Harmonization of soil RAMs

Christy van Beek



Risk Assessment Methodologies for Soil Threats





Harmonization of soil RAMs

This presentation:

- Current status of soil RAMs
- Reasons for harmonization
- Harmonization of soil RAMs theoretical framework
- Needs for harmonization
- Options for harmonization
- Conclusions and recommendations



Current status of soil RAMs in Europe

Questionnaires Policy questionnaires Thematic questionnaires

Literature review



Current status of soil RAMs in Europe





Current status of soil RAMs in EU

Input from policy makers required





Current status of soil RAMs in EU

Many RAMs, but most are incomplete.

 The incompleteness of many RAMs may be regarded as a pitfall but actually provides good opportunities for harmonization as the best time to harmonize RAMs is when they are being developed.

Often scientific understandings are comparable, which provides a basis for harmonization.



Consequences of unharmonized results

Unharmonized results may lead to different advices.
E.g. sport fishing in the great lakes, USA
Differences in affected areas.





Kamrin M.A. 1997. Environmental Risk Harmonization: Federal/State Approaches to Risk Assessment and Management. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology 25: 158-165.





Harmonization – theoretical framework

 Harmonization can be achieved through conversion factors or finding consensus of approaches.



Need vs options for harmonization.



Need for harmonization

Ideally: run every RAM for the same site and look at differences





Need for harmonization





Options for harmonization

 Methodology: quantify relative share of common elements (MI)

- Data collection: common criteria of Annex 1
- Data processing: common use of fundamental concept
- Data interpretation: reciproke of number of threshold values
- Risk perception.....





Options for harmoniz

Data collection focusses on the common criteria, but neglects issues like sampling depths, monitoring networks, etc

	Data	Data		K ISK	Average
	collecti on	processing	interpretation	perception	U
Erosion	0.62	0.55	0.17	n.c.	0.45
Salinization	0.81	0.62	0.13	n.c.	0.52
Compaction	0.58	0.35	0.09	n.c.	0.34
Landslides	0.77	0.63	0.55	n.c.	0.65
SOM decline	1.00	0.50	n.c.	n.c.	-0.75

Best options for landslides and SOM decline

Is averaging the best way to estimate harmonization options? Results are predominantly based on process quantification.



Conclusions

There are many RAMs currently in use; the vast majority has comparable basic understandings.

Many RAMs are incomplete, i.e. lack data interpretation and risk perception.

 Harmonization is not always feasible, due to different definitions (e.g. wind versus water erosion).

The need for harmonization seems highest for salinization and erosion, when evaluated on the basis of CFD.

The options for harmonization seem best for landslides and SOM decline, when evaluated on the basis of MI.



Current developments

With the EU soil thematic strategy objectives and scales of soil RAMs are staightened out. This facilitates the development of harmonized RAMs.

 Recent activities show increasing assessments at EU level. This may overcome harmonization of local or national RAMs, but may also result in loss of local information.



Recommendations

- Provide a 'tiered' approach at EU level
- Tier1 is an assessment at EU level (hence standardized)
- Tier2 is an assessment at national level with more detailed approach (harmonized with Tier1)





www.ramsoil.euinfo@ramsoil.eu



Issues for discussion

- Strict interpretation of the definition of harmonization and standardization?
- Soil science in Europe has a long history and consequently many RAMs exist. RAMs differ because of differences in objectives, notions, scales, personal differences, driving factors and climatic conditions. Is harmonization always feasible or are there situations for which harmonization is not feasible?
- Harmonization has consequences for the soundness, flexibility and acceptability of RAMs. Is harmonization obligatory or unnecessary complex?

