consultants understands that this indicator might be in between awareness raising and management, and at a later point we can come back to this issue. BE uses it as awareness raising indicator for media, PL has a similar indicator and it works and can contribute further to the indicator development. ES finds this indicator interesting. COM Consultants comments on the need to specify the causes (drought, abstractions) and its influence on the evolution; BE has a tool to split this. IT/BE: WFD asks for data on good quantitative status of GWBs, but there is doubt if these data are useful or appropriate to use in this WEI+ exercise. SK on groundwater, there should be info on the status and how it relates to D. FR: When there is a D, the indicator can be useful, and you can see the GWBs where you had a drought. FR will take the lead for the development and testing exercise.

- Soil moisture

ES explains that a factsheet was presented at the last meeting, but the results were not so good. FR uses "standardized soil moisture index", JRC has published some data. JRC explains the model (used also for flooding risk) on top soil and deep soil, simulation; not based on measurements, detecting anomalies compared to long-term baselines. The issue is operative, some local level data require more calibration, and interconnectivity of data with EDO might be useful. A presentation of JRC at the next meeting might be useful to decide the way forward. ES found 2 problems: a) data from Lisflood do not fit with local data and D do not occur at the same time; b) areas with irrigation have an affected soil moisture, and there are no valid conclusions regarding D. JRC made a comparative analysis (punctual values vs. grid values). Agreed – if we have time – we discuss the issue tomorrow.

- WEI+ and other water scarcity indicators

ETC and COM Consultants are presenting the results of the Technical Working Group (TWG) established at the Venice meeting, in order to come up with an adequate proposal of a WEI+ indicator. It has been a long and complex process to define a simple and pragmatic indicator at an adequate level of aggregation. The presentation will be uploaded at CIRCA and the contents are included in the indicator factsheet.

Two complementary indicator was proposed comparing a) water demand and availability (Water Demand Index, WDI) and b) observed streamflow to natural(ized) streamflow (RoONS).

In the discussion, the following points were raised:

- **Formula/data**

- EUROSTAT: Need to define "returned water" and other elements of the formula. There is a risk of confusion because it differs from the term used by OECD and EUROSTAT.
- BE, AT and FI: Prefer to have the 2-step approach, making monthly calculations only where appropriate and sufficient data are available. AT: Comparable overview for Europe. For target-oriented approach, the effort should be adequate (time and spatial). For spatial scale the diction of the WFD (e.g. Art. 5(1)) should be followed: RBDs or "portions of international RBDs falling within a MSs territory". ETC: The critical point is for RBs where you have a problem at the monthly scale (each year) but not at annual.
- IT Need to reach a common statement. BE: If MS want this as a management tool, it's up to them to decide.
- COM: There are still issues to clarify how and by whom will the indicator be calculated, but this does not have to be decided at this EG. It should not be used as a commitment for new reporting (bearing in mind that the Blueprint will assess the knowledge basis and evaluate options).
- IT and ETC evaluate the option of having a storage indicator. This might be discussed in future. BE warns not to develop too many indicators at an EU level. Every Member State can decide to develop indicators themselves, in particular when they are addressed to management.
- NL welcomes the indicator and results, and asks for the use of thresholds. COM consultants explain discussions/agreements on the scope of indicators; and ETC regarding the cuts/threshold values. The issue still needs further exploration, and any use of the indicator should be meaningful and checked with the situation in the basins.
- FR could agree with the conclusions, with 2 Qs: a) definition of (actual) demand; b) limit the indicators to one (WEI+) and not extend it to further indicators. Regarding return water, irrigation in Southern France much water is submitted to GW. ETC: there is need to quantify in particular returns from agricultural water usage.
- PL asks for the procedure on generation of the indicator (e.g. if data cannot be given on a monthly data, in particular regarding GW abstraction). ETC mentions that WISE-SoE data are collected at the end of the year. PL asks also about the return water abstracted

from mining activities, but has Qs regarding monthly WEI+ calculation. COM explains that these Qs have been discussed previously, and that data gathering should be solved by the water accounts project. COM Consultants explains that the factsheet will enter into the issue of differing GW and SW, but at this stage it is impossible; similar to the time scale.

- **Thresholds**

- UK welcomes the equation, but there should be a clear way forward on how the results will be used (this has implications for the threshold definition). COM: Blueprint is only 15 pages (so no maps), but there will be a document on impact assessment, so to define which options are the most appropriate. This will be supported by facts, including a quantification of how relevant is the problem. To include in note to WDs. JRC puzzled by COM consultants on “permanent” situation of water scarcity and link to aridity. EEA explains that in water scarce areas you can take options to reduce water consumption and overexploitation; COM relates to the document prepared by the EG for definitions on WS and D.
- AT asks for the regional thresholds for EF that should be adapted to the situation on-site. This shifts the complexity of definition from the formula to the thresholds. Use a pragmatic approach to stay at single threshold levels.
- ES proposes that the thresholds take into account not only the ecological status of water bodies, but also the expected deficit for existing uses in the basin. In this sense could be encouraged to try to correlate the values of WEI with the expected annual deficit.

- EURELECTRIC Complexity of dams which are not fully for hydropower, there has to be coherence of data with artificial storage. COM Consultants explain that you have to work on the naturalized flows. Clarifications are made by AT, ETC and EEA.

Way forward proposed by COM includes the following steps:

- Drafting factsheet, sent out tomorrow and to be reviewed by EG until Wednesday. The factsheet will include reference on the thresholds that will be tested once data are available and everybody will be consulted adequately.
- Sub-indicators should be included in the factsheet as a complementary option, determined by situation in RBs.

BE expresses doubt that this EG is the right or only place to fully discuss environmental flows. If there is an agreement on environmental flows, then this can be discussed in the EG WS&D to include in the WEI+. IT considers that this EG should be maintained in the discussion on eflows which is cross-cutting different EGs. UK concerned on positions of MS on eflows; this might conflict with this process; and the currently proposed thresholds might strongly impact on water management. AT supports BE to inform other groups about new developments on

environmental flows before publishing them in the frame of the Blueprint and also understands the point of IT.

<u>Conclusions</u>: COM proposes to ask WDs to endorse WEI+ factsheet and to support the further work to be done by the EG.

3. **Update of WS&D in RBMPs**

The update was presented by COM Consultants, and two Qs were raised regarding the expected timeline and the accessibility to the report. COM responds that the report will be due in 4-6 weeks and will be reported to the EG.

4. **Working Definitions of Water Scarcity and Droughts**

COM consultants presented the draft document for discussions at the EG, and a larger number of final comments from FR, IT, NL, BE, AT and other EG members were discussed and introduced into the document.

It was agreed to have definitions that should be as short as possible. The final document should be prepared with final input from JRC by 27 April for submission to the SCG.

<u>Conclusions</u>: EG agrees that the working definitions should be endorsed by WDs.

5. **In-depth analysis of RBMPs: Environmental water allocation and Drought Management Plans**

COM Consultants presents the draft results on Pressures and Measures which is an in-depth and follow-up assessment on the topic screening presented the day before (presentation and draft document are uploaded at CIRCA). Com informs that the input from MS is needed. The discussion covers the following points:

- FR: Feedback from MS will be taken into account.
- WWF: use information not only from MS
- AT is well represented, but misses the link to the problem (problem-oriented approach). There is no obligation for DMPs, so there should be a mention to this in the report.
- Next steps: coordination, factsheets, PSI storylines, including cost-effectiveness. COM Consultants ask for comments in the coming 15 days, in order to ensure that the report can be finished by end May. The document will be changed in 2 aspects: a) split in two reports, and b) case studies will be added.
- ES asks if their DMPs are being considered.

<u>Conclusions</u>: The EG agrees on providing input for this study in the next 2 weeks, and COM proposes a second round of consultation once the document has been finished (possibly end May).

6. **Discussion document on environmental water allocation**

COM consultants present a briefing on the discussion document that aims to place eflows as a tool to achieve WFD objectives. The presentation and the background documents are uploaded at CIRCA. Discussion on:

- UK: asks for the range of the figure, why limited to 70%. Best results of case studies on eflows are about 50%; if they are > 50% there shouldn't be risk of not achieving risk due to flow abstractions. UK data are not included in the IWMI dataset. This is needed to improve European datasets.
- EEA asks for how safety margins are considered (reaction/adaptation). UK: one of their target issues is on risks.
- JRC: Mean annual runoff has not a normal distribution, so the mean values are not the best. COM consultants complain about data availability.
- IT is often calculated as observed (which has already problems). COM consultant: Scientific-technical community refers always to the "natural mean annual runoff"
- AT considers the paper as an interesting starting point; and requests the aim of defining eflows: a) one demand of water use; b) keep alive ecosystems; other EGs should have a look at the issue. COM: this group is kicking off an initiative which needs to be consolidated, and there will be a workshop in June for this purpose. SCG will be informed about the e-flow discussion paper and it will be presented during the EC Green Week. The paper can be distributed to other EGs over summer. COM consultant remains the need to use eflows in the frame of the PSI storyline, addressing pressures on WBs.
- EEA requests to have a deeper look at using "mean annual runoff" under further assessments, related to different types of WBs; and this should lead to a connection between eflows and GES/GEP. It is not only on water quantity, it is a wider issue. Will there be further intercalibration exercises to define eflows for different river types? COM: this is just the starting point. The Blueprint policy options include this issue and different ways of approaching. It is a way of linking water quantity to WFD.
- WWF welcomes the development, which places the EU in a global frame that is very active on this issue. WWF wants differentiating eflows targets. Some eflows might be measures, as implementation or restoration/mitigation.
- ES Consultants asks for how much eflows can be reduced under drought situations. COM consultants explains that variability is a key concept for eflows, so under D situations there is a different frame. ES is sometimes using percentiles (10/25), which reflect this issue; and relaxation is discussed in ES plans.

<u>Conclusions</u>: COM invites EG in a round of first comments of the paper in the next 2 weeks, in particular of including EU experiences. In parallel, it will be presented to SCG/WDs to discuss on decide which other EGs should be involved in the further discussion.

7. **Fostering European Drought Research and Science-Policy Interfacing (DROUGHT-R&SPI)**

COM presents some information on the research project and the pan-EU Dialogue forum on 30-31 October 2012 in Cyprus to advance in Drought Research and Science-Policy Interfacing, for expressing scientific views on the Blueprint options. The presentation is uploaded at CIRCA. Discussion on:

- IT (Po) is involved as stakeholder. There is a strong link with this group.
- ETC asks if different desertification grant projects can present results; COM: there will be room but in the frame of the setup of the meeting
- EEA asks for how far the meeting will address vulnerability issues (for management). COM: it is covered by the scope of the project, we need to frame discussions. Policy cycle should be the frame, and vulnerability might be addressed in this context. EEA and COM will discuss further.

8. Blueprint

COM explains the framework, current status and presents the 12 problems and corresponding policy options. The presentation is uploaded at CIRCA. About 50% of the meeting attendants have already have a look at the options paper under consultation. Discussion is developed according to the 12 issues.

- General remark: BE is discussing internally on the options currently, so it is difficult to make comments. ES makes the same remark.
- Regarding Problem 1, ETC recommends making a careful use of the term “water accounts” (footnotes)
- Regarding Problem 2, COM informs that no decision has been taken regarding a WS&D Directive, but it is one of the options being assessed. The “Fitness-check” recognizes the absence of legislation on this issue, but this is only an assessment of the current status, but not an indication for the way forward. UK: Would option 1 only require a “physical link” or should there be a deeper interconnection? COM: this will be discussed in the Blueprint IA. AT will address WS&D in 2nd round of plans similar to the first round, but no DMPs as not considered needed. DMPs should be considered where necessary. Concerns regarding new legislation. IT raises concern that many planning issues are being transferred to emergency management (civil protection issues), so proactive approaches are less relevant. EDO Observatory is now a monitoring tool to understand the past for learning, and not aimed at early warning (as suggested by option 2), so it seems we accept that no planning measures are taken into account. JRC mentions that the second (early-warning) not necessarily excludes the EDO. IT (Po) supports, and explains that DM includes a) water balances and b) DMPs for actions in emergency; there should be a continuous approach. IT concerned about wording on “early warning” and proposes “monitoring and forecasting”. BE supports and refers to previous discussions (e.g. the conclusions of the Council of June 2010). ES considers that all options can fit together. ETC remains that not all are policy options, some are more policy and others more focused under delivery. COM: The combination of options is also assessed by COM. WWF wishes clarification that the process is not selecting one out of

the options, and COM clarifies that there might be a combination, and clarifies that WWF does not see the need for further regulation. Emergency funds have been abused in WWFs point of view. PL asks for the need to clarify what will be the basis for assignments of D-related funds; COM responds that this EG is working to develop a more harmonized approach on D and the indicators could be a tool for supporting decisions on funding. JRC gives some input from agricultural fund requests, which are based on a MS request supported with technical data that are later verified by COM, and eventually requires further bilateral information exchange. AT: other instruments (e.g. DMPs) and steps should be solved before applying emergency funds.

- Regarding Problem 3, BE comments on the role of stakeholders. WWF explains that some are useful tools; maybe guidance is not the best tool (looking at the poor use of previous guidance documents); SEA should be addressed, but possibly not in this EG.
- Regarding Problem 4, IT mentions the data differences that need to be checked, and there might be very relevant issues of costs, in particular e.g. for old buildings. COM explains its interest in using MS data whenever possible; and different initiatives will be assessed separately for costs and benefits (e.g. on old/new buildings). UK would appreciate work on appliances, and asks for complexity of introducing a labeling scheme when MS are currently working on different standards (e.g. UK has a buildings regulations). WWF disappointed with the progress on product standards.
- Regarding Problem 5, COM is developing an important study on leakages (incl. the link to water prices), including 7 pilots on the sustainable economic level of leakages. Targets should be specific and targeted at problems. A consolidated version will be circulated once it is finished (envisaged for June 2012).
- Regarding Problem 8, WWF mentions that it is still unclear how the sustainability standards will be made operational. AT asks for the way the Blueprint can have effects on the CAP, and COM clarifies that this will be dealt with in the implementation rules for the CAP, if relevant.
- Regarding Problem 11, IT asks for the use of INSPIRE.
- Regarding Problem 12, COM asks EG members for reflection and comments on the study on footprinting and labeling, which is uploaded at the website and CIRCA.

COM informs that further discussions will happen again at the Green Week and the EU Water Conferences. WWF asks if MS input will only go via stakeholder consultation. Information will be provided by COM.

9. Mandate review and Next steps

COM presents an outline of what has been achieved so far by the EG under its Mandate, according to the 7 tasks.

Mandate established 7 tasks:

1. Support the definition of commonly accepted indicators for water scarcity and for droughts) in Europe including the demonstration of the added value of these indicators.

- The WD has already validated 2 indicators (SPI and fAPAR) for drought and we expect 1 indicator (WEI+) more for the next meeting. This could be a baseline for fulfilling the task.
- Further work on indicators will be developed further over the coming months.
- The development of further indicators is useful, but difficult to conclude in the 2012 frame of this Mandate.
- Start of an exercise on sharing of best practices on management indicators after the summer. ES will lead the process.

2. Exchange information on WS&D in the first river basin management plans.

- A topic report on how WS&D will be updated with further information from MS and stakeholders by May 2012 and consulted with EG (and will be discussed at the next EG meeting also).
- In consequence, a working Definitions document has been agreed.
- Discussion document on environmental water allocation.
- Experience and learned lessons from the RBMP drafting. Future work might focus on the analysis of the PoM implementation. Study on Pressures and Measures of “eflows” and “drought management plans”.

3. Transfer and exchange experience and expertise with international fora/other regions.

- Exchange has been fostered with the Med WSD activity, WMO, WG C, and several presentations on experiences have been held, including one on the Murray-Darling RBMP (Australia). No work seems necessary.

4. Contribute to the development of the European Drought Observatory (EDO) under development at JRC.

- JRC has closely coordinated the EDO development with the EG, and updated the EG on the developments, including the contribution to the indicator developments. This coordination will continue.

5. Support the creation of Drought Risk Maps, through commonly agreed methodology and scales.

- No activities have so far been developed on Drought Risk Maps. This should be on the agenda for the next meeting, lead by ES.

6. Support the development of a progressive integration of WS&D aspects under WISE, on voluntary basis.

- No specific activities have been developed for the integration of WS&D aspects under WISE. Future work might support the validation and operations of the water accounts. However the EEA and ETC have been closely involved in the EG and thereby ensuring the link to the WISE WS&D reporting.

7. Link WS&D policies and strategies with research initiatives, especially within the FP7 framework (e.g. XEROCHORE project) and promote the use of appropriate technological tools. This can be done in close collaboration with the future SPI ad hoc activity.

- Research projects have fed into the EG in several lines, including overall information (in particular via the October 2011 meeting in Venice), and the development of documents and indicators.
- "Drought Forum" which will be organized in Cyprus on 29-30 October in the frame of a new research project Drought R&SPI (drought research and science policy interface), and EG should be present.
- There is a need for better communication, which will have to be addressed. IT reports for the next EG meeting on research activities, and will eventually propose a presentation for the next EG Meeting.

TWG on WS&D - 25.04.2012

name	Surname	Nationality	organisation	email
Carlos	Benítez	Spanish	Intecsa-Inarsa	carlos.benitez@snclavalin.com
D'hont	Didier	belgian	VMM (Flemish Environmental Agency)	d.dhont@vmm.be
vernoux	jean francois	France	BRGM	jf.vernoux@brgm.fr
Maggie	Kossida	GREEK	NTUA	mkossida@chi.civil.ntua.gr
Renáta	Magulová	SK	Ministry of Environment of the Slovak Republic	renata.magulova@enviro.gov.sk
Bernardo	Mazzanti	Italy	Arno River Basin Authority	b.mazzanti@adbarno.it
Magdalena	Mrkvickova	czech	T.G. Masaryk Water Research Institute, p.r.i.	magdalena_mrkvickova@vuv.cz
Nicola	Poole	British	Environment Agency	nicola.poole@environment-agency.gov.uk
jana	poorova	Slovak	Slovak Hydrometeorological Institute	jana.poorova@shmu.sk
RAFAEL	SANCHEZ	Spanish	TYPSA	rsancheznavarro@gmail.com
Guido	Schmidt	German	Intecsa-Inarsa	guido.schmidt@snclavalin.com
Ernst	Ueberreiter	Austria	Ministry of Environment, BMLFUW	ernst.ueberreiter@lebensministerium.at
JORGE	URETA	SPAIN	SPANISH ENVIRONMENT MINISTRY	Jureta@magrama.es
~~Giuseppina~~	~~Monacelli~~	~~Italian~~	~~ISPRA~~	
Claudia	Vezzani	Italian	Autorità di Bacino del Fiume Po	claudia.vezzani@adbpo.it
SIMONFFY	ZOLTÁN	Hungarian	Ministry of Rural Development, Hungary	simonffy@vkkt.bme.hu
Rudy	VANNEVEL	BE	Flemish Environment Agency	r.vannevel@vmm.be
Javier	Gres	Spanish	C. H. Segura	jgres@pgrconsultores.es

EG on WS&D - 26-27.04.2012

name	Surname	Nationality	organisation	email
Galina	Balusheva Rinkova	Bulgarian	Ministry of Environment and Water	galia@moew.government.bg
DESAINT	Benoit	FRENCH	Eurelectric	benoit.desaint@edftrading.com
D'hont	Didier	belgian	VMM	d.dhont@vmm.be
Morice	Emmanuel	Française	ministère de l'écologie	emmanuel.morice@developpement.-durable.gouv.fr
Peter	Galkowski	Poland	Polish Geological Institute-National Research Inst	ul. Rakowiecka 4, 00-975 Warsaw, POLAND piotr.galkowski@pgi.gov.pl
Agnieszka	Kowalczyk	Polish	Polish Geological Institute	agnieszka.kowalczyk@pgi.gov.pl
Violeta	KUZMICKAITE	Lithuanian	EUREAU GS	v:kuzmickaite@eureau.org
Renata	Magulova	SK	Ministry of Environment of the Slovak Republic	renata.magulova@enviro.gov.sk
Adler	Mary-Jeanne	Romanian	MMP-INHGA	m.adler@hidro.ro
Alison	Maydom	British	Defra	alison.maydom@defra.gsi.gov.uk
Fabio	Micale	Italian	European Commission DG-JRC	fabio.micale@jrc.ec.europa.eu
Giuseppina	Monacelli	Italian	ISPRA	giuseppina.monacelli@isprambiente.it
Massimiliano	Pasqui	Italian	CNR - IBIMET	m.pasqui@ibimet.cnr.it
jana	poorova	Slovak	Slovak Hydrometeorological Institute	jana.poorova@shmu.sk
Guido	Schmidt	German	Intecsa-Inarsa	guido.schmidt@snclavalin.com
FILAR	SLAWOMIR	POLAND	Polish Geological Institute	slawomir.filar@pgi.gov.pl
Runge	Tania	German	Copa-Cogeca	tania.runge@copa-cogeca.eu
Ernst	Ueberreiter	Austria	Austrian Federal Ministry BMLFUW	ernst.ueberreiter@lebensministerium.at
Olli-Matti	Verta	Finnish	Southwest Finland ELY-centre	olli-matti.verta@ely-keskus.fi
Claudia	Vezzani	Italian	Po River Basin Authority	claudia.vezzani@adbpo.it
SIMONFFY	ZOLTÁN	Hungarian	Ministry of Rural Development, Hungary	simonffy@vkkt.bme.hu
RAFAEL	SANCHEZ	SPANISH	INTECSA	rsanchezNavarro@gmail.com
SIMON	LELIE	BELGIAN	EUROPEAN COM. DJ	SIMON.LELIE@EXT.EC.EUROPA.EU
Benitez	Carlos	Spanish	Intecsa	carlos.benitez@snclavalin.com
Javier	Gres	Spanish	PGR - CHSegura	jgres@pgrconsultores.es
JORGE	URETA	SPAIN	MINISTRY	jureta@magrama.es
NICOLA	POOLE	BRITISH	ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	nicola.poole@environment-agency.gov.uk
Maggie	Kossida	Greek	ETC/ICM	mkossida@chi.civil.ntua.gr
Max	Larsen	Dutch	Rijkswaterstaat	max.larsen@rws.nl
Beate	Werner	DK	EEA	beate.werner@eea.europa.eu
guillermo	HERNANDEZ	Spanish	Milieu	guillermo.hernandez@milieu.be
SERGIY	MOROZ	UKRAINE	WWF	