OSPAR CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT OF THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC

National Eutrophication Assessment Report under the Common Procedure

Ireland

Report on the Third Application of the Comprehensive Procedure

2016

Compiled by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Marine Institute

Table of Contents

1.	Summary4
2.	Introduction5
3.	Description of the assessed area5
	Delineation of estuarine and nearshore coastal water bodies5
	Delineation of coastal and offshore water bodies for winter nutrient assessment5
	Table 1. Irish coastal and offshore marine areas for the purpose of the nutrient trendassessment
	Figure 1. Location of estuarine and nearshore coastal water areas for the third assessment7
4.	Methods and data9
	Environmental Protection Agency – sampling and analytical methods
	Marine Institute – sampling and analytical methods9
	National Assessment Scheme and the OSPAR Comprehensive Procedure10
	Table 2. Parameters and assessment levels for Irish estuaries, bays and nearshore coastal watersused in the TSAS scheme.11
5.	Eutrophication assessment
	5.1 Summary of data12
	5.1.1 Estuarine and nearshore coastal waters12
	Figure 3. Percentage below or above the assessment levels for winter DIN (top) and MRP (bottom) in 2006-2008 and 2010-2014
	Figure 4. Mann Kendall trend analysis on TP (left) and TN (right) inputs from 2006-2013. Only siginifcant trends are plotted
	Figure 5. WFD assessment of elevated Chlorophyll (large circles) and elevated individual taxa counts (inset circles) using WFD assessment tool (2007-2012)
	5.1.2 Coastal and offshore waters: Winter nutrients assessment
	Figure 6. Spatial coverage of the stations where salinity>33 within the major regions of Irish coastal, shelf and offshore waters between 1997 and 2014. 2b Station positions of the separate transects in the Irish Sea where trends were assessed. Station plots of individual years are in Figure 1 in the Appendix
	Table 3. Trend results for median nutrient and salinity concentrations (at salinity > 33) for the different regions in Figure 1 from 2006-2014. Significant P-values (<0.05) are highlighted17
	Table 4. Trend results for median nutrient and salinity concentrations (at salinity > 33) for the different regions in Figure 1 for the full length of the time series. Significant P-values (<0.05) are highlighted
	Figure 7. Annual Median winter concentrations of TOxN, Phosphate, N:P, N:Si and P:Si ratios per area between 2006 and 2014 in all regions. OSPAR nutrient assessment criteria are also shown (50% above background e.g. 12μM ToxN for the Irish Sea and 15μM ToxN for other coastal and offshore waters)
	5.2 Parameter-related assessment
	5.2.1 Estuarine and nearshore coastal waters (sub-areas)20

2

Figure 8. Initial classification of estuarine and nearshore coastal waters and Final classific	cation.
	20
5.2.1 Coastal and offshore waters	20
5.4 Overall assessment	20
Figure 9. Overall classification for the Third Application of the OSPAR Comprehensive Pro included the offshore areas assessed as non-problem areas	
Figure 10. Comparison between 1st, 2 nd and 3 rd application of the comp	22
6. Comparison and/or links with European eutrophication related policies	22
8: Perspectives	23
9. Overall summary and conclusions from the national report	23
10. References	24
11. Annexes	26
Annex 1: IRELAND – Third Application of the Comprehensive Procedure	26
Annex 2a Boxplots of TOxN, Phosphate, Silicate, N:P ratios and salinity for each region highlighted in Figure 2a and each transect in Figure 2b	
Annex 2b: Station positions of surface winter nutrient samples for each individual yea included in the assessment	
Annex 3: link to assessment table	

3

1. Summary

This report contains the outcome of the third application of the OSPAR Comprehensive Procedure by Ireland and is primarily based on data collected between 2006 and 2014. A total of 83 water bodies (estuarine and nearshore coastal waters) have been included in the assessment along with 7 coastal and offshore areas.

In this third assessment, 20 areas (24%) have been classified as Problem areas, 16 (19%) as potential problem areas and 47 (57%) as non-problem areas. All coastal and offshore areas remain classified as non-problem areas.

In the second application, 26 (41%) were classed as problem areas, 5 (8%) were classified as potential problem areas and 32 (51%) were classified as non-problem areas. The coastal and offshore waters, which were divided into 7 separate assessment zones for screening, were all classified as non-problem areas.

The assessment has shown that the largest number of problem areas, are located inshore, and predominantly along the eastern, south eastern and southern coasts of Ireland. In general, this distribution reflects the greater impacts that arise from pressures associated with higher human population densities and more intense agricultural activities in these regions.

All coastal and offshore areas remain as non-problem areas and trend analysis shows little change in nutrient levels of Ireland's marine waters.

Overall, in terms of extent, the proportion of Ireland's maritime area that is classified as a problem area with regard to eutrophication is small and restricted to estuarine and nearshore coastal waters. These areas fall under the regime of the EU Water Framework Directive, which has established programmes of measures to ensure that the environmental objectives that have been set for these waters are met.

2. Introduction

Under the OSPAR convention, eutrophication is defined as:

The enrichment of water by nutrients causing an accelerated growth of algae and higher forms of plant life to produce an undesirable disturbance to the balance of organisms present in the water and to the quality of the water concerned, and therefore refers to the undesirable effects resulting from anthropogenic enrichment by nutrients.

A key element of the OSPAR Strategy to Combat Eutrophication is the Comprehensive Procedure for the Identification of the Eutrophication Status of the Maritime Area. This Procedure, adopted by OSPAR in 1997, sets the framework within which it is the responsibility of individual OSPAR Contracting Parties to assess the eutrophication status of their parts of the OSPAR maritime area.

This report contains the results of Ireland's third application of the Comprehensive Procedure and follows the first application of the Comprehensive Procedure in 2003 and second application in 2007.

3. Description of the assessed area

A map of the assessment area including the location of individual sub-areas and the general sampling area of estuarine, near-shore coastal and offshore waters is shown in Figures 1 and 2.

Delineation of estuarine and nearshore coastal water bodies

The boundaries of the estuarine and nearshore waters included in this assessment are those that have been developed for the Water Framework Directive and those that had been previously identified for the purposes of the Urban Waste Water Treatment and Nitrates directives. The landward boundary of a transitional water body (estuarine) was defined as the upper tidal (either freshwater or saltwater) limit, with the outer boundary, in the majority of cases, being defined by a surface salinity value of 30.0 PSU (Practical salinity Unit). Some large transitional waters were further sub-divided into practical management units based on existing information on the impact from known pressures. The inshore boundary of coastal stretches and bays was defined by the outer limit of the adjacent transitional water, with the outer limits of these waters being drawn according to the most prominent enclosing headlands or other significant physical features as appropriate. The outer limit of more offshore coastal water bodies was demarcated by the baseline plus 1-nautical mile seaward boundary of the WFD.

Delineation of coastal and offshore water bodies for winter nutrient assessment

The boundary of the offshore waters in this assessment includes Ireland's Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) boundary, MSFD areas and extends out to surface waters of the Rockall trough, as indicative of background off-shelf nutrient levels. Irish coastal and offshore waters were separated into 7 areas, broadly based on salinity regime, hydrographic characteristics and other features such as riverine inputs (Table 1). Assessments of nutrient status vs areas-specific criteria and temporal trends for these areas were carried out for water of salinity >33.

Table 1. Irish coastal and offshore marine areas for	the purpose of the nutrient trend assessment.
Tuble 1. Insh coustal and onshore marine areas for	the purpose of the nutrient trend assessment.

	Area	Description	Main riverine inputs and other features
1	NE Irish Sea	Carlingford to South Dublin	Main riverine inputs are the R. Liffey and R. Boyne
2	SE Irish Sea	South Dublin to Waterford Harbour, including St. George's Channel	Main riverine inputs are the R. Avoca, R. Slaney and the Barrow, Nore and Suir rivers (into Waterford Harbour). Also some influence from the Severn/Wye (trans-boundary UK)
3	Celtic Sea	Waterford Harbour to Mizen Head	Main riverine inputs are the Rivers Blackwater and Lee
4	SW Coastal Waters	Mizen Head to Galway Bay	Main riverine inputs are the Rivers Shannon and Corrib
5	NW Coastal Waters	Galway Bay to Lough Foyle	Main riverine inputs are the Rivers Corrib, Erne and Foyle
6	Western Shelf	Across the shelf until the shelf break	No direct riverine inputs
7	Rockall Trough*	Across Rockall Trough	No riverine inputs. Deep winter mixing regenerates nutrients to surface.

*note area mostly outside the Irish EEZ





7



Figure 2. Stations with salinity >=33 psu, sampled for winter surface dissolved inorganic nutrients during shipboard environmental and oceanographic surveys between 2008 - 2014

4. Methods and data

The main source of data used in this assessment is derived from the Environmental Protection Agency's national estuarine and nearshore coastal waters monitoring programme and the Marine Institute's annual winter monitoring programme of coastal and offshore Irish waters. The winter component of the both the EPA and Marine Institute programmes are carried out between the months of November to March inclusive, with the summer component of the EPA programme being undertaken between the months of May to September inclusive.

Environmental Protection Agency – sampling and analytical methods

Monitoring is undertaken four times per annum, once in winter and three times over the summer months (May- September) in estuarine and coastal areas around Ireland. Winter monitoring is carried out to assess trends and maximum concentrations in inorganic nutrients in the absence of biologically induced variability, whereas summer monitoring is designed to detect the direct and indirect effects of nutrient enrichment such as accelerated plant growth and impacts on oxygenation conditions.

Sampling is carried out at multiple locations throughout the water body, and at multiple depths and is undertaken, where practicable, as close to low and high water to capture tidally driven variability.

Field measurements include temperature, salinity, dissolved oxygen (percent saturation), secchi depth. The water samples, which are collected using Ruttner sampling bottles, are analysed for pH, ammonia (NH3), total oxidised nitrogen ($NO_2 + NO_3$), ortho-phosphate (PO_4 , - Molybdate Reactive Phosphorus), biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and chlorophyll A variety of techniques are used to analyse the samples such as flow-injection colorimetry for nutrients and UV spectrometry for chlorophyll, which is extracted using the hot methanol technique.

Field instruments used to measure salinity are calibrated against KCL standards of known conductance and chlorophyll fluorescence readings are calibrated against discrete water samples whose chlorophyll a content has been determined in the laboratory. Analytical techniques are validated through intercalibration and intercomparison exercises carried out between the different EPA laboratories.

Marine Institute – sampling and analytical methods

Annual winter nutrient sampling is carried out in January/February on board the *RV Celtic Voyager* for coastal surveys and on the *RV Celtic Explorer* for surveys across the shelf and the Rockall Trough (station positions of each year Annex 2b). Over the last two decades the sampling programme has evolved with coverage initially focusing on Western Irish Sea but subsequently extending into the Celtic Sea. The current winter environmental programme on board the *Celtic Voyager* includes sampling for dissolved inorganic nutrients around the entire Irish coast (coastal water focus) biennially, along with a number of offshore transects completed. Nutrients samples are also collected during Celtic Voyager hydrographic surveys along 53N (shelf) and across the Rockall Trough. Actual winter sampling is highly weather dependent and annex 2b shows the sampling completed on a year by year basis. Given the weather dependence and evolution of sampling approaches, caution must be exercised in comparing summary results from year to year for given areas.

The assessment includes surface waters only, collected from each station at a depth of 2 to 3 metres using either the on-board peristaltic pumping system or using Niskin bottles on the conductivity, temperature and depth (CTD) rosette. All seawater samples for nutrient analysis were filtered using acid-cleaned polycarbonate filters and preserved by freezing. A sub-sample was collected for each sample for accurate salinity analysis.

Total oxidized nitrogen (TOxN), ortho-phosphate (ortho-P), nitrite and silicate were analysed using segmented flow analysers. Discrete salinity samples were analysed using Guildline benchtop salinometers. Vertical profiles of conductivity and temperature were recorded using a Seabird SBE - 911 CTD system. A rigorous quality assurance scheme underpins analysis, including accreditation to ISO 17025 for both nutrient and salinity analysis and participation in QUASIMEME proficiency testing exercises. A detailed description of sample collection, analysis and quality control is outlined in McGrath et al. (McGrath *et al.* 2013).

A relatively simple approach was used to assess temporal trends in surface winter dissolved inorganic nutrient concentrations using non-parametric Mann-Kendall tests using the R platform and the TTA trend analysis package(Devreker and Lefebvre 2014).

Coastal waters with salinity > 33 and offshore waters are compared directly with the OSPAR areaspecific assessment criteria for elevated TOxN (15 μ M for off-shelf waters and 12 μ M for the Irish Sea) and ortho-phosphate (0.8 μ M). Although assessment parameters are related to dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN), ammonia was not determined so TOxN are reported. N:P ratios are assessed for offshore waters using OSPAR assessment criterion of 24 (50% above Redfield Ratio).

National Assessment Scheme and the OSPAR Comprehensive Procedure

The parameters included in Ireland's national trophic status assessment scheme (TSAS), along with their units, assessment levels and statistics are summarised in Table 2. As can be seen from the cause-relationship structure of the scheme, the approach used to assess the trophic status of Irish water bodies is similar to the OSPAR Comprehensive Procedure. Importantly the values for each of these parameters is scaled to take into account the influence of salinity, which is an important factor in determining the water quality characteristics of estuarine and nearshore coastal waters. A full description of the national method can be found in (Toner *et al.* 2005). To summarise, both dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN) and ortho-phosphate (MRP) levels are assessed in summer and winter, chlorophyll data is assessed using a median and 90 percentile approach and oxygen conditions are assessed both in respect of deoxygenation and supersaturation.

As indicated by Ireland in the previous application of the Comprehensive Procedure the use of N:P ratios, while applied in the current assessment to offshore and coastal waters, was not applied to estuarine and nearshore coastal waters that are influenced by freshwater input. Previous examination of over 1000 freshwater sites has shown that the N:P ratio can on average be as high as 75:1.

In addition to water-column monitoring information is also included on the abundance and composition of macroalgae from certain transitional areas. This uses the WFD assessment for opportunistic macroalgal blooms which has been used in Ireland since the implementation of the WFD monitoring programme in 2007. This scheme is comprised of 5 metrics that describe the biomass and coverage of green opportunistic algae in a water body.

Table 2. Parameters and assessment levels for Irish estuaries, bays and nearshore coastal waters used in the TSAS scheme (Toner *et al.* 2005). Assessment criteria are adjusted on a sliding scale from 0-34.5 psu.

Parameter	Numeric Criterion	Statistic	Period to which Criterion Applies
Category A (Nutrient Enrichn	nent)		· · ·
Dissolved Inorganic Nitrogen	mg/l (≈ μM)		
Tidal Fresh Waters (0 psu)	>2.6 (185)	Median	Winter or Summer
Intermediate Waters (1-17)	>1.4 (100)	Median	Winter or Summer
Full salinity Water (>34.5)	>0.25 (18)	Median	Winter or Summer
Ortho-phosphate (MRP)	μg/I (≈ μM)		
Tidal Fresh Waters (0 psu)	>60 (2.0)	Median	Winter or Summe
Intermediate Waters (1-17)	>60 (2.0)	Median	Winter or Summe
Full salinity Water (>34.5)	>40 (1.25)	Median	Winter or Summe
Category B (Accelerated grov	vth)		
Chlorophyll	(µg/l)		
Tidal Fresh Waters (0 psu)	>15 (median) c	or >30 (90 percentile)	Summer
Intermediate Waters (1-17)	>15 (median) c	or >30 (90 percentile)	Summer
Full salinity Water (>34.5)	>10 (median) c	or >20 (90 percentile)	Summer
Category C (Undesirable dist	urbance)		
Tidal Fresh Waters (0 psu)		or >130 (95 percentile)	Summer
Intermediate Waters (1-17)	<70 (5 percentile)	or >130 (95 percentile)	Summer

<80 (5 percentile) or >120 (95 percentile)

Full salinity Water (>34.5)

Summer

5. Eutrophication assessment

5.1 Summary of data

This section provides a summary of the data that have been used in the second application of the Comprehensive Procedure for each of the sub-areas and Irish coastal and offshore waters of the western Irish Sea and eastern Celtic Sea.

5.1.1 Estuarine and nearshore coastal waters

Winter DIN and DIP Concentrations

The assessment of the data from 2006-2014 have been undertaken using a series of rollingaggregations. These assessments consist of other eutrophication assessments undertaken for national and international requirements (e.g. UWWTD, nitrates directive, WFD etc.). The periods assessed are 2006-2008, 2007-2009, 2009-2011, 2010-2012, 2010-2014. These assessments combine all the data across each period which allows for greater confidence in the assessment.

The level of exceedance above or compliance below an assessment parameter is presented as a percentage deviation from the respective assessment level (based on salinity related thresholds detailed in table 2). The use of percentages to represent breaches or compliance with each of assessment parameters provides a means of summarizing the results of the monitoring programme. The percentage exceedance above or compliance below the assessment levels for a winter DIN and MRP (ortho-phosphate) for the first 2006-2008 assessment and the most recent 2012-2014 assessment are shown in Figure 3. This information is summarized in the assessment tables in Annex XX and results of the initial and final classification are given in section 5 below.

A statistical measure of confidence has been calculated based on the methodology proposed by Norway (Molvaer *et al.* 1997, Molvaer *et al.* 2008)



Figure 3. Percentage below or above the assessment levels for winter DIN (top) and MRP (bottom) in 2006-2008 and 2010-2014.

Riverine inputs and direct discharges of total N and total P

Data from the OSPAR riverine inputs programme has been used to assess the levels of inputs of N and P into the marine environment and also to look at trends from 2006-2014. Trends analysis was undertaken using the TTA interface in R using a Mann Kendall trend test with sens estimator. An analysis of total P, total N, MRP, TON and NH3 was undertaken and for all areas assessed there were no upward trends. Significant downward trends in total P were seen in the Deel, Maigue, Erne, Nore and Liffey inputs. Significant declines in total N were seen in 40% of the areas assessed (Figure 4). A summary table is included in the annexes.



Figure 4. Mann Kendall trend analysis on TP (left) and TN (right) inputs from 2006-2013. Only significant trends are plotted.

Winter N:P ratios

As in previous applications of the Comprehensive Procedure, the use of N:P ratios was not applied to estuarine and nearshore coastal waters that are influenced by freshwater input. Previous examination of over 1000 freshwater sites has shown that the N:P ratio can on average be as high as 75:1 and often higher. While in many of the higher salinity nearshore water bodies the N:P was between 16 and 24, in the majority of areas this criteria was not used.

Area-specific phytoplankton indicator species

The assessment of direct effects of nutrient enrichment on the phytoplankton community was obtained from information gathered as part of the WFD monitoring programme. The Irish WFD assessment tool calculates two Ecological Quality Ratios for the assessment of phytoplankton- one based on the Chlorophyll concentration and a second metric looking at abundance of individual taxa above an assessment threshold. WFD assessments of moderate status or worse were considered as indictors of possible direct effects of nutrient enrichment. An analysis of the data from 2007-2012 was used for this assessment, to tie in with WFD assessments.



Figure 5. WFD assessment of elevated Chlorophyll (large circles) and elevated individual taxa counts (inset circles) using the WFD assessment tool (2007-2012).

Elevated growths of opportunistic macroalgae.

Elevated macroalgal growth due to the effects of nutrient enrichment are also assessed using the WFD monitoring tool. This tool is primarily used in estuarine water bodies but is also applied in some coastal areas. 17 areas were assessed- 9 (53%) were high or good status, 5 (29%) were moderate status indicted a degree of direct effects of enrichment and 3 (18%) were of poor status.

Indirect effects

Oxygen deficiency was found at 17% of the estuarine and nearshore coastal waters assessed. The lowest level of deficiency was a saturation of 38% in the Feale estuary following the collapse of a phytoplankton bloom. Other areas with persistent low O_2 levels include the upper Liffey estuary and the Lee estuary in Cork. Some areas in the North west of the country have shown depressed O_2 levels following a series of large phytoplankton blooms of *Karenia* sp. (O'Boyle *et al.* 2016).

Organic carbon/organic matter

Insufficient data was available for a full assessment of organic carbon. The WFD set a BOD value of 4mg/l (95%ile) for transitional waters. This EQS has been breached in 14 areas and is generally related to die off of phytoplankton blooms in the water column.

5.1.2 Coastal and offshore waters: Winter nutrients assessment

A trend assessment of dissolved inorganic nutrient data collected by the Marine Institute in winter between 2006 and 2014, and also between 1997 and 2014 is shown below in Table 3 and 4, respectively, with box plots for each region in Annex 2a.

There are no trends in nutrient concentrations in offshore waters along the western shelf and Rockall Trough between 2006 and 2014. These offshore datasets provide information on background or oceanic nutrient concentrations and support an assessment of the natural variability of nutrient concentrations in seawater.

The more enclosed Irish Sea is subject to greater freshwater influences and the potential for anthropogenic nutrient inputs. No significant trends in nutrient concentrations were observed in the of western Irish Sea areas (at salinities > 33) between 2006 and 2014. Individual transects were examined where greater year to year consistency of sampling was achieved (Figure 6). There is an increase in N:P ratio in the NE Irish Sea over the same period, with an upward trend in both TOxN and N:P ratio along the Liffey transect (within the NE Irish Sea region). There are very small negative trends in phosphate and silicate along the Boyne transect, coinciding with a small positive increase in salinity may be an artefact of the evolving sampling regime. Similarly, there is a small negative trend in salinity in both the NE and SE Irish Sea, with a positive trend in phosphate between 1997 and 2014 may also be an artefact of sampling.

In summary, while there are some significant trends in the data depending on the timescale, these are small and should be treated with caution. There are no major trends in surface nutrient concentrations in coastal (salinity > 33) and offshore waters.

The annual median nutrient concentrations between 2008 and 2014 for each area were plotted against salinity in Figure 7. Median TOxN and ortho-phosphate were lower than the OSPAR criteria (50% above background) in all regions over this period. Most N:P ratios were close to the Redfield Ratio of 16, however N:P ratios were lower in the Irish Sea (12-14) in all years, presumably due to denitrification leading to naturally lower concentrations of TOxN in the Irish Sea compared to the shelf break (Hydes *et al.* 2004). Overall while concentrations of TOxN, P are higher into the Irish Sea and eastern Celtic Sea the concentrations offshore are within the OSPAR criteria which are In

conclusion, there are no indications of elevated nutrient concentrations in Irish coastal (salinity >33) and offshore waters relative to the OSPAR assessment criteria.



Figure 6. Spatial coverage of the stations where salinity>33 within the major regions of Irish coastal, shelf and offshore waters between 1997 and 2014. 2b Station positions of the separate transects in the Irish Sea where trends were assessed. Station plots of individual years are in Figure 1 in the Appendix.

	Sal >33	Trend (uM/yr)	Trend (%/yr)	P-value	Units
NE Irish Sea	PO4	-0.02	-2.68	0.12	μM
2006-2014	TOxN	0.04	0.48	0.47	μM
	Silicate	0.00	0.05	1.00	μM
	Salinity	0.01	0.03	0.60	
	N:P	0.44	3.19	0.03	
SE Irish Sea	PO4	0.00	0.07	1.00	μM
2006-2014	TOxN	0.04	0.47	0.75	μM
	Silicate	0.04	0.68	0.75	μM
	Salinity	-0.02	-0.05	0.60	
	N:P	0.05	0.31	0.92	
Celtic Sea	PO4	0.01	2.05	0.76	μM
2006-2014	TOxN	0.07	0.77	1.00	μM
	Silicate	0.08	1.65	0.76	μM
	Salinity	-0.01	-0.02	1.00	
	N:P	-0.13	-0.76	0.37	
SW Coastal	PO4	0.00	-0.25	0.83	μM
2006-2014	TOxN	0.25	2.57	0.25	μM
	Silicate	0.06	1.20	0.60	μM
	Salinity	-0.07	-0.21	0.35	
	N:P	0.17	0.99	0.35	
Western	PO4	-0.01	-0.93	0.37	μM
Shelf	TOxN	-0.22	-2.37	0.37	μM
2006-2014	Silicate	-0.02	-0.78	0.77	μM
	Salinity	-0.01	-0.02	1.00	
	N:P	-0.11	-0.64	0.76	
Rockall	PO4	-0.01	-2.16	0.09	μM
2006-2014	TOxN	-0.24	-2.24	0.46	μM
	Silicate	-0.28	-8.27	0.09	μM

Т

Т

Table 3. Trend results for median nutrient and salinity concentrations (at salinity > 33) for the different regions in Figure 1 from 2006-2014. Significant P-values (<0.05) are highlighted.

	Salinity	-0.02	-0.05	0.22	
	N:P	-0.04	-0.21	1.00	
Liffey	PO4	-0.01	-2.11	0.35	μМ
Transect	TOxN	0.21	2.67	0.03	μМ
2006-2014	Silicate	0.09	1.46	0.92	μМ
	Salinity	0.00	0.01	0.92	
	N:P	0.56	4.39	0.03	
Boyne	PO4	-0.02	-3.71	0.02	μМ
Transect	TOxN	-0.26	-3.44	0.12	μМ
2006-2014	Silicate	-0.21	-3.19	0.03	μМ
	Salinity	0.07	0.22	0.03	
	N:P	0.01	0.05	1.00	
Arklow	PO4	-0.01	-1.16	1.00	μМ
Transect	TOxN	0.30	3.21	0.55	μМ
2006-2014	Silicate	0.08	1.42	0.55	μМ
	Salinity	-0.03	-0.09	0.37	
	N:P	0.26	1.66	0.76	
Slaney	PO4	0.02	3.08	0.65	μМ
Transect	TOxN	0.20	2.00	0.55	μM
2006-2014	Silicate	0.21	3.44	0.55	μM
	Salinity	-0.01	-0.03	1.00	
	N:P	0.23	1.28	0.37	

Table 4. Trend results for median nutrient and salinity concentrations (at salinity > 33) for the different regions in Figure 1 for the full length of the time series. Significant P-values (<0.05) are highlighted.

	Sal>33	Trend (unit/yr)	Trend (%/yr)	P-value	Units
NE Irish Sea	PO4	0.00	0.61	0.36	μM
1997-2014	TOxN	0.00	-0.02	1.00	μM
	Silicate	0.11	1.68	0.07	μM
	Salinity	-0.02	-0.06	0.01	
	NP	-0.07	-0.45	0.65	
SE Irish Sea	PO4	0.01	1.16	0.01	μM
1997-2014	TOxN	0.02	0.18	0.79	μM
	Silicate	0.05	0.94	0.13	μM
	Salinity	-0.02	-0.05	0.02	
	NP	-0.19	-1.08	0.06	
Celtic Sea	PO4	0.02	2.74	0.21	μM
2003-2014	TOxN	0.11	1.20	0.72	μM
	Silicate	0.03	0.57	0.86	μM
	Salinity	0.00	0.00	1.00	
	NP	-0.34	-1.98	0.05	
Liffey	PO4	0.00	-0.01	0.94	μM
Transect	TOxN	-0.14	-1.65	0.40	μM
1997-2014	Silicate	0.07	1.18	0.26	μM
	Salinity	-0.01	-0.02	0.47	
	NP	-0.20	-1.43	0.40	
Boyne	PO4	0.00	-0.03	0.94	μM
Transect	TOxN	-0.09	-1.19	0.05	μM
1997-2014	Silicate	-0.01	-0.12	0.91	μM
	Salinity	-0.01	-0.02	0.50	
	NP	-0.08	-0.64	0.23	
Arklow	PO4	0.01	1.44	0.03	μM
Transect	TOxN	0.00	-0.05	1.00	μM
1997-2014	Silicate	0.12	2.20	0.12	μM
	Salinity	-0.03	-0.09	0.01	

	NP	-0.29	-1.68	0.14	
Slaney	PO4	0.01	2.52	0.03	μM
Transect	TOxN	0.04	0.44	0.52	μM
1997-2014	Silicate	0.03	0.55	0.62	μM
	Salinity	-0.01	-0.03	0.30	
	NP	-0.23	-1.25	0.17	



Figure 7. Annual Median winter concentrations of TOxN, Phosphate, N:P, N:Si and P:Si ratios per area between 2006 and 2014 in all regions. OSPAR nutrient assessment criteria are also shown (50% above background e.g. 12µM ToxN for the Irish Sea and 15µM ToxN for other coastal and offshore waters).

5.2 Parameter-related assessment

5.2.1 Estuarine and nearshore coastal waters (sub-areas)

Of the 83 areas included in the initial classification, 27 (32%) were classified as problem areas, 24 (29%) were classified as potential problem areas and 32 (39%) were classified as non-problem areas. In the final classification, 20 (24%) were classified as problem areas, 16 (19%) were classified as potential problem areas and 47 (57%) were classified as non-problem areas.



Figure 8. Initial classification of estuarine and nearshore coastal waters and Final classification.

5.2.1 Coastal and offshore waters

Winter dissolved nutrient concentrations are consistently below area-specific OSPAR thresholds for offshore and coastal areas assessed. Nutrient ratios for offshore waters are below OSPAR thresholds. The confidence in this assessment is high as the dataset is substantial with good coverage of the areas assessed.

5.4 Overall assessment

The outcome of the final classification, following appraisal of all relevant information, is shown in Figure 9. In the final classification, 20 (24%) were classified as problem areas, 16 (19%) were classified as potential problem areas and 47 (57%) were classified as non-problem areas.

Figure 9 clearly shows the contrast between the regions with the largest number of problem areas being located along the eastern and south eastern coasts and the majority of non-problem areas being located along the western and north western coasts. In general, this distribution reflects the difference in the magnitude of nutrient inputs from agricultural and municipal wastewater treatment sources that are much greater along the eastern, south eastern and southern coasts.

It is also apparent from Figure 8 that the occurrence of eutrophication is mainly restricted to inshore estuarine waters and rarely extends out to the adjacent more open coastal areas.



Figure 9. Overall classification for the Third Application of the OSPAR Comprehensive Procedure

5.5 Comparison with preceding assessment

In the 3rd application of the OSPAR common procedure, 24% of transitional and coastal waters assessed were identified as Problem areas, 19% as potential problem areas and 57% as non-problem areas. This is an improvement from the 2nd application where 41% were identified as problem areas and in increase from 51% in areas identified as non-problem (Figure 10). As in the previous assessments, offshore waters do not show elevated nutrient concentrations.



Figure 10. Comparison between 1st 2003, 2nd 2007 and 3rd 2015 application of the comp

6. Comparison and/or links with European eutrophication related policies

Urban Waste Water treatment

In 2014, a total of 12 (7%) large urban areas did not meet the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive requirement to provide secondary (biological) treatment (EPA, 2015a). Seven large urban areas did not comply with the Directive's requirement to provide infrastructure to reduce nutrients and discharged effluent that did not meet nutrient quality standards. Untreated sewage was discharged into 45 areas, mostly estuaries or coastal areas. Just 24% of the waste water load discharged into sensitive areas from large towns and cities complied with mandatory EU nutrient quality standards, up from 17.5% in 2013. This is well below the EU average of 88% compliance for nutrients (EC 2016).

The Nitrates Directive and the Nitrates Action Programme

The Nitrates Directive which was adopted in 1991 has the objective of reducing water pollution caused or induced by nitrates from agricultural sources and preventing further such pollution, with the primary emphasis being on the management of livestock manures and other fertilisers. Ireland's national Nitrates Action Programme (NAP) was given statutory effect by the European Communities (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2006 which were made on 19 July 2006. The purpose of the Nitrates Action Programme is to provide a set of rules relating to the use and application of Livestock manure and artificial fertilizers. The National Action Programme under the Nitrates Directive is due to be reviewed again in 2017. This will provide an

opportunity to evaluate the need to amend existing farm management measures under the programme.

Water Framework Directive

Feedback from the first cycle of WFD implementation highlighted that better governance arrangements were needed for subsequent cycles of River Basin Management. Ireland has attempted to remedy this by the development of a new three-tier governance structure (www.catchments.ie). Underpinning the new water governance arrangements for managing water is the integrated catchment management approach, which complements the river basin planning process. It approaches sustainable resource management from a catchment perspective, in contrast to a piecemeal approach that artificially separates land management from water management.

8. Perspectives

Eutrophication from nutrient enrichment continues to be the main issue impacting on Irish WFD surface waters. 48% of transitional waters and 22% of coastal water are at less than good WFD ecological status (Bradley et al. 2015). The two most important sources of nutrient pressure remain agriculture and municipal discharges. While downward trends in nutrient inputs(Ní Longphuirt *et al.* 2015) have been observed, particularly from the agricultural sector, these pressures need to be managed to ensure modest improvements seen so far are maintained and improved.

9. Overall summary and conclusions from the national report

This report contains the outcome of the Third Application of the OSPAR Comprehensive Procedure by Ireland. It is primarily based on data collected between 2006-2014, and some data from outside this period has also been used. A total of 83 areas (estuarine and nearshore coastal waters) as well as the coastal and offshore waters have been included in the assessment.

The assessment is mainly based on data collected by the Environmental Protection Agency's national estuarine and nearshore coastal waters monitoring programme and the Marine Institute's annual winter monitoring programme of coastal and offshore waters. The winter component of the both the EPA and Marine Institute programmes are carried out between the months of November to March inclusive, with the summer component of the EPA programme being undertaken between the months of May to September inclusive.

Information on winter and summer concentrations of DIN and DIP together with summer levels of chlorophyll and oxygen undersaturation and super-saturation were used in the assessment. Information was also included on the abundance and composition of macroalgae from certain transitional areas. While information on shellfish biotoxins and potential toxic phytoplankton species was taken into account in the initial assessment it was not considered in the overall assessment as there is little evidence that the occurrence of these blooms, or associated toxicity in shellfish, in Irish waters, is related to nutrient enrichment or other forms of anthropogenic pollution.

Of the 83 areas included in the initial classification, 27 (32%) were classified as problem areas, 24 (29%) were classified as potential problem areas and 32 (39%) were classified as non-problem areas. In the final classification, 20 (24%) were classified as problem areas, 16 (19%) were classified as potential problem areas and 47 (57%) were classified as non-problem areas.

The assessment has shown that the largest number of problem areas are located inshore and predominantly along the eastern, southeastern and southern coasts of Ireland. In general, this distribution reflects the greater impacts that arise from pressures associated with higher human population densities and more intense agricultural activities in these regions.

10. References

- Bradley, C., Byrne, C., Craig, M., Free, G., Gallagher, T., Kennedy, B., Little, R., Lucey, J., Mannix, A.,
 McCreesh, P., McDermott, G., McGarrigle, M., Ní Longphuirt, S., O'Boyle, S., Plant, C.,
 Tierney, D., Trodd, W., Webster, P., Wilkes, R. and Wynne, C. (2015). WATER QUALITY IN
 IRELAND 2010-2012. WATER QUALITY IN IRELAND. C. Byrne and A. Fanning. EPA Wexford,
 EPA.
- Devreker, D. and Lefebvre, A. (2014). TTAinterfaceTrendAnalysis: An R GUI for routine Temporal Trend Analysis and diagnostics. *2014* **7**(1).
- EC (2016). Eighth Report on the Implementation Status and the Programmes for Implementation (as required by Article 17) of Council Directive 91/271/EEC concerning urban waste water treatment, REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS
- Hydes, D. J., Gowen, R. J., Holliday, N. P., Shammon, T. and Mills, D. (2004). External and internal control of winter concentrations of nutrients (N, P and Si) in north-west European shelf seas. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 59(1): 151-161. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2003.08.004</u>
- McGrath, T., Kivimäe, C., McGovern, E., Cave, R. R. and Joyce, E. (2013). Winter measurements of oceanic biogeochemical parameters in the Rockall Trough (2009–2012). *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **5**(2): 375-383. 10.5194/essd-5-375-2013
- Molvaer, J., Knutzen, J., Magnuson, J., Rygg, B., Skei, J. and Sørensen, J. (1997). Classification of environmental quality in fjords and coastal waters. A guide. <u>TA report 1467/1997</u>.

Molvaer, J., Magnuson, J., Pedersen, A. and Rygg, B. (2008). Water Framework Directive: Development of a system for marine classification. <u>Progress Report autumn 2008</u>.

- Ní Longphuirt, S., O'Boyle, S., Wilkes, R., Dabrowski, T. and Stengel, D. (2015). Influence of Hydrological Regime in Determining the Response of Macroalgal Blooms to Nutrient Loading in Two Irish Estuaries. *Estuaries and coasts*: 1-17. 10.1007/s12237-015-0009-5
- O'Boyle, S., McDermott, G., Silke, J. and Cusack, C. (2016). Potential impact of an exceptional bloom of Karenia mikimotoi on dissolved oxygen levels in waters off western Ireland. *Harmful Algae* **53**: 77-85. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hal.2015.11.014</u>
- Toner, P., Bowman, J., Clabby, K., Lucey, J., McGarrigle, M., Concannon, C., Clenaghan, C., Cunningham, P., Delaney, J., O'Boyle, S., MacCárthaigh, M., Craig, M. and Quinn, R. (2005).
 Water Quality in Ireland 2001-2003. <u>Water Quality in Ireland</u>. Wexford, Environmental Protection Agency.

Annex 1: IRELAND – Third Application of the Comprehensive Procedure (¹Upper Transitional waters, ²Lower transitional waters, ³nearshore Coastal waters)

Area	Category I Degree of nutrient enrichment		Degree of nutrient enrichment		Degree of nutrient enrichment		Degree of nutrient enrichment		Degree of nutrient enrichment		Degree of nutrient enrichment		Degree of nutrient enrichment		Degree of nutrient enrichment		Degree of nutrient enrichment				Category III and IV Indirect effects/ other possible effects			Initial classification	Appraisal of all relevant information (concerning the harmonised assessment criteria, their respective assessment levels and the supporting environmental factors)	Final classification
Castletown Estuary	, Inner a	nd Out	er Dund	lalk Ba	y																					
(1) Castletown Estuary ¹	NI DI	+	Ca Ps	++	O ₂ Ck	+	At	Problem area	Elevated winter nutrients and direct effects present.	Problem area																
	NP		Мр		Oc	-																				
(2) Inner Dundalk	NI		Ca	+	O ₂	-	At	Problem area	Elevated winter nutrients and direct and indirect effects	Problem area																
Bay ²	DI	+	Ps	+	Ck				present. Elevated levels of chlorophyll, phytoplankton bloom																	
	NP		Мр	÷	Oc	-			frequency and opportunistic green algae present. Change in benthic invertebrate community structure indicative of organic enrichment.																	
(3) Outer Dundalk	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area																
Bay ³	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area																		
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-																				
Boyne Estuary and	Plume Z	one	•		•		•																			
(4) Boyne Estuary ²	NI	-	Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Problem area	Elevated winter nutrients, dissolved inorganic nitrogen and	Potential-problem																
	DI	+	Ps	+	Ck		k		elevated phytoplankton bloom frequency. This latter indicator,	area																
	NP		Мр	-	Oc	÷			in the absence of elevated biomass, is not sufficient to confirm a direct effect so the area is classed as a potential problem area.																	
									In the last assessment this area was classified as a potential-																	
									problem area due to the presence of opportunistic macroalgae,																	
									but levels of this indicator have decreased in the current																	
									assessment period. Decrease in riverine inputs of total																	
									phosphorus (TP) and total ammonia (NH ⁴).																	
(5) Boyne Estuary	NI		Са	-	02	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area																
Plume Zone ³	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area																		
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-																				
Rogerstown Estuary	, Broad	meadov	w, Mala	hide B	ay and	Northw	estern Iris	h Sea	·																	
(6) Rogerstown ²	NI		Ca	-	02	-	At	Problem area	Elevated levels of green opportunistic affecting seagrass beds in	Problem area																
	DI	+	Ps	-	Ck				the inner part of estuary.																	
	NP		Мр	+	Oc	-																				
(7)Broadmeadow ²	NI		Ca	+	O ₂	+	At	Problem area	Elevated levels of winter nitrogen and phosphorus and summer	Problem area																
	DI	+	Ps	+	Ck				phosphorus. Elevated summer chlorophyll and very high levels																	

	NP		Мр		Oc	+			of dissolved oxygen supersaturation indicating excessive photosynthetic activity.	
(8) Malahide Bay ³	NI		Ca	-	0 ₂	-	At	Problem area	Elevated levels of winter nitrogen and elevated levels of green	Problem area
	DI	+	Ps	-	Ck				opportunistic macroalgae in summer.	
	NP	+	Мр	+	Oc	-			Elevated winter N:P ratio	
(9) Northwestern	NI		Ca	-	0 ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
Irish Sea (HA08) ³	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area		
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-				
Liffey Estuary, Tolka	a Estuary	, Dublir	n Bay a	nd Sout	hweste	ern Irisł	n Sea			
(10) Liffey Estuary	NI	-	Са	-	O ₂	-	At	Potential-	No direct or indirect effects arising and decrease in riverine	Non-problem area
Lower ¹	DI	+	Ps	-	Ck			problem area	inputs of total phosphorus (TP) and total ammonia (NH ⁴).	
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
(11) Liffey Estuary	NI	-	Ca	-	O ₂	+	At	Problem area	Decrease in riverine inputs of total phosphorus (TP) and total	Potential-problem
Upper ²	DI	+	Ps	-	Ck				ammonia (NH ⁴). Degree of nutrient enrichment has decreased in	area
	NP		Мр		Oc	-			the current assessment. Depressed dissolved oxygen levels in upper estuary may be due to historically-enriched sediment.	
(12) Tolka Estuary ²	NI	-	Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Problem area	Elevated levels of winter nitrogen and phosphorus and in	Problem area
	DI	+	Ps	-	Ck				summer excessive levels of green opportunistic macroalgae.	
	NP		Мр	+	Oc	-				
(13) Dublin Bay ³	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Potential-	Elevated levels of brown opportunistic algae (Ectocarpus sp.) are	Potential-problem
	DI	-	Ps		Ck			problem area	seasonally present and occasionally wash-up on shore in	area
	NP	-	Мр	?	Oc	-	-		nuisance quantities. Change in benthic invertebrate community structure indicative of organic enrichment.	
Broad Lough	•	•		•	•	•				•
(14) Broad Lough ²	NI		Ca	-	02	+	At	Problem area	Depressed dissolved oxygen levels in summer. Elevated winter	Problem area
_	DI	+	Ps		Ck		-		nutrients	
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
Avoca Estuary										
(15) Avoca	NI	-	Ca	-	02	-	At	Potential-	Significant reduction in riverine inputs of total nitrogen (TN),	Problem area
Estuary ²	DI	-	Ps		Ck			problem area	total ammonia (NH 4) and total phosphorus (TP). Previously a	
	NP		Мр		Oc	-			Problem area	

Slaney Estuary and		Harbo		1		1				
(16) Upper Slaney Estuary ¹	NI	-	Ca	-	02	-	At	Problem area	Decrease in riverine inputs of total phosphorus (TP) and total	Non-problem area
Estuary	DI	+	Ps		Ck				ammonia (NH ⁴), but excessive levels of nitrogen in summer and winter. No direct effects observed. Direct effects may be	
	NP	+	Мр		Oc	-			inhibited due to high flushing rate.	
(17) Lower Slaney	NI	-	Ca	+	O ₂	-	At	Problem area	Excessive levels of winter and summer nitrogen and elevated	Problem area
Estuary ²	DI	+	Ps	+	Ck				levels of chlorophyll and dissolved oxygen supersaturation. Lack	
	NP	+	Мр	-	Oc	+			of suitable substrate may inhibit opportunistic algal growth.	
(18) Wexford	NI		Ca	+	O ₂	-	At	Problem area	Elevated winter N:P ratio, but no direct effects arising. Change	Potential-problem
Harbour ³	DI	+	Ps		Ck				in benthic invertebrate community structure indicative of	area
	NP	+	Мр		Oc				organic enrichment. Low levels of DSP and <i>Dinophysis</i> sp. detected in this area.	
Barrow-Nore-Suir E	stuaries		-		-					
(19) Nore Estuary ¹	NI	-	Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Problem area	Elevated levels of winter and summer nitrogen and summer	Non-problem area
	DI	+	Ps		Ck				phosphorus. No direct or indirect effects arising. Decrease in	
	NP		Мр		Oc	-			riverine inputs of total phosphorus (TP) and total ammonia (NH ⁴).	
(20) Upper Barrow	NI	-	Ca	+	O ₂	-	At	Problem area	Excessive levels of winter and summer nitrogen and direct and	Problem area
Estuary ¹	DI	+	Ps		Ck				indirect effects arising but decrease in riverine inputs of total	
	NP	+	Мр		Oc	-			phosphorus (TP) and total ammonia (NH ⁴).	
(21) Barrow Nore	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Problem area	Excessive levels of winter and summer nitrogen but primary	Non-problem area
Estuary Upper ¹	DI	+	Ps		Ck				production likely to be limited by light availability.	
	NP	+	Мр		Oc	-				
(22) New Ross	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Potential-	Excessive levels of winter and summer nitrogen but primary	Potential-problem
Port ¹	DI	+	Ps		Ck			problem area	production likely to be limited by light availability. Change in	area
	NP		Мр		Oc	-			benthic invertebrate community structure indicative of organic enrichment.	
(23) Upper Suir	NI	+	Ca	+	O ₂	-	At	Problem area	Increase in riverine inputs of total nitrogen (TN) (although not	Problem area
Estuary ¹	DI	+	Ps		Ck				statistically significant) but decrease in total phosphorus (TP)	
	NP	+	Мр		Oc	+			and total ammonia (NH ⁴). Elevated levels of winter and summer nitrogen and summer chlorophyll.	
(24) Middle Suir	NI	+	Ca	+	0 ₂	-	At	Problem area	Increase in riverine inputs of total nitrogen (TN) (although not	Problem area
Estuary ¹	DI	+	Ps	1	Ck				statistically significant) but decrease in total phosphorus (TP)	
	NP	+	Мр		Oc	-			and total ammonia (NH ⁴). Elevated levels of winter and summer nitrogen and elevated summer chlorophyll and dissolved oxygen superstauration.	

(25) Lower Suir	NI	+	Ca		O ₂	-	At	Problem area	Elevated levels of winter and summer nitrogen but primary	Non-problem area
Estuary ²	DI	+	Ps		Ck				production likely to be limited by light availability.	
	NP	+	Мр		Oc	-				
(26) Barrow Suir	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Potential-	Elevated winter nitrogen but no direct or indirect effects arising.	Non-problem area
Nore Estuary ²	DI	+	Ps		Ck			problem area		
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
(27) Waterford	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Non-problem	Elevated N:P ratio, but no direct or indirect effects arising.	Non-problem area
Habour ³	DI	-	Ps		Ck			area	DSP algal toxins and intermittent episodes of Dinophysis above	
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-			assessment level but at levels considered not to be indicative of eutrophication.	
Colligan Estuary an	d Dungai	rvan Ha	rbour	1		1				
(28) Colligan	NI		Ca	-	02	-	At	Problem area	Elevated winter nitrogen and elevated green opportunistic	Problem area
Estuary ²	DI	+	Ps		Ck				macroalgae in summer.	
	NP		Mp	+	Oc	-				
(29) Dungarvan	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Potential-problem
Harbour ³	DI	-	Ps		Ck			area		area
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-				
Blackwater Estuary	and You	ghal Ba	iy					•	·	
(30) Upper	NI	-	Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Potential-	Elevated winter and summer nitrogen but no direct or indirect	Non-problem area
Blackwater	DI	+	Ps		Ck			problem area	effects arising. Direct effects may be inhibited due to high	
Estuary ¹	NP		Мр		Oc	-			flushing rate. Notable decrease in riverine inputs of total nitrogen (TN), total ammonia (NH ⁴) and total phosphorus (TP).	
(31) Lower	NI	-	Ca	+	02	-	At	Potential-	Direct effects present; elevated chlorophyll and opportunistic	Problem area
Blackwater	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			problem area	green macroalgae.	
Estuary ²	NP		Mp	-	Oc	-				
(32) Youghal Bay ³	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At -	Potential-	Elevated N:P ratio but no direct or indirect effects arising.	Non-problem area
	DI	-	Ps		Ck			problem area	Intermittent accumulations of green opportunistic algae, but	
	NP	+	Мр	-	Oc	-			levels not indicative of problem area status.	
Lee Estuary, Lough	Mahon,	Harper	's Island	, Owe	nacurra	Estuar	y and Nort	h Channel Great I	sland	
(33) Lee (Cork)	NI	+	Ca	-	02	+	At	Problem area	Increase in riverine inputs of total phosphorus but decrease in	Potential-problem
Estuary Upper ¹	DI	+	Ps		Ck				total nitrogen. Elevated winter nitrogen and depressed	area
	NP		Мр		Oc	+			dissolved oxygen levels in summer which may be linked to	
									historically enriched-sediments.	
(34) Lee (Cork)	NI	+	Ca	-	02	+	At	Problem area	Increase in riverine inputs of total phosphorus (although not	Potential-problem
Estuary Lower ²	DI	+	Ps	-	Ck				statistically significant) but decrease in total nitrogen. Elevated	area
	NP		Мр		Oc	-			winter nitrogen and depressed dissolved oxygen levels in	
									summer which may be linked to historically enriched-sediments.	29
(35) Lough Mahon ^{2AR} Third ap	NI pligation	of the (Ca Opppre	- hen <u>s</u> iv	O₂ e Proce	- dure –	At Ireland	Potential- problem area	Elevated winter nitrogen but no direct or indirect effects arising. Opportunistic algoingrowth may be inhibited due to absence of	Non-problem area
	NP		Mp		Oc	-			suitable substrate.	

(36) Harper's	NI		Са	-	02	+	At	Potential-		Non-problem area
Island ²	DI	+	Ps	-	Ck			problem area		
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
(37) Owenacurra	NI		Ca	-	02	-	At -	Potential-	Excessive winter nitrogen but no direct or indirect effects	Non-problem area
Estuary ²	DI	+	Ps		Ck			problem area	arising.	
	NP		Мр		Oc	+				
									PSP and DSP toxins detected sporadically and presence of	
									Alexandrium and Dinophysis above respective assessment	
									levels but no elevated trend detected.	
(38) North	NI		Ca	-	02	+	At	Potential-	Elevated winter nitrogen and elevated summer dissolved oxygen	Problem area
Channel Great	DI	+	Ps	-	Ck			problem area	supersaturation. PSP and DSP toxins detected sporadically and	
Island ²	NP		Мр		Oc	-			presence of Alexandrium and Dinophysis above respective	
									assessment levels but no elevated trend detected.	
Glashaboy Estuary a		k Harbo		1		1	1	1		1
(39) Glashaboy	NI		Са	-	02	-	At	Potential-	Excessive winter and summer nitrogen but no direct or indirect	Non-problem area
Estuary ²	DI	+	Ps		Ck			problem area	effects arising. High flushing rate may inhibit phytoplankton	
	NP		Мр		Oc	+			growth.	
(40) Cork Harbour ³	NI		Ca	-	02	-	At	Problem area	Elevated winter nitrogen and elevated phytoplankton bloom	Potential-problem
	DI	+	Ps	+	Ck				frequency. In the absence of elevated phytoplankton biomass,	area
	NP	+	Мр		Oc	-			elevated bloom frequency on its own is not sufficient to indicate	
			-						a direct effect. Classified as potential problem area.	
(41) Outer Cork	NI		Са	-	02	-	At	Problem area	Elevated winter nitrogen, winter N:P ratio and elevated	Potential-problem
Harbour ³	DI	+	Ps	+	Ck				phytoplankton bloom frequency. In the absence of elevated	area
	NP	+	Мр	?	Oc	-			phytoplankton biomass, elevated bloom frequency on its own is	
									not sufficient to indicate a direct effect. Elevated cover of green	
									opportunistic algae on rocky shores requires further	
									investigation and assessment. Classified as potential problem	
Bandon Estuary and	Kincola								area.	
-	1		Ca			+	۸+	Problem area	Elevated levels of winter pitragen and elevated levels of	Problem area
(42) Upper Bandon Estuary ¹	NI DI	-+	Ps	+	O ₂ Ck	+	At		Elevated levels of winter nitrogen and elevated levels of chlorophyll, bloom frequency and DO supersaturation indicating	
Locualy	NP	+		-	Ос	+			excessive levels of photosynthesis. Elevated levels of organic	
	NP		Мр		UC	+			enrichment in summer.	
(43) Lower Bandon	NI	-	Са	+	0 ₂	+	At	Problem area	Elevated levels of winter nitrogen and elevated levels of	Problem area
Estuary ²	DI	+	Ps	· -	Ck				chlorophyll, bloom frequency and DO supersaturation indicating	i i obietti di ed
Locuary	NP		Mp	-	Oc	+			excessive levels of photosynthesis. Elevated levels of organic	
			ivip			- -			enrichment in summer.	
(44) Kinsale	NI		Са	+	0,	-	At -	Non-problem	Low levels ASP and DSP toxins present – no elevated trend	Non-problem area ³⁰
Harlog PAR Third app		oftha					reland	area	detectedMarch 2016	
ארייאפשיישיי app	NP		Mp	neißive	Ос	uure –				
	INF	-	ivip		υι	-				

Argideen Estuary	_ .	1				1				
(45) Argideen	NI		Ca	+	0 ₂	+	At	Problem area	Elevated levels of winter and summer nitrogen. Excessive levels	Problem area
Estuary ²	DI	+	Ps		Ck				of green opportunistic macroalgae present in summer and	
	NP		Мр	+	Oc	+			elevated levels of chlorophyll also present in summer. Elevated	
Ileas Fatarana									levels of organic enrichment in summer.	
Ilen Estuary	1			1		1	T			
(46) Ilen Estuary ²	NI	-	Ca	-	0 ₂	-	At	Potential-	Elevated phytoplankton bloom frequency, but in the absence of	Non-problem area
	DI	+	Ps	+	Ck			problem area	elevated biomass, insufficient to indicate a direct effect.	
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
Kenmare River and		loge Ha		1	1 -	1		1		1
(47) Inner	NI		Ca	-	0 ₂	-	At	Non-problem	Elevated levels of organic enrichment.	Problem area
Kenmare River ²	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area		
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
(48) Kilmakilloge	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Non-problem	Presence of DO undersaturation due to natural seasonal	Non-problem area
Harbour ²	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area	stratification and not anthropogenic nutrient enrichment.	
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
(49) Outer	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	+	At	Non-problem area	Presence of DO undersaturation due to natural seasonal	Non-problem area
Kenmare River ³	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck				stratification and not anthropogenic nutrient enrichment.	
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-				
Castlemaine and Cr	omane									
(50) Castlemaine	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
Harbour ²	DI	-	Ps		Ck			area		
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
(51) Cromane ²	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
	DI	-	Ps		Ck			area		
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
Lee (Kerry) Estuary	and Trale	ee Bay	•	•		•			•	
(52) Lee (Kerry)	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Potential-	Elevated winter phosphorus but no direct or indirect effects	Non-problem area
Estuary ¹	DI	-	Ps		Ck			problem area	arising.	
-	NP	•	Mp	•	Oc	-				
(53) Inner Tralee	NI		Ca	-	0 ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
Bay ²	DI	-	Ps		Ck			area		
,	NP	-	Mp		Oc	-				
Feale Estuary and	1		- TF							
Cashen										
(54) Upper Feale	NI		Са	-	0 ₂	+	At	Potential		Non-problem area
Estuary ¹	DI	-	Ps		Ck			Problem area		3
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	NID				Oc Proces	. +				
OSPAR Third ap (55) Cashen	NP plication NI	of the (Mp Compre Ca	hensiv -	e Přőceo 02	lure –	Ireland At	Potential	March 2016 Elevated organic enrichment: source unknown.	Potential Problem
(DI	-	Ps		Ck			Problem area		area

 	•••••••					
NP		Мр	Oc	+		

Shannon Estuary	1	1	1	1	1	1				1
(56) Deel Estuary ¹	NI	-	Ca	-	02	-	At	Problem area	Elevated summer phosphorus and summer BOD.	Problem area
	DI	+	Ps		Ck					
	NP		Мр		Oc	+				
(57) Fergus	NI	-	Ca	-	02	+	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
Estuary ¹	DI	-	Ps		Ck			area		
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
(58) Maigue	NI	-	Ca	-	02	+	At	Potential-	Elevated winter phosphorus and nitrogen but no direct or	Non-problem area
Estuary ¹	DI	+	Ps		Ck			problem area	indirect effects arising.	
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
(59) Limerick Dock	NI		Ca	-	02	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
T	DI	-	Ps		Ck			area		
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
(60) Upper	NI	-	Ca	-	0 ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
Shannon Estuary ¹	DI	-	Ps		Ck			area		
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
(61) Lower	NI	-	Ca	-	O ₂	-	At -	Non-problem	Low levels of DSP and Dinophysis; above assessment level but	Non-problem area
Shannon Estuary ²	DI	-	Ps		Ck			area	not considered at levels indicative of eutrophication.	
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
Kinvarra Bay, Corrik	Estuary	and In	ner Gal	way Ba	iy 🛛					
(62) Kinvarra Bay ³	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Potential-	Some evidence that groundwater inputs of nutrients may be	Potential Problem
	DI		Ps	-	Ck			problem area	causing nutrient enrichment. Elevated phytoplankton bloom	area
	NP		Мр		Oc	+			frequency. Classed as potential problem area because elevated	
									bloom frequency on its own insufficient to indicate a direct	
									effect and uncertainty about magnitude of groundwater inputs.	
(63) Corrib	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At -	Non-problem		Non-problem area
Estuary ²	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area		
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
(64) Inner Galway	NI		Ca	-	02	-	At -	Non-problem	Intermittent low levels of DSP, and Dinophysis above	Non-problem area
Bay ³	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area	assessment level but not considered at levels indicative of	
	NP		Мр		Oc	-			eutrophication.	
Camus Bay and Kilk	ieran Ba	<u>y</u>			1			1	1	1
(65) Camus Bay ²	NI		Ca	-	0 ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
	DI	-	Ps		Ck			area		
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
(66) Kilkieran Bay ³	NI		Ca	-	02	-	At	Non-problem	Change in benthic invertebrate community structure indicative	Non-problem area
	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area	of organic enrichment, but may be linked to collapse of large	3
OSPAR Third ap	lingtion	of the	oMBre	hensiv	Place	durē — I	reland		Karenia mikimotoi bloom in summer 2005. These blooms are March 2016 known to originate offshore and are not thought to be linked to	
			1						inshore nutrient enrichment.	

(67) Erriff Estuary ²	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
	DI	-	Ps		Ck		<u>L</u>	area		
	NP		Mp		Oc	-				
(68) Killary	NI		Ca	-	0 ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
Harbour ³	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck		k	area		
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-				
Inner Clew Bay, We	stport B	ay and	Newpo	rt Bay		·	•		-	
(69) Inner Clew	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
Bay ²	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area		
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-				
(70) Westport Bay ²	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area		
	NP	-	Мр	-	Oc	-				
(71) Newport Bay ²	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area		
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-				
Moy Estuary and Ki	llala Bay	/		1						
(72) Moy Estuary ²	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Potential	Elevated levels of green opportunistic macroalgae and	Problem area
	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			Problem area	phytoplankton bloom frequency.	
2	NP		Мр	+	Oc	-				
(73) Killala Bay ³	NI		Са	-	02	+	At -	Potential	Single elevated BOD measurement – insufficient to classify as	Non-problem area
	DI	-	Ps		Ck			Problem area	potential problem area.	
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-			AZP and low levels of DSP and <i>Dinophysis</i> .	
Garavogue Estuary	and Slig	o Bay					•		-	
(74) Garavogue	NI		Са	-	02	-	At	Non-problem	Elevated phytoplankton bloom frequency, but insufficient on its	Non-problem area
Estuary ²	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area	own to indicate a direct effect in the absence of elevated	
	NP		Мр		Oc	-			biomass.	
(75) Sligo Bay ³	NI		Ca	-	0 ₂	-	At -	Non-problem	Low levels of DSP, and Dinophysis above assessment level but	Non-problem area
	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area	not considered at levels indicative of eutrophication.	
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-				

Ballysadare (76) Ballysadare	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Non-problem	Elevated phytoplankton bloom frequency and DO	Potential Problem
Estuary ²	DI	-	Ps	_	Ck			area	supersaturation.	area
	NP		Mp		Oc	_		urcu		area
Erne Estuary, Inner		Bav. K		Harbo		wvnes	Bav			
(77) Erne Estuary ²	NI	+	Ca	-	02	-	At	Potential	Elevated riverine inputs of total phosphorus (although not	Potential Problem
(,	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck		L	Problem area	statistically significant) and elevated phytoplankton bloom	area
	NP		Mp		Oc	-			frequency.	
(78) Inner Donegal	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
Bay ²	DI	-	Ps		Ck			area		
	NP		Мр		Oc	-				
(79) Killybegs	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	+	At	Problem area	Depressed DO levels and elevated brown opportunistic algae in	Problem area
Harbour ³	DI	+	Ps		Ck		-		inner part of Harbour.	
	NP	-	Мр	+	Oc	-				
(80) McSwyne's	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	+	At	Non-problem	Significant DO undersaturation in summer. Donegal Bay is an	Non-problem area
Bay ³	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area	area of slack residual flow and water column stratification can	
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-			occur close to the coast. Oxygen undersaturation in the bottom layer of this water body is likely to be due to the presence of seasonal water column stratification. Persistant and high levels of AZP, low levels of DSP toxins and low levels of <i>Dinophysis</i> .	
Gweebarra Estuary	and Bay							·	·	
(81) Gweebarra	NI		Ca	-	O ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
Estuary ²	DI	-	Ps		Ck			area		
	NP		Мр		Ос	-				
(82) Gweebarra	NI		Ca	-	0 ₂	+	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
Bay ³	DI		Ps		Ck			area		
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-				
Swilly Estuary and L	ough Sw	/illy							1	1
(83) Swilly Estuary ²	NI		Ca	+	0 ₂	+	At	Problem area	Direct effects arising; excessive phytoplankton blooms may be	Problem area
	DI	-	Ps	+	Ck				linked to organic enrichment and elevated levels of dissolved	
	NP		Мр		Oc	+			organic matter (DOM).	
(84) Lough Swilly ³	NI		Ca	-	0 ₂	-	At	Non-problem		Non-problem area
	DI	-	Ps	-	Ck			area		
	NP	-	Мр		Oc	-				

¹ For example, caused by transboundary transport of (toxic) algae and/or organic matter arising from adjacent/remote areas.

At

² The increased degree of nutrient enrichment in these areas may contribute to eutrophication problems elsewhere.

Key to the table

- NI Riverine inputs and direct discharges of total N and total P
- DI Winter DIN and/or DIP concentrations (exceedance above or below salinity adjusted threshold)
- NP Increased winter N/P ratio
- Ca Maximum and mean chlorophyll *a* concentration (µg/l)
- Ps Increased bloom frequency

- Mp Macrophytes including macroalgae (WFD EQR for Opportunistic macroalgae)
- O₂ Oxygen deficiency (% saturation)
- Ck Changes/kills in zoobenthos and fish kills
- Oc BOD mg/l
 - Algal toxins (DSP/PSP mussel infection events)
- + = Increased trends, elevated levels, shifts or changes in the respective assessment parameters
- = Neither increased trends nor elevated levels nor shifts nor changes in the respective assessment parameters
- ? = Not enough data to perform an assessment or the data available is not fit for the purpose
- Note: Categories I, II and/or III/IV are scored '+' in cases where one or more of its respective assessment parameters is showing an increased trend, elevated levels, shifts or changes.
Annex 2a Boxplots of TOxN, Phosphate, Silicate, N:P ratios and salinity for each region highlighted in Figure 2a and each transect in Figure 2b.



















Annex 2b: Station positions of surface winter nutrient samples for each individual year included in the assessment



1 Summary statistics dissolved inorganic nutrients for coastal and offshore waters of salinity >33psu 2008 – 2014

						PO4							
		NE	NW		SE	SW	Western		NE	NW		SE	S۱
	Celtic Sea	Irish Sea*	Coastal	Rockall	Irish Sea	Coastal	Shelf	Celtic Sea	Irish Sea*	Coastal	Rockall	Irish Sea	C
Mean	9.85	9.15	9.30	10.32	9.54	9.68	9.83	0.56	0.63	0.50	0.60	0.56	
Median	9.39	9.03	9.43	10.47	9.00	9.83	9.97	0.55	0.63	0.51	0.61	0.56	
Std Dev	3.24	2.65	1.70	0.97	2.87	2.19	1.40	0.13	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.10	
Min	3.21	3.43	6.10	7.98	3.89	3.85	4.21	0.20	0.29	0.29	0.37	0.29	
Max	31.60	17.33	13.37	12.20	22.40	14.40	12.80	0.98	0.95	0.61	0.75	0.79	
25%ile	7.70	6.95	7.69	9.68	7.82	8.06	9.20	0.48	0.56	0.48	0.56	0.51	
75%ile	11.20	10.80	10.84	10.90	10.80	11.33	10.51	0.67	0.70	0.54	0.64	0.62	
90%ile	13.64	12.51	11.29	11.55	13.38	12.46	11.15	0.73	0.76	0.56	0.67	0.68	
Number	465	385	192	96	305	200	66	464	386	192	95	305	

				Salinity											
	Celtic Sea	NE Irish Sea*	NW Coastal	Rockall	SE Irish Sea	SW Coastal	Western Shelf	Celtic Sea	NE Irish Sea*	NW Coastal	Rockall	SE Irish Sea	S		
Mean	17.50	14.41	18.66	17.38	17.08	16.84	17.84	34.79	33.95	34.30	35.44	34.29			
Median	16.58	13.97	18.66	17.13	16.55	16.32	17.47	34.90	33.98	34.40	35.46	34.32			
Std Dev	4.25	3.27	2.78	1.44	3.95	2.38	1.86	0.42	0.36	0.51	0.12	0.35			
Min	9.71	8.97	13.38	15.07	10.23	13.41	14.49	33.15	33.06	33.02	34.46	33.00			
Мах	57.45	28.18	26.59	23.67	31.28	24.96	22.65	35.56	35.00	35.03	35.59	35.47			
25%ile	14.82	12.14	16.26	16.33	14.14	15.04	16.57	34.60	33.70	33.98	35.43	34.12			
75%ile	19.17	15.88	20.65	17.97	19.09	18.03	19.04	35.08	34.21	34.70	35.49	34.53			
90%ile	22.57	18.92	22.33	19.21	22.81	20.41	20.80	35.20	34.40	34.85	35.53	34.71			
Number	464	385	192	95	305	198	66	470	387	194	99	307			

*Note 52% of NE Irish Sea stations in this table have a salinity >33 and <34psu

Annex 3: link to assessment table

		Riverine inputs	and direct di	ischarges of to	tal N and total	,												Degree of N	utriert Enrichmen	e ())											Direct Effects (II)				indirect Effects (III)		Other Possible Effects (M)	
				neut trans	2006-2013								winter	DIN and/or DI	P concentration	16								overall		Winter N	/Pratia (Redfield P	$N/P = 1\hat{k}$	Maximum and mean chlorophyll		Area-specific phytoplankton indicator species	Macrophytes including	Oxygen deficiency	a2 Conf	o2 comments	órganic carbon/arganic	Algal toxins (DSP)PSP mussel infection	
P inputs N inp	nputs			P Trend		sens p To	2005-2008	2007-2009	9 2009-201	11 2000-201 DIN	2 2012-201	64	-		2006-2008 2 MRP	007-2009 2	009-2011 2	010-2012 2	012-2014		P SCORE OF					0709	1214	Score, 'Trend'	2007-2012	1007 2022	Budo Casfidence Commands	12001111			- Contraction	BOD BOD	Parts.	Initial Classification Final Classi
astletown Estuary				_			58	54	4 5	54 5				100	2	3	-14	-15				100	+	100	cont on previous	61.9		* v	0.436	a.	Phyto Confidence Comments Biooms caused mainly by the diator 0.418 200% mod or worse Asterionellopsis glacialis	1	FAIL		97 mod 72%	000		Problem Area Problem A
er Dundalk Bay							35	5 36	6 -1	19 -3	0		**-	100	-38	-27	-35	-24				100		100	cont on previous	49.5		+ v	0.476		0.438 200% mod or worse Atterioneticpsis glacialis Biopris caused mainly by the diator 0.4 200% mod or worse specially Asterionellopsis	mod	High	1	100			Problem Area Problem
der Dundalk Bay							-45	s -48	8				-	100	-31	-35					-	100			cont on previous	15.8		- v	0.869		1 98.2% Good or better Biopris caused by diatoms species 0.6 83.3% good or bette mainly Skeletonema spo.		Good		00			Non-problem area Non-pro
	2 No	o Trend -3.	19 0	54 -4.62	No Trend	-365.05 0.05 -8	1.67 116	s 76	16	8 2	5 .		****	60	-33	-33	-33	- 38	-36			100	•	60 100		105.9	41.3		0.72			mod	Good		100 fail for high DO	5.43 Fail		Problem Area Potentia Non-problem area Non-pro
yne Estuary Plume Zone							-60	-59	0 -J	29 -5	2 -1	73		100	-40	-52	-30	-37	-50		-	100	•	100		29.1	48.5	- v ++ A	0.93		0.8 99.5% good or better 1 81.7% good or better		High Good		100 fail for high DO			Non-problem area Non-prob
genroen Estuary							-33	2 67	7 1	30				50		-11	-33		-39 -			100	•		low sample num	45.7	85.0	** ^	0.637		Biopris caused by Skeletonema and 04 99.9% mod or worse Chaetoceros son.	poor	FAIL		100 72% and fail high 160%	6.02 Fail		Problem Area Problem
alahide Bay							98	5 2	2 -5	50 -4	2	o =	++	65	-40	-35	-42	-67	-33	- 11		100	•	65	low sample num	34.4	34.8	** ^	+ 0.659		1 \$3.5% good or better	mod	High					Problem Area Problem
orthweatern Irish Sea (NA 08)							-62	-56	6 -4	42 -4	и -	-0		100	-44	-46	-48	-49	-45			100		100		16.7	20.6	- ^	1		1 1999 second or heating		High	1	100			Non-problem area Non-pro
Ny Estuary Lower							55	s -10	ο	-1 -5	2 .	-a -	+	67	-15	-23	-23	-37	-14			100		67		68.1	18.5	+- V	1		1 200% good or better 1 200% good or better Falls due to blooms of 0.6 82.7% good or bette Euglenophyceae group and		Good		100			Potential-problem an Non-pri
						-27.49 0.17 -1		-35	s -1	21 -1	15 -1	-17	• •	29	-25	-33	-51	-51	-63		-	100	•	99		24.0	165.6	** ^	0.77		0.6 82.7% good or bette Euglenophyceae group and		FAIL		100 66%			Problem Area Potenti
ika Estuary	No	o Thend -0.	17 0	.71 4.31	Sig decline	-10.85 0.02 -7	7.65 32	2 1	1	7	5 1	17	••••	58	-6	2	4	-2	-24		++-	100	•	58		23.1	35.0	-+ A	1			poor	Good	3	100 fail for high DO			Problem Area Proble
ublin Bay							53	5 -61	a -1	39 -5	и -	-14	+	100	-19	-40	-38	-45				100	7	100		15.0	16.7	- ^	1		1 100% good or better	good	High	1	100			Potential-problem an Potent
road Lough voca Estuary		o Trend -2.			No. Torond	-51.39 0.11 -4	15	5 -57	7 22	24		-14	*** *	61	-20	-45	-37	-	-50			100	•	61	near threshold	55.2 380.3	211.5 748.9	** ^	0.732		0.8 200% good or better		High Good		100 fail for high DO 100 73%			Problem Area Problem
oper Staney Estuary						-8.31 0.9 -0		5 112	2 5	97 9		78		29	-44	-38	-42	-70	-00		_	100		22		318.1	444.4	** ^	1				High		100			Problem Area Non-pr
wer Slaney Estuary							99	119	9 7	76 7.	2 :	ss = = = - -		91	-8	-81	-47	-61	-57		-	100		91		188.0	243.6	** ^	0.393		Fails due to blooms of both diatoms 0.4 200% moderate or w (Chaetoceros spp. C. closterium) or		High		00 fail for high DO	6 Fail		Problem Area Problem
Fexford Harbour							-45	5	-1	36 2	м - з	25		91	-33		-63	-54	-53			100	7	91		\$7.4	36.5	** v	+ 0.385		1 63.2% good or better		High		100			Problem Area Potenti
one Estuary	51	ig decline -12				-305.03 0.11 -6		39	9 1	17 12	9 3	32	•••••	63	-67	-42	-23	-36	-44			100		68		221.4	118.8	** v	0.904		1 99.3% Good or better		High		100			Problem Area Non-pro
oper Barrow Estuary	No	o Trend -7.	-13 0	.11 -7.91	No Trend	-110.83 0.27 -1	1.75 45	s 90	0 4	47 4	17 6	62	•••••	98	-74	-33	-18	-63	-73			100	•	98		273.9	509.1	** ^	0.704		1 87.4% good or better		High		100			Problem Area Probler
erow Nore Estuary Upper							34	41	a e	69 7.	2 4	44	•••••	100	-73	-50	-13	-57	-65			100	•	100		263.5	390.0	** ^	0.685		1 85.9% good or better		High		100			Problem Area Non-pri
lew Ross Port		Trend -		.11 -8.53	No Terrat	-306.46 0.11 -4	23	62	u 1	10 23 28 ~	u 2	23		65	-73	-18	-17	-37	-60			100	:	65	near threshold	241.7 297.7	294 400.8	** ^	0.679		1 85.3% good or better 08.61.2% moderate or wrme		High		100 100 fail for high DO	4.35 fail		Potential-problem an Potentia Problem Area Problem
Adde Suir Estuary	No				Trend		20	44	a 1	17 2	3 3	23		93	-58	-50	-33	-50	-57			100		93		259.0	213.3	** *	0.240		0.8 61.2% moderate or worse Fails due to blooms of Coscinediscu 0.6 83.8% moderate or spp. (20-50am)		Good		98 fail for high DO			Problem Area Problem
ower Suir Estuary (Little Island - Cheekpoint)	0						38	3 26	6 1	10 2		24		100	-58	-43	-45	-40	-40			100		100		162.1	109.5	++ ^					High		100			Problem Area Non-pr
Sarrow Suir Nore Estuary							70	25	5 1	10 4	18 1	10		72	-45	-45	-42	- 31	-29		-	100		72		112.7	77.9	++ v	0.694		1 85.6% good or better		High		100			Potential-problem an Non-pr
Vaterford Harbour							-34	-25	5 -1	31 -5	1 -		•	100	-63	-53	-48	-54				100		100		58.9	23.3	*- V	1		1 300% good or better		High		100 some high values			Non-problem area Non-pr
oligan Estuary							173	111	1 -1	35 -3	8 -1	13	++	67	-65	-60	-59	-59	-05			100	•	67		178.2	51.8	** v	0.849			mod	High	1	100			Problem Area Proble
lungarvan Harbour							-12	2 -19	9 -6	-60 -61	0 - 4	ao		100		-52	-61	-61				98		98		32.2	19.4	+- V	1		8/94.7% good or better	good	High	1	100			Non-problem area Non-pr
lpper Blackwater M Estuary ower Blackwater M Estuary / Youghal Harbour		o Trend -14	1.47 0	.17 -8.33	Sig decline	-744.24 0.01 -2	2.4 -34		1 4	42 4	8 1			33	-42	-40	-72	-73	-63			100	•	33		252.2 113.5	305.9 143.7	** ^	0.829		0.8 55.3% good or better	good	High		100			Potential-problem an Non-pe
oughai Bay	307						-23	-24		42 -3	о . г			30	-0	-42	-72	-04			_	100		90 A1		25.4	29.1	** ^	0.447		0.8 94.7% good or better	good	High		100			Non-mobilem area Non-m
ee (Cork) Estuary Upper	No	o Trend -7.	17 0	.05 -10.5	Sig decline	-209.69 0.04 -7	7.05 39	5	5 1	25 4	6 5	50	• •••••	29	-47	-47	-53	-59			_	100	•	99		201.2	360.3	** ^	0.852			1000	FAIL		100 48%	7.20545 Full		Problem Area Potenti
ee (Cork) Estuary Lower							85	5 67	7 E	88 11	a :	sa 		97	-32	-29	-30	-37	-15			100		97		91.5	67.3	** v	0.83		0.6 \$1.9% good or better		FAIL		98 55N			Problem Area Potent
rugh Mahan							102	2 70	0 1	15 -1		22		89	-22	-27	-48	-48				100		89		95.7	79.3	** v	0.702		0.6 \$3.4% good or better		Good		91			Potential-problem an Non-pr
sugh Mahon (Harper's Island)							_	73	3 5	50 -3	2 -3	30	++	low		10	-23	-42	-40			100			low sample num	101.7	79.3	** v	0.815				FAIL	low	63%, low sample nos			Potential-problem an Non-pr
weracuma Estuary							134	84	и з	78 1	7	2	•••••	35	-45	-48	-66	-67	-62		-	100	•	35	low sample num	291.9	175.6	** v	0.633		0.6 \$3.9% good or better		High	3	100	5.5 Fail		Potential-problem as Potenti
korth Channel Great Island							85	5 71	1 1	11 :	1	2	•••••	50	-29	-28	-57	-55	-43			100	•	50	low sample num	86.7	49.6	** v ** ^	0.66		0.6 \$3.8% good or better		Good	1	100	7.111 Fail		Potential-problem an Problem
Zashaboy Estuary Cork Harbour							182	2 157	7 11	21 19	2 14	-0	*****	94	-0	-44	-52	-58	-57			100		94		73.6	459.1 29.5	++ A ++ V	0.851		0.6 82.2% good or bette fails due to diatom blooms		Good		100	7.111 Parl		Potential-problem are Potent
luter Cork Harbour							13	12	2 -1	38 -3	и в - 3	-13 36	++	91	-30	-42	-50	-52	-30			100		91		43.1	22.3	+- v	. 1		0.8 94.7% good or better		High		100			Potential-problem an Non-pr
oper Bandon Estuary	No	o Trend -11	.02 0	27 -5.07	No Trend	-99 -4.7 0.	27 91	6	6 1	17 2	10 2	z •		100	-35	-50	-57	-58	-42			100		100		198.6	209.3	** ^	0.303		0.2 (H.7% good or better Fails due to blooms of diatoms and 0.6 (H. 3% moderate or Heterocaps triguestra blooms Fails due to blooms of diatoms and 0.6 (H.5% moderate or heteromast investing blooms		High		100 fail for high DO	7.435 Fail		Problem Area Problem
ower Bandon Estuary							140	22	2 1	11 2	10 1	10		61	-43	-54	-54	-56	-45		_	100		61	sample near bo	145.3	131.1	** v	0.418		Fails due to blooms of diatoms and 0.6 \$4.5% moderate or «Heterocapsa triquestra blooms		High		100 fail for high DO	S Fail		Problem Area Problem
Graale Harbour							-34	-36	6 -4	45 -4	n -	-2		98	-61	-50	-88	-71	-50		-	100		98		21.9	19.6	- v	1		1 100% good or better		Good		100			Non-problem area Non-pr
rgideen Estuary							60	88	8 5	55 9	17		••••		-38	-43	-55	-53					•	0		115.2		+ v	0.323		0.6 \$4.2% moderate or worse Fails due to blooms of Skeletonema 0.4 \$3.5% moderate or vGlenodinium. Heterocipia and	poor						Problem Area Probler
en Estuary							12	2 -6	6 .	-6 -3	5 4	a -	• •	100	-50	-49	-59	-55				100	7	100		67.9	43.2	++ v	0.71				High	9	9.9			Potential-problem an Non-pro
mer Kenmans River							-61	-81	a -3	-70	ъ - о	ð1 		100	-83	-83	-73	-73	-75			100		100		109.4	37.4		0.855		0.6 81.5% good or better		High		96			Non-problem area Non-pro
Imakiloge Harbour uter Kenmane River							-85	5 -84		55 -5		.76		100	-79	-91	-60	-60	-70			100		100		48.5	17.9	+- v - v	1		1 300% good or better 0.6 78.4% good or bette Fails due to diatoms blooms		High		100 100 probably due to stratifi	-		Non-problem area Non-pro
astemaine Habour							-72	2 -69	n	~		83		100	-02	-70	-34	-,44	-62			100		100		75.3	16.6	+- V	0.659		0.6 83.8% good or better	hieb	High		100			Non-problem area Non-pr
ee K Estuary							-42	-30	D D		-1	.74		29	-20	8						100	7	99		47.4		+- V	0.851		0.8 300% Good or better		Good		100	4.5 Fail		Potential-problem an Non-pro
mer Tolee Bay							-0	-48	8			as – –		100	43	-42						100	7	100		19.7	21.0	- ^	1		1 200% Good or better	high	High		00			Non-problem area Non-pro
pper Feale Estuary							-60	-60	о -e	-60	r- 0	-73		100	-30	-45	-45	-45	-50			100		100		78.2	51.2	** v	0.746		1 90.8% good or better		FAIL		100 38%	7 Fail		Potential-problem an Potenti
sshen							-52	2 -50	0 -5	50 -5	ю -1	.71		100	-2	-38	-38	- 38				100		100		52.2	29.9	** v	0.945		0.8 99.0% Good or better		Good		100 fail for high DO	5.84 Fail		Potential-problem an Potenti
eel Extuary						-57.21 0.05 -9		5 -11	1 -1	27 -4	10 -3		+	100	-58	-58	-65	50	50			99	•	99		201.4	46.7	++ v	0.739		1 90.3% good or better		Good		100 fail for high DO			Problem Area Probler
ergus Estuary						-55.49 0.02 4 -124.08 0.04 4		-53	3 -5	2- N	2 -3	72		100	-63	-58	-57	-5	-17			81 97		81		85.3 276.0	19.4 71.1	+- v ++ v	1		1 300% good or better		FAIL		100 69% 100 67% also fail high DO			Potential-problem an Non-pro
algue Estuary merick Dock						-124.08 0.04 -2 -454.46 0.04 -5		5 .40		53 .9		61		100	-66	-60	-54	-73	-67			100		97		274.0	71.1	** v ** v	0.00		1 100% good or better		High		100 or A and fail high DO			Potential-problem an Potenti Non-problem area Non-pr
oper Shannon Estuary						-454.46 0.04 -5		-52	2 .5	53 -5		ca		100	-67	-76	-78	-53	-50			100		100		201.2	74.1	** v			1 100% good or better		High		100			Non-problem area Non-pr
wer Shannon Estuary							-51	-54	4 -5	51 -4	n -	61		100	-45	-53	-65	-57	.7			71		71		48.9	21.0	+- V	1		1 100% good or better		High		100			Non-problem area Non-pr
marra Bay							-35	s -44	4 -5	55 -5	8 4	63		100	-54	-56	-63	-58	-61		_	100		100		45.6	40.9	++ v	0.711				High		100	5.63 Fail		Potential-problem an Potent
mb Estuary	No	o Trend -4.	75 0	71 -6.91	Sig decline	-278.41 0.02 -7	7.73 -47	r -62	2 -6	62 -4	16 -1			100	-60	-62	-54	-54	-81			100		100		40.6	61.9	** ^	1		Fails due to mainly Chaetoceros spp		High		100			Non-problem area Non-p
er Galway Bay North							-42	2 -53	3 -6	62 -4	5 <	55		100	-56	-56	-57	-57	-79			100		100		41.3	50.9	** ^	1		and the first of the second		Good		100			Non-problem area Non-p
mus Bay							-91	-92	2 -5	92 -9	2 -5	90		100	-79	-88	-88	-90	-90			100		100		24.0	26.5	-+ A	1		1 200% good or better		High	3	100			Non-problem area Non-p
kleran Bay							-80	-82	u -1	95 -8	u -	01 01		100	-72	-70	-70	-88	-65 -63			100 100		100		28.0	22.1	- ^ ++ V	1		1 500% good or better 1 500% good or better		High		100			Non-problem area Non-p
If Estuary lary Harbour							-86	-91 	ч S Б	68 -5	2 ,	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		100	-73	-73	-72	-52	-53		_	100		100		28.0	26.5		0.927		1 300% good or better 0.8 99.6% good or better		Good	,	100			Non-problem area Non-p
er Oew Bay							-74	-76	8 -5	56 -4	8 4	68		100	-55	-58	-60	-52	-52		_	100		100		8.9	13.5	- ^	1		1 200% good or better		High		100			Non-problem area Non-p
alport Bay							-77	-87	a -4	a -s	1 4	a1		100	-59	-59	-62	-55	-52			100		100		8.8	7.7	- v	1		0.6 78.4% good or better		High		100			Non-problem area Non-p
pot Bay							-92	-93	s -t	80 -6	и -			100	-65	-65	-64	-57	-53		_	100		100		10.3	14.9	- ^	1		0.8 94.7% good or better		High	1	100			Non-problem area Non-p
y Estuary	No	o Thend -2	91 0	27 -4.45	Sig decline	-164.38 0.04 4	53- CE.	-72	2 -8	80 -8	ю - «	ao ao		100	-62	-50	-53	-58	-63			100		100		45.4	112.8	** ^	0.716		0.6 \$3.3% good or better	mod	High		100			Potential-problem an Poten
ala Bay							-64	-58	8 -6	68 -4	n -	44		100	-50	-46	-48	-51	-51			100		100		31.1	19.4	+- V	1		0.6 78.4% good or better		FAIL		100 72%			Potential-problem an Non-p
avoge Estuary							-71	-73	3 -3	73 -7	6 -1	76		100	-50	-48	-49	-57	-64			100		100		16.9			0.902		0.6 80.7% good or better		High		100			Non-problem area Non-p
yo Bay							-70	-70	υ -ε	63 -6	3 -	62		100	-57	-55	-44	-51	-55			100		100		14.0	18.8	- ^	1		0.6 78.4% good or better	good	High		100			Non-problem area Non-p
lysadan Estuary					No. Tex. 1		-70	-69	9 -3 • -	78 -7.	2 4	50 		100	-61	-49	-44	-58				100		100		29.0 47.3	70.8 34.6	++ A	0.671		0.6 83.7% good or better	good	High	1	100			Non-problem area Non-p
er Donegal Bay	SI	g oecline -13	Lo7 0	-8.05	NO Trend	-145.95 0.11 -4	-65	-68	e -3	ry -7.		87		100	-33	-50	-25	-13.3333	-50			100		100		47.3	34.6 28.8	** *	1		0.6 78.4% good or better 0.6 78.4% good or better		High		8.7			Non-mobilem and Poten
er Donegal Bay lybegs Harbour							-60	60	1		1	o4		100	-au	-81	-63	-62	-13	•		500 84		100 84		37.6	13.3	- v	0.927		0.6 78.4% good or better 0.6 80.1% good or better		FAIL		8.7			Problem Area Proble
Seyne's Bay							-43	-56	6 -1	36 -4	0 -1	.75		100	-52	-52	-51	- 70	-13			100		100			24.3		0.915		1 99.5% good or better		FAIL		100 62%, natural stratifictai	m		Non-problem area Non-p
veebarra Estuary							-92	2 -91	a -s	92 -9	6 4	a7		low	-63	-82	-83	-83	-63			100			low sample num	11.0			1		0.6 78.4% good or better	high						Non-problem area Non-p
weebarra Bay								-68	8	-3	8 -1	74		100		-76		-51	-52			100		100	low sample num	22.1		- v	0.775		1,92.9% good or better Fails due to diatoms blooms and 04.99.0% moderate or a Heterocapse tripuetra blooms		FAIL	9	8.8 73%			Non-problem area Non-pr
By Estuary							-53	-57	7 -5	57 -9	<i>б</i> - 4	a		100	-67	-57	-57	-57	-57			100		100		35.4		+- V	0.167		Fails due to diatoms blooms and 0.4 99.0% moderate or s Heterocapse triquetra blooms		High		00 fail on high DO	S Fail		Problem Area Proble
ough Swily							-53	-57	7 -5 8 -5	57 -9 52 -9		63 -75		100	-57	-57	-57	-57	-57		_	100		100		35.4		+- V - V	0.167		0.4 90.0% moderate or « Heterocapse triquetra blooms 0.8 99.5% good or better		High		100 fail on high DO	5 fail		Problem Non-pro

Bradley, C., Byrne, C., Craig, M., Free, G., Gallagher, T., Kennedy, B., Little, R., Lucey, J., Mannix, A., McCreesh, P., McDermott, G., McGarrigle, M., Ní
Longphuirt, S., O'Boyle, S., Plant, C., Tierney, D., Trodd, W., Webster, P., Wilkes, R. and Wynne, C. (2015). WATER QUALITY IN IRELAND 2010 2012. WATER QUALITY IN IRELAND. C. Byrne and A. Fanning. EPA Wexford, EPA.

Devreker, D. and Lefebvre, A. (2014). TTAinterfaceTrendAnalysis: An R GUI for routine Temporal Trend Analysis and diagnostics. 2014 7(1).

- EC (2016). Eighth Report on the Implementation Status and the Programmes for Implementation (as required by Article 17) of Council Directive 91/271/EEC concerning urban waste water treatment, REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS
- Hydes, D. J., Gowen, R. J., Holliday, N. P., Shammon, T. and Mills, D. (2004). External and internal control of winter concentrations of nutrients (N, P and Si) in north-west European shelf seas. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **59**(1): 151-161. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2003.08.004</u>
- McGrath, T., Kivimäe, C., McGovern, E., Cave, R. R. and Joyce, E. (2013). Winter measurements of oceanic biogeochemical parameters in the Rockall Trough (2009–2012). *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **5**(2): 375-383. 10.5194/essd-5-375-2013
- Molvaer, J., Knutzen, J., Magnuson, J., Rygg, B., Skei, J. and Sørensen, J. (1997). Classification of environmental quality in fjords and coastal waters. A guide. <u>TA report 1467/1997</u>.

Molvaer, J., Magnuson, J., Pedersen, A. and Rygg, B. (2008). Water Framework Directive: Development of a system for marine classification. <u>Progress Report autumn 2008</u>.

- Ní Longphuirt, S., O'Boyle, S., Wilkes, R., Dabrowski, T. and Stengel, D. (2015). Influence of Hydrological Regime in Determining the Response of Macroalgal Blooms to Nutrient Loading in Two Irish Estuaries. *Estuaries and coasts*: 1-17. 10.1007/s12237-015-0009-5
- O'Boyle, S., McDermott, G., Silke, J. and Cusack, C. (2016). Potential impact of an exceptional bloom of Karenia mikimotoi on dissolved oxygen levels in waters off western Ireland. *Harmful Algae* **53**: 77-85. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hal.2015.11.014</u>
- Toner, P., Bowman, J., Clabby, K., Lucey, J., McGarrigle, M., Concannon, C., Clenaghan, C., Cunningham, P., Delaney, J., O'Boyle, S., MacCárthaigh, M., Craig, M. and Quinn, R. (2005). Water Quality in Ireland 2001-2003. <u>Water Quality in Ireland</u>. Wexford, Environmental Protection Agency.