**1st Romanian-Hungarian meeting on the harmonsation of Water Framework Directive implementation in line with the requirements for the preparation of the Roof Report 2004 – part A for the Danube River Basin District**

**15-16 April 2004, Gyula**

**Participants of the meeting:**

Romania:

Petru SERBAN
National Administration "Apele Romane"
petru.serban@rowater.ro

Daniela RADULESCU
National Administration "Apele Romane"
daniela.radulescu@rowater.ro

Graziella JULA
National Administration "Apele Romane"
graziella.jula@rowater.ro

Dan TEODOR
National Administration "Apele Romane"
dan.teodor@rowater.ro

Marius SUIUGAN
Crisuri Water Directorate
marius.suiugan@dac.rowater.ro

Mihai BRETOTEAN
National Institute of Hydrology and Water Management
mihai.bretotean@hidro.ro
mbretotean@yahoo.com

Hungary:

BUZÁS Zsuzsa
Ministry of Environment and Water (MoEW)
buzaszs@mail.kvvm.hu

CSÁKI Zsuzsanna
MoEW
csaki@mail.kvvm.hu

JELINEK Gabriella
MoEW
jelinek@mail.kvvm.hu

POROSZLAI Józsefné
MoEW
poroszlai@mail.kvvm.hu

SÁRVÁRYNÉ SZENTKATOLNAY Blanka
MoEW
szentkatolnay@mail.kvvm.hu

SIMONFFY Zoltán
BUTE
simonffy@vcst.bme.hu

TÓTH György
Geological Institute of Hungary
toth@mafi.hu
Dr. WÁGNER János
Environmental Inspectorate of Körös District
kovikofe@ktm.x400GW.ITB.hu
WÁGNER Mária
Environmental and Water Directorate of Körös District
wagner.maria@korkovizig.hu

## 1. Opening of the meeting

After welcome of Mr. Bak Sándor the director of the Körös River Valley Environment and Water Management Directorate and introduction of the participants the agenda was accepted. (Annex 1.) Mr.Serban and Ms.Buzás gave information about the WFD national implementation process and the related bilateral harmonisation.

## 2. General presentations

Mr. Zoltán Simonffy presented the Hungarian approach on:

- river typology and surface water bodies
- delineation of groundwater bodies
- possible Romanian – Hungarian transboundary groundwater bodies

Ms. Gabriella Jelinek gave information about the ongoing bilateral processes of harmonisation of GIS datasets. She explained the Hungarian proposal for bilateral harmonisation.

Ms. Graziella Jula gave presentation on defining stream typology based on abiotic and biotoc approaches.

Ms. Daniela Radulescu gave presentation on surface water bodies delineation and quantitaive criteria for evaluation of pressures in order to designate the HMWBs.

Mr. Mihai Bretotean gave presentation on delineation of groundwater bodies in Romania and about the possible transboundary groundwater bodies with Hungary.

After discussion of all presenatations the participants continued the work in three groups: surface water, groundwater and GIS .

The presentations were exchanged.

**Surface water issues:**

The experts (Mr.Serban, Ms.Jula, Ms.Radulescu, Mr.Suiugan, Ms.Buzás, Ms.Poroszlainé, Ms.Sárváryné, Dr.Wágner, Ms Wágner) discussed the fill-in of the ICPDR templates No 1. sheet 6. – Description of WB; No 1. sheet 3.- Location HMWB and No 1. sheet 4 – Description of HMWB abd No 1 shet – WB at risk.
They agreed upon the datasets of the six transboundary rivers for the Roof report:

Szamos / Somes
Fehér Körös / Crisul Alb
Fekete Körös / Crisul Negru
Sebes Körös / Crisul Repede
Berettyó / Barcau
Maros / Mures

Typology – Both countries have used the system B for defining the stream typology, taking into account the obligatory parameters and optional parameters.
Regarding to the obligatory parameters, the geology is interpreted differently. In the Romanian approach, the geology is referring to the geology as a whole structure (calcareous, siliceous, organic) and in the Hungarian approach, geology is referring to the geochemistry of the water.

The Hungarian geochemical assessment was based on measurements of ionic composition of water ($Ca^{+2}$,$Mg^{+2}$,$Na^{+}$,$HCO3^{-}$,$CO3^{-2}$,$Cl^{-}$,$SO4^{-2}$) carried out from all types of sites (natural and antropogenically disturbed sites). The assessment was focusing on the level Ca, Mg,HCO3 type of the water which reflects high buffer capacity.

The Romanian stream typology approach has taken into account the parameters which define natural or near natural conditions.

Regarding to the optional parameters, the Romanian approach takes into consideration the following:

- lithological bed structure;
- slope;
- multiannual mean specific flow;
- specific yearly minimum monthly flow 95%;
- multiannual mean precipitation;
- multiannual mean temperature.

The Hungarian approach is taking into account the following parameters:

- landscape character: slope, natural vegetation, etc;
- river bed substratum

Regarding to the stream types, Romanian typology indicates the defining of 2 different types for the stream sectors with wetlands and stream sector without wetlands, which is also the case of the all transboundary Romanian-Hungarian types (defined as stream sectors with wetlands in plain area).

The Hungarian approach does not consider wetlands and oxbows as a separate type inside the floodplain area.

Also, it was mentioned that these transboundary types represent the sectors located in the downstream parts of the rivers, which collect waters from upstream river catchments with various geology (siliceous, calcareous and organic) and which influence the characteristics of waters, the distinction among these being difficult to be made.

Due to these difference, at this stage it was not possible to define common types for transboundary Romanian-Hungarian rivers. After the monitoring system fully compliant with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive will be in place, more data will be available and these will lead to the re-analysing and redefining of the existing types and to the defining of possible common transboundary types.

SWB_HMWB
Because at the Romanian-Hungarian border there are two different types – for the time being -, different water bodies were defined using as WB limit, the state border. All water bodies at the border were identified provisionally as HMWBs.

Romanian and Hungarian delegations agreed on the following templates, for the border water bodies:

- Template 1, sheet (6) – Description of WB
- Template 1, sheet (3) – Location of HMWB
- Template 1, sheet (4) – Description of HMWB
- Template 1 on risk assessment - there are different analyse and interpretation system for risk assesement (the new ICPDR deadline is the mid of May)

Where the national length of the HMWBs is less then 50 km, but together with the neighboring part is more, this will be included into template No 1 sheet 3, as HM strecth with remarks.

Both countries will send agreed part of the templates to the ICPDR and paralell to each other. The above mentioned Romanian templates and the Hungarian data are attached as Annex 2-3.

The Hungarian party handed over the printed map and the draft table of all waterflows and channels crossing the border to the Romanian party for cheking. Romania will add the Romanian names of the waterflows and chanals and check wether the sign "1" (more than 10 km2) or "0" (less than 10 km2) is relevant for the Romanian catchment area. The deadline of cheking is 30 November 2004.

**Groundwater issues:**
The experts (Mr.Bretotean, Mr.Simonffy, Mr.Tóth) discussed the delineation of transboundary GWBs.
The result of the discusion is enclosed in Annex 4.
The necessary harmonisation for the country reports will be carried out since June 2004. via e-mail, eventually a meeting will be held in September 2004. The Maros/Mures and the Szamos/Somes groundwater sytems have been selected for IDPDR Roof Report (see Annex 4), because the Mares/Mures groundwater system is important and was agreed by Romanian – Hungarian Hydrotechnical Commission, the Szamos/Somes groundwater system is important and was investigated within a common NATO project. In Annex 4. Responsible for submission of the Szamos/Somes GWB is Romania and for the

Maros/Mures GWB is Hungary. Contribution of the other country will be sent to the responsible country by 20. April 2004,

**GIS issues:**

The experts (Mr.Teodor, Ms.Jelinek) discuss about the harmonisation of datasets concerning cross boundary rivers between Romania and Hungary. They agreed according to the Annex 5.

**Future activities for 2004**

- identification of all transboundary surface water bodies for the national reports
- delineaton of all transboundary groundwater bodies for the national reports
- harmonisation of datasets according for the above mentioned tasks

The experts will continue the work directly and as well via e-mail.

The Heads of delegations will agree upon the date of the next meeting for the transboundayr related parts of the national reports.

Gyula, 16. April 2004.

Petru Serban
Head of the Romanian delegation

Buzás Zsuzsa
Head of the Hungarian delegation

Annex 1.

**AGENDA**

15-16th April 2004, Gyula, Hungary

Session 1.

- Objectives of the meeting – information on the national WFD issues

Session 2.

- General presentations from both countries:
  - (1) on river typology and surface water bodies,
  - (2) on delineation of groundwater bodies,
  - (3) GIS related questions
- Discussion on the possibilities of harmonisation and on how to handle differences

Session 3.
(Surface water, groundwater and GIS groups in parallel sessions)

- Surface water
  - (1) identification of all transboundary water bodies of rivers
  - (2) looking through the ICPDR-templates for rivers with catchments over 4000 $km^2$ for the Roof Report (water bodies, heavily modified wb., risk assessment) inc. all relevant issues of common interest
  - (3) discussion on GIS issue

- Groundwater
  - (1) identification of all transboundary groundwater bodies
  - (2) discussion on common groundwater bodies proposed for the roof report
  - (3) common filling-in of ICPDR-template for transboundary groundwater bodies
- GIS
  - (1) Bilateral harmonisation of datasets concerning cross boundary rivers between Romania and Hungary
  - (2) Common "fix points"

Session 4.

- Summary of the results and common proposals
- Preparation of the draft minutes with work plan for further negotiation