Streamlining monitoring and reporting obligations in environment policy, <u>position paper</u> and additional input on specific questions under point 6

In advance:

<u>**Position Paper NL Remarks on effectiveness and efficiency**</u>

Under point 3 the five key criteria are mentioned. Under point 4, only 2 of the key criteria are mentioned. Relevance (why reporting is in place), coherence and added value are missing.

The NL would like to give the following observations as input.

Assessing effectiveness and efficiency should be done **in light of the aims of a reporting requirement** (a requirement to send/collect certain information). At the MiW expert workshop in Brussels in November 2015[1] we distinguished four aims for sending/collecting information:

- To demonstrate compliance with a legal obligation.
- To determine if the objectives of legislation are being achieved including, where appropriate, contribution to the level playing field.
- To help inform the understanding of an issue and so help to improve decision making and inform policy evaluation.
- Providing specific information to the public at EU level.

Equally important is to bear in mind **who sender and receiver are**. This also is highly relevant for assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of reporting and monitoring. Senders can be businesses, local and regional authorities, Member States. Receivers can be authorities, Member States, the Commission, the EEA, the general public.

<u>**Effectiveness**</u>

Effectiveness of reporting is about whether the reported information serves the intended aim/purpose of the reporting requirement.

Related MiW principles: Value, sufficiency, timeliness, continuity comparability.

Value and sufficiency: Information collected and used should be of value. Is the aim/purpose of the reporting clear (see above for the four aims)? Does the requested information serve that purpose? Is the requested information in that respect sufficient, has it enough detail or too much detail? Or is some of the requested information not really necessary (there is no need to know, but it is nice to know). Has been addressed properly whether the requested information is provided and presented in such a way that the receiver can use it? Is the requested information of sufficient quality to serve the purpose of the reporting (does it need to be validated)?

Timeliness and continuity: For requested information to have value, it must be timely. Whether to assess compliance or evaluate policies, old information may have limited use. In many cases there is value in understanding how environmental pressures, state, etc., change over time. If policies are effective one would expect to see improvements. Therefore, requested information need continuity over time.

---

[1] http://www.ieep.eu/assets/1857/Discussion_paper_for_Workshop_on_Reporting_13-10-15.pdf

Comparability and subsidiarity: depending on the aim of reporting, information collected at EU level may only be of value if the information is comparable across different MS. This means that some uniformity of measuring methods, monitoring processes, analysis, quality assurance, etc., is needed. On the other hand, where comparability is less needed, very detailed reporting requirements often do not serve the purpose of the reporting at stake and are therefore counterproductive. It is better to leave in these cases more flexibility to the MS.

Efficiency

Efficiency of reporting refers to the efforts made and resources used to collect, verify/validate, send, receive, process/access/understand the information. The lower the efforts/resources the more efficient the reporting.

Related MiW principles: proportionality, consistency, timeliness.

Proportionality: assessing proportionality is weighing the burden of a reporting requirement against the value of the information reported. Factors that affect proportionality include the degree of difficulty in obtaining the required information, the amount of detail required, the frequency of reporting, whether there is simple and clear format and process of reporting etc.

Consistency: consistency across the environmental acquis is critical in reducing the burdens: consistency regarding definitions and terms used and regarding formats, systems and processes for reporting across DG ENV (and DG CLIMA, etc) Eurostat, EEA and others. If requirements are more consistent this will also be favorable for reported information to be used more times by different receivers (report once, use many times).

Timeliness: reporting requirements should allow senders to give sufficient time to collect information.

Additional input on specific questions

4.1 Air quality and pollution

Specific comments

As part of the next evaluation of air policies (thematic strategy), following issues may be taken into account:

- Monitoring strategy: what can be done by new (cheaper ?) techniques, like micro sensors & satellite data in combination with measurement techniques – in terms of data quality, timing, cost, level of detail at different spatial scales;
- Problems show up more on a regional/local scale > What kind of information (local scale) do we need? By means of measurements, or do we also use modeling results? Can Satellite information be of help? It makes sense to assess /evaluate what is the information need at the level of the EC for being able to judge the quality of the information reported by the countries?
- On emissions: quality of E-PRTR can hardly be checked because there is no link to or reporting of related activity data. The aim of PRTR (public validation) cannot be achieved because of a lack of transparency;
- Non mandatory information gives red tape and leads to reporting gaps (some countries report this information; others don't and can't be forced to do so) making the whole effort of little value.

4.2 Air quality and pollution

Specific comments

- Some (spatial) information is needed for a broader range of assessments. Info across Europe on population density, location of buildings (and height), location of roads, road density, etc. could more efficiently be collected and stored once (e.g. by EEA?) and used for multiple purposes. This would not only improve efficiency, but also consistency. INSPIRE can be a part of the solution. However the INSPIRE data model is very complicated due to the fact that it should cover all the inconsistent definitions in the various obligations. This should be harmonized.
- On emissions: do we really need a separate NECD inventory/ LRTAP inventory/ Large Point sources collected and reported in the context of LRTAP/LCPD/ E-PRTR/ETS reporting/UNFCCC inventory? Why not one report on facility data (covering IED, E-PRTR, ETS, UWWTP-D, LPS and LCP) and another on national data (EU-MM, NECD, LRTAP, ODS, F- gas D) with HARMONIZED reporting timing and HARMONIZED format and categorisation. As examples, we refer to the discussion about reporting SO_2 and/or SO_x ($SO_2 + SO_3$) to be reported in different obligations. Different definitions used for international shipping and aviation, include natural emission yes or no depending the obligation.
- Speed up the timing of reporting may increase its usability. ETS information is available on a daily/monthly basis. Emissions are reported only by ca. 15 months after the end of the year (so in year (t+2). Validation/verification takes a lot of time.

4.1 INSPIRE

About right

Monitoring and reporting on INSPIRE are not the problem. That is why "about right" is chosen. However there could be more focus on achieving the goals and less focus on the details. The most important is improving the effectiveness (and efficiency) in relationship with the other environmental directives and regulations (see also input for air). EC should be more clear on this.

4.2 INSPIRE

reporting process is neither efficient nor inefficient, some specific improvements could be made

It would be an improvement if monitoring could be fully automatic through the National Georegister. People are already working on this (fully automatic monitoring via National Georegister).

3.3 Objectives

Last question explaining the score "5"
Importance of comparability between MS depends on the geographical scale of ecosystems or environmental issues addressed by the legislation. Comparability is relatively important where MS need to act together to maintain or improve the quality of ecosystems or human health.

It is hard to answer this question for all the different monitoring and reporting obligations.

3.4 Principles

Efficiency: this principle is okay, but is has to be understood correctly. Reference has to made to the Dutch position paper. It has to be clear that this is not about efficiency of the obligations but about the efficiency of the monitoring and reporting itself.

4.5 Process of reporting

Last question tend to agree because of tools for delivering information to European Commission and – in as far as it is possible – making EU sectoral environmental directives "compatible" with INSPIRE.

Additional remark: The efficiency would benefit tremendously when the current formats for the different requirements under Air Quality, that fall within the scope of INSPIRE, get a mapping according to the INSPIRE data model.
In general: harmonizing code lists and definitions of INSPIRE and the sectoral directives where possible for monitoring and reporting has potential. The Commission should take initiative here. Streamlining of information models on EU level (EC/EEA) is needed. This is a precondition for INSPIRE to work.

5. Areas for further consideration

Under the Seveso directive there are reporting obligations. Reported information has to be disseminated. This is causing problems in several member states. For security reasons NL has chosen to make some information public www.risicokaart.nl. Being information on activities with dangerous substances in their own environment or in another environment. If they would like to have more information this has to be requested from the competent authority.
De Commission only distinguishes public and confidential environmental information. MSs have to account for confidential information to the Commission. In NL the information is not confidential,

but for professional use and available after request. These MS choices should be respected and made possible under EU legislation.