

Comments on the Report

- The report should imply that if N assessments has not ben carried out it is a gap
→ Its is not always relevant.
- Some problems with the methods used in analysing the information in the report. (box plots give the wrong picture as some values are more important than others)
- Boundary values may be miss-leading because they do not say anything about application

Reason why a certain method is (not) applied

- BQE are not intercalibrated
- In-cooperate risks (e.g. 90% percentile)
- Historic tradition
- Political reasons

How to obtain „high status“

- Different approaches
- No clear picture across EU
- There might be exception to the concept of high status (e.g. Role of geology for setting boundaries)

Other reasons for the differences in MS boundary values?

- MS use them in different situations
- Precation is built in or not
- Political issues

-> The understanding of this issues is limited

How are boundaries used

- DE: uses the supporting elements as a further indication of the problem
- AT: Used for licensing
- They are just 2 values in a more complex system
- Are they target values or are they standards?

Recommendations/next steps

- Values should be based in scientific evidence
- Focus on the 3rd cycle
- Future effort to work on pressure-response
- Further work on application of boundaries in classification assessments
- Work on how boundaries are (not) used for designing the POM ???
- Draft paper on way forward to be discussed by the group