

page	part	issue	content	comment
general comment				It should be added in the report (e.g. in the introduction) that according to water storage there is a change in category from rivers to lakes in many cases (larger reservoir).
5	last paragraph	Significant adverse effect	"...Significant adverse impact..."	"effect" instead of "impact"
5	last paragraph	method	"Most Member States base GEP on the mitigation measures method (kc 40)."	Delete sentence and use results from drainage/flood template on general HMWB issues
8	first paragraph	large dams	In WFD implementing countries, the following states with the largest number of reservoirs are Spain (approx. 1200), Norway (approx. 364) and the UK (approx. 570). Other countries with a large number of reservoirs are Italy (approx. 570), France (approx. 550) and Sweden (approx. 190).	Order of countries should be according to decreasing numbers of reservoirs; DE with 308 reservoirs with large dams is missing in the row and should be added.
29	measure box upstream continuity	Construction fish pass	fish ladder etc.	Add fish lift (also suitable for higher dams)
29	measure box upstream continuity	catch transport & release	transport etc.	Delete "or even lifts are known strategy some places" (lift is comparable to fish pass)
32	6.1, first 4 bullet points	pressures & impacts	"Water abstraction...."	Together with other pressures/impacts in chapter 1.1 (description of figure 1)
38	box, last bullet point	flow alteration and measures	"All countries..."	"Nearly all countries..." (Some countries don't have a general ranking)
42	box measures	Introduce mobilising flows	"....flows sufficient to mobilise sediment"	It should be stated that flushing flows often are not feasible to improve type-specific sediment dynamic downstream of reservoirs. Instead of that, flushing flows from the bottom outlet of reservoirs cause high peaks with high loads of fine sediments in many cases, which is in many cases a critical alteration for river segments downstream.
43	2nd paragraph	Ponded rivers	-	Additional paragraph The technical feasibility of measures for reaching GEP is in general different if a ponded river has navigation as relevant use, especially in the navigation channel.
53 ff.	2nd paragraph	scale of impacts	"several countries (e.g. IT, DE, FR; see Table 8 for full country details) seem not to have assigned a typical minimum length to the impacted reach but determine it on the basis of the combination of pressures and river behaviour, which seems to be varying more than the predefined typical length classes in our MMT."	If the approach of defining water bodies is sensible for river basin management than it is sensible to define relevant impacts in relation to water body length. Impacts should be considered in general if they have a relevant effect on water body level. According to different length of water bodies in member states, absolute length values for considering impacts are only comparable to a limited extent between member states. Table 9 shows a correlation between average length of water bodies and the considered length for impacts for several countries. Please change the paragraph as following: "several countries (e.g. IT, DE, FR; see Table 8 for full country details) seem not to have assigned a typical minimum length to the impacted reach but determine it on the basis of the combination of pressures and river behaviour which considers the size of water bodies. These countries probably have a comparable scale of impact if all relevant impacts on water body level are taken into account."
63	1st box, 3rd/4th bullet point	Reasons for "outruling" measures	"...Significant adverse impact on the water use Significant adverse impact on the wider environment"	"effect" instead of "impact"
64	box, 4th bullet point	Reasons for "outruling" measures	"Other criteria for ruling out measures specified in the WFD, due to either significant adverse impact on the wider environment or disproportionate costs, are less common."	Delete bullet point (content already included)
66	2nd box, 6th bullet point	final clarification	How similar is ecological quality at GEP? Is it more similar for some uses than others?	Please specify which similarity is mentioned here. Similarity between Member States?

page	part	issue	content	comment
67	15.1, 3rd bullet point	common understanding	"typical mitigation measures to be implemented"	Addition of "typical habitat conditions that can be reached"
67	Table 14	fish stocking	"* fish stocking excluded"	Addition of the same comment on fish stocking as on table 14
67	Table 15	upstream continuity	"Uncommonly/rarely"	Please change the frequency from "Uncommonly/rarely" to "More common than not" for DE measure.
67	Table 15	fish flow	DE not included	Addition of DE in category "More commonly than not" as stated in the previous version of the report
69	1st/2nd bullet point	pending issues	- Do we look at similar impacts, regarding type and scale? - Do our national mitigation measure libraries contain similar measures for these impacts?	"similar" should be substituted by "comparable" as in the third sentence
69/70	whole chapter	pending issues	whole chapter	The pending issues sound comprehensible, but it seems not to be realistic to work on all these aspects in a sufficient way within time. The intercalibration of HMWB/GEP should be finished within the current CIS mandate if possible, therefore priorities should be identified. It should be stated more obvious in the report that we already know that a precise "intercalibration" comparable to the natural water bodies will not be possible (in addition of the reasons), so that the aim is a certain "common understanding".