

Part 1: Relating to pressure-response relationships in general and approaches used by MS

◆ What kind of pressure-response relationships were used?

- YES:
 - regression: NO (PP: lakes, PB&MZB: rivers), NL (PP: lakes, PB&MZB: rivers), UK (PB&MP: rivers),
 - categorical: IE (only MZB), LT (PP, MZB, FI: lakes; PB&MP, MZB, FI: rivers)
- NO:
 - BE (WL) → statistical
 - BE (FL) → expert judgement
 - UK → expert judgement for lakes
 - HU → expert judgement (refinement process using biological data)*
 - PL → expert judgement (plans to use pressure-impact relationships)*
 - LV → expert judgement
- *Validated (how?) by biology: Hungary, Poland
- Lumping biological types (to increase the pressure gradient, assuming similar pressure-impact relationship)
- 2 step process: setting thresholds, interpreting WB score (from observed values)

Part 1: Relating to pressure-response relationships in general and approaches used by MS

- ◆ What are the main obstacles for **not** using pressure-response relationships ?
 - lack of data, short pressure gradient
 - Political reasons: convenience (referring to old, established standards)

Part 1: Relating to pressure-response relationships in general and approaches used by MS

- ◆ What are the main difficulties to using pressure-response relationships ?
 - Noisy datasets (due to multiple pressures)
 - R^2 above a certain value to use pressure-impact relationships; equivalent necessary for categorical approach

Part 1: Relating to pressure-response relationships in general and approaches used by MS

- ◆ If pressure-response relationships were used, how can the results be interpreted?
- ◆ How to deal with uncertainty, particularly for rivers?
 - Define uncertainty (incl. critical R^2 -values)
 - MS should chose value within this range of uncertainty
 - Document reasons of choice
 - Our guidance should provide arguments for pros and cons of different nutrient boundary setting

Part 2: Relating specifically to the findings of the report on pressure-response relationships

- ◆ What is the opinion of the participants on the approaches proposed in the report?
- ◆ Can these approaches be used to set nutrient boundaries to “good” biological boundaries?
- ◆ Can these approaches be used to check the correspondence of the MS boundaries to “good” biological boundaries?
 - **Need for guidance:** no comparison of national boundaries but devising methodological approach
 - Comments by end of February to be amended for April ECOSTAT
 - Paragraph in the conclusions (summary of main principles towards designing a guidance)

→ *Keeping the momentum !*

Part 3: the way forward ...

- Finalize current report until ECOSTAT in April 2016
- Produce guidance (setting up working group incl. volunteering MS) in 2016
- Provide tools (e.g. R scripts) to implement guidance
- Helping MS to apply guidance (in the context of a technical workshop) in 2017

Additional consideration

- Do not forget to define appropriate nutrient values for reference (high status)!