

# Common Understanding of Using Mitigation Measures for Reaching Good Ecological Potential for Heavily Modified Water Bodies

## Part 1: Impacted by water storage

### Publication

[Report](#)

### Citation

Halleraker et al. (authors). Kampa, Eleftheria and Sebastian Döbbert-Grüne (eds.) 2016: Working Group ECOSTAT Report On Common Understanding Of Using Mitigation Measures For Reaching Good Ecological Potential For Heavily Modified Water Bodies. Luxembourg.

In the latest Work Programme 2016-2018 of the Common Implementation Strategy (CIS) of the Water Framework Directive (WFD), the Water Directors of European countries agreed to set up a specific Ad-hoc Task Group (ATG) on best practice and guidance to deal with hydromorphology. In this context, one of the core activities of the Working Group (WG) ECOSTAT of the WFD CIS has been to compare the ecological quality expected by different countries for water bodies impacted by water storage. The process involved the use of a number of workshops and questionnaires to collect relevant information from European water managers. This report is based on information collected via a template on mitigation measures for water bodies impacted by water storage, which was completed by 23 countries and edited by Eleftheria Kampa (Ecologic Institute) and Sebastian Döbbert-Grüne (Planungsbüro Koenzen).

This report was written by the GEP water storage core group of the WG ECOSTAT.

Hydromorphological alterations for water storage are among the most widespread pressures on water bodies in Europe. Because of the importance of the water uses relying on water storage, such as hydroelectricity generation and public water supply, many of the affected water bodies have been designated as heavily modified. However, in a substantial number of these water bodies, the effects of the alterations are expected to require some mitigation if good ecological potential (GEP) is to be achieved.

The report is available for download.

### Language

English

## Authorship

Jo Halvard Halleraker (Norwegian Environment Agency)  
Wouter van de Bund (European Commission DG Joint Research Centre)  
Martina Bussetini (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research, Italy)  
Richard Gosling (Scottish Environment Protection Agency, UK)  
Sebastian D'Elbelt-Grüne (Planungsbüro Koenzen in order of the German LAWA, Germany)  
Janine Hensman (Scottish Environment Protection Agency, UK)  
Johan Kling (Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management, Sweden)  
Veronika Koller-Kreimel (Federal Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, Austria)  
Peter Pollard (Scottish Environment Protection Agency, UK)

## Credits

**edited by:** [Eleftheria Kampa](#) (Ecologic Institute) and Sebastian D'Elbelt-Grüne (Planungsbüro Koenzen)

## Published in

JRC Technical Reports

## Published by

[Publications Office of the European Union](#) (Publications Office), International

## Year

2016

## Dimension

103 pp.

## ISBN

978-92-79-64993-6 (print), 978-92-79-64994-3 (pdf)

## ISSN

1018-5593 (print), 1831-9424 (online)

## DOI

10.2760/722208 (print), [10.2760/649695](#) (online)

## Project

[Harmonisation of Good Ecological Potential for Heavily Modified Water Bodies \(HMWB\)](#)

## Project ID

[2316-05](#)  
[2123](#)

## Table of contents

Acknowledgements  
Abstract

1	Introduction	
1.1	Scope of the report	
1.2	Key principles of Heavily Modified Water Bodies and Ecological Potential	
1.3	Intercalibration of ecological status and potential	
1.4	Mandate and scope of the information exchange on GEP mitigation measures	
1.5	Relevant water uses for HMWB designation	
2	Water storage and impacts on water bodies	
2.1	Key principles of hydropower and water storage	
2.2	Large dams for water storage in Europe	
2.3	HMWB designation due to hydropower	
2.4	Key terms in this report	
3	European questionnaires on Mitigation Measures for water bodies impacted by water storage	
3.1	Overview of mitigation measure template	
3.2	Specific questions in the mitigation measure template	
3.3	Responding countries	
4	Report structure & content	
5	Key measures to mitigate impacts from water storage in Europe	
5.1	Overview of key measure types	
5.2	Mitigation of impacts in national lists of mitigation measures	
6	Mitigation for interrupted continuity for fish	
6.1	Description and applicability	
6.1.1	Mitigation measure options or combinations needs	
7	Mitigation for flow alteration	
7.1	Description and applicability	
7.1.1	Mitigation measure options or combinations needs	
8	Mitigation for sediment alteration	
8.1	Description and applicability	
8.1.1	Mitigation measure options or combinations needs	
9	Mitigation of ponded rivers (impoundments)	
9.1	Description and applicability	
9.1.1	Mitigation measure options or combinations needs	
10	Mitigation of lake level alteration	
10.1	Description and applicability	
10.1.1	Mitigation measure options or combinations needs	
11	Mitigation for physico-chemical alteration	
11.1	Description and applicability	
11.2	Mitigation measure options or combinations needs	
12	Sustainable vs. non-sustainable mitigation solutions	
13	Scale of impacts typically mitigated	
14	Significant adverse effect on water use and wider environment	
14.1	Significant adverse effect upon storage for hydropower	
14.2	Significant adverse effect upon storage for uses other than hydropower	
14.3	Significant adverse effects on wider environment	
15	Reasons for 'outruling' measures	
16	Minimum requirements for GEP and objective setting	
17	Key findings	
17.1	Understanding the impacts on ecological condition	
17.2	Minimum spatial scale of impacts requiring mitigation	
17.3	How comprehensive are the mitigation measures libraries of the responding countries?	
17.4	Assessing the degree of similarity between responding countries on impacts and mitigation measures	
17.5	Assessing the degree of similarity on ecological and practical effectiveness of measures	
17.6	Comparability of criteria to select/rule out mitigation measures	
17.7	Assessing similarity on adverse effect on water use	
17.8	Minimum ecological requirement for GEP	
18	Conclusions and recommendations	

18.1 GEP is possible to harmonise  
18.2 Common terminology  
18.3 Emerging good practice  
18.4 Minimum requirements for GEP or use of exemptions in HMWB  
18.5 Clarify criteria for determining significant adverse effects on water use  
18.6 Spatial scale and relevance of impacts  
18.7 Applying national methods to a common set of HMWBs  
References  
List of abbreviations and definitions  
List of figures  
List of tables

## **Keywords**

[Water](#)

Water Framework Directive, heavily modified water bodies, good ecological potential, hydropower

---

**Source URL:** <https://www.ecologic.eu/14545>