Main objectives of Directive 76/160/EEC

• To protect the environment and public health by reducing the pollution of bathing water and protecting such water against further deterioration.

• Requirements:

  • Identification of bathing areas
  • Compliance with water quality parameters
  • Sampling of bathing waters
  • Reporting to the European Commission
Art 4. “Member States shall take all necessary measures to ensure that within ten years (1986) following the notification of this directive, the quality of bathing water conforms to the limit values set in accordance with Article 3…”

Article 13:
« Every year... the Member States shall send to the Commission a report on the implementation of this directive in the current year...

The report shall be made to the Commission before the end of the year in question.

The Commission shall publish a Community report...within four months of receiving the report »

Format: decision 92/446/EEC
Reported parameters under the BWD

- Total & Faecal coliforms….1990… 2 parameters
- Mineral oils, surface-active substances, phenols…1995… 3 parameters
- Annex BW Directive… 19 parameters

These parameters must be monitored + reported (minimum set)
Reported parameters under the BWD

Other 14 parameters in the BW Directive:

• 5: Concentration to be checked by the competent authorities when an inspection in the bathing area shows that the substance may be present or the quality of the water has deteriorated

Faecal streptococci/ Salmonella/
Enteroviruses/ pH/ dissolved oxygen
Reported parameters under the BWD

Other 14 parameters in the BW Directive:

- **6:** Have no value associated in the Directive: Ammonia/Nitrogen/Pesticides/Heavy metals/cyanides/nitrates & phosphates

- **3:** Minimum sampling frequency: fortnightly Colour, transparency and tarry residues

*Priority is not given by the Commission to those parameters for the status calculation in BW quality*

• Agglomerations above 2000 p.e. (inc. tourist season): secondary treatment (end 2005)

• Agro-food industry

• Imposition of advanced treatment when the quality of protected waters (i.e. bathing waters) is at stake
Reporting in the “new” MS

2004
• 6 MS reported last year: CY, CZ, EE, LI, SK, SI
• Lowest compliance rate: 22.4 % (SK)
• Insufficiently sampled sites: up to 42.9 % (LT)
• Sites banned for bathing: up to 17.9 % (SK)
• Best results (compliance): CY-85%, SI-90%

2005
• **All MS reported this year** Marked improvement for the “6”
• Best results %: EE f, 100. SI c, 94.7. CY c, 100. LT c, 100, f, 98.2

• **ALL EU MS:** compliance: 85f, 96c
• sites: 20000: 14000c, 6000f
Main deliverables regarding BW Report


– Printed reports---short version---20 language versions
– Website:
  *Atlas
  *Lists and detailed maps
  *Long version of report, national reports
    ---English---
Revision of the Bathing Water Directive: main aims

WHY?

Update of legislation due to changes in science, technology and management

• To tighten but to simplify the health standards for bathing water

• To improve the management of bathing sites and the provision of public information about them

• To streamline water quality monitoring programme
The new Bathing Water Directive: Adoption process


October 02: proposal by the Commission

June 03: first-reading opinion by the EP

April 04: Commission’s amended proposal

January 05: Council’s common position
The new Bathing Water Directive: adoption process

May 05: second-reading opinion by the EP

October 05: conciliation agreement on revised bathing water directive

February 06 (15th): adoption of the Directive


• Transposition into national law within two years of its adoption
Main items in the new Bathing Water Directive

Quality and management of bathing water (compared to 76/160/EEC)

• Reduction of 19 parameters to two (microbiological)

• Sampling frequency ~ one sample per month/fortnightly

• Parametric values based on risk (95 and 90 percentile). Different values for fresh and coastal waters. (same in the “old” directive)

• 3 “compliant” categories in water quality: excellent, good and sufficient. Below “sufficient”: “poor”. Two in the “old” directive: compliant with guide and with imperative values.
Main items in the new Bathing Water Directive

• *Quality and management of bathing water:*

  • Establishment of bathing water profiles, to be revised every 2-4 years, to be ready by 2011 (deadline)

  • Discarding of samples is foreseen (no more than 15%, in case of short term pollution)

  • Assessment of quality on the basis of 4 bathing seasons

  • No reference to other recreational activities (initially foreseen in Commission’s proposal)
Main items in the new Bathing water Directive

Public information and participation:

Member States should ensure that the public will find out how to participate in the implementation of the directive.

The results of the monitoring will be available on the Internet upon completion of the analysis.
Main items in the new Bathing Water Directive (adoption process)

Public information and participation:

• Clear and simple warning signs will indicate:
  * causes of pollution and measures taken in "poor" bathing sites
  * current classification
  * temporary deterioration
  * bathing prohibition.

• Deadline for first classification of bathing sites: 2015

• MS will disseminate information to public in several languages.

Main items in the new Bathing Water Directive

Standards and viruses

• Plans to be drawn up for "sufficient", with measures to identify and assess sources of pollution and to reduce the risk of pollution, + indicative timetable for improvement measures.

• The Commission shall submit its report by 2008 on epidemiological studies, including viruses.

• Member States shall, by the end of 2014, submit written observations on the report in view of the Commission review of the directive

• When reviewing the directive, the Commission shall decide on: modification of standards, phasing out the "sufficient" classification;
Council versus EP proposal on quality standards for fresh and coastal waters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parameter</th>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IE (cfu/100 ml)</td>
<td>200*, 100*</td>
<td>400*, 200*</td>
<td>360**, 450* 330** 200**, 250* 185**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC (cfu/100 ml)</td>
<td>500*, 250*</td>
<td>1000*, 500*</td>
<td>900**, 1100* 500**, 550*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*95 percentile
**90 percentile

*Italics: EP.*
**Bold: compromise**
Differences in parametrical values for category “sufficient”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IE (cfu/100 ml)</th>
<th>Council Common Position</th>
<th>EP Amendment</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inland Waters</td>
<td>360**</td>
<td>450*/225**</td>
<td>330** 8.5 risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Waters</td>
<td>200**</td>
<td>250*/125**</td>
<td>185** 7.8 risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*95 percentile  
**90 percentile  
*Risk based on WHO study  
N.B. “Sufficient”: risk between 9%(Council) and 6.4% (EP)