WG Nutrients

Nutrient pollution is one of the key issues to be addressed in the DRB Programme of Measures

Issues addressed

- Data collection and assessment
- Scenarios development
- Cost-effective measures to better manage nutrients

Data collection and assessment

- Needed for MONERIS and PM EG
- Use the data to validate and calibrate models to justify measures
- Differences of the types (emission and in-stream), availability and quality of data
- Need for further extension and harmonization of the data network from local scale (farm planning) to the Black Sea

Scenarios development

- Scenario development for agriculture is more difficult than for urban waste water
- Scenarios support awareness raising and policy making (from development to evaluation)
- ICPDR to stimulate scenarios development and harmonization

Cost-effective measures for nutrient management

- The same measure can result in different effects and costs in different countries and regions
- Unilateral actions may be more costly than basin-wide agreed set of measures
- Developed criteria how to contribute to jointly contribute to nutrient reduction target
- Need of a thorough analysis on the effects of different measures in the DRB countries

An empirical example of the political goal of achieving 50% nutrient reduction in the Baltic Sea

	Costs (mill EUR)	Reduction in %	Costs (mill EUR)	Reduction in %
Sweden	171	42	213	50
Germany	58	15	4,816	50
Poland	358	59	124	50
Estonia	47	54	34	50
Latvia	147	66	29	50
TOTAL (all Baltic Sea countries)	1,328	50	5,711	50

The costs of joint action *vs.* unilateral action → joint action leads to lower overall costs (cost-effective solution!)

Results of a study by Gren et al. (1997): *Cost-effective Nutrient Reductions to the Baltic Sea*.