

Public Consultation as part of the Green Data for All impact assessment.

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

Public consultation on the initiative ‘GreenData4All – updated rules on geospatial environmental data and access to environmental information’

About the consultation

This consultation is part of the impact assessment of the GreenData4All initiative, which aims to increase the availability, accessibility and reusability of data to support environmental policy development and implementation. The initiative seeks to address current challenges hampering effective data sharing and to ensure that environmental data sharing is adapted to the information needs of end users. The GreenData4All initiative also aims to limit burden on data providers and ensure that every push for making data available is substantiated by a clear user need and/or business value chain.

On the supply side, the initiative seeks to simplify the technical specifications for data and data sharing, which are currently set out in the [INSPIRE Directive](#) and to align them with the relevant horizontal legislation, such as the [Open Data Directive](#), the [High-Value Datasets Regulation](#), the [Data Act](#), the [Data Governance Act](#) and the [Interoperable Europe Act](#). On the demand side, the initiative seeks to refocus and expand the scope of data sharing (e.g. to non-spatial environmental data) to align it with environmental policy needs and in particular priority use-cases, and to provide easy-to-use end-user applications.

This public consultation aims to gather the views of EU citizens and stakeholders on possible options for building a dataspace with a data offering that is adapted to the needs of environmental data users, easily accessible and reusable by all users, less constraining for data producers, while guaranteeing, where needed, data confidentiality and privacy. Replies may be submitted in any EU official language. It takes approximately 20 minutes to fill in the questionnaire. You may interrupt your session at any time and continue answering at a later stage. If you do so, please remember to keep the link to your saved answers as this is the only way to access them. Only questions marked with a red asterisk are mandatory. Once you have submitted your answers online, you will be able to download a copy of the completed questionnaire. Thank you for taking part in this consultation.

About you

* Language of my contribution

Bulgarian

- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Irish
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union

Other

* First name

Martin

* Surname

Silič

* Email (this won't be published)

martin.silic@eureau.org

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

European Federation of National Associations of Water Services

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

39299129772-62

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

This list does not represent the official position of the European institutions with regard to the legal status or policy of the entities mentioned. It is a harmonisation of often divergent lists and practices.

- Afghanistan
- Djibouti
- Libya
- Saint Martin
- Åland Islands
- Dominica
- Liechtenstein
- Saint Pierre and Miquelon
- Albania
- Dominican Republic
- Lithuania
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

- Algeria
- American Samoa
- Andorra
- Angola
- Anguilla
- Antarctica
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Ecuador
- Egypt
- El Salvador
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Eswatini
- Ethiopia
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Luxembourg
- Macau
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar/Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Samoa
- San Marino
- São Tomé and Príncipe
- Saudi Arabia
- Senegal
- Serbia
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Sint Maarten
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syria

- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Türkiye
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu

- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena
Ascension and
Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **For the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association', 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

* Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

Introduction: General questions

What is the role of your organisation? Please select all that apply

- Producing and making available environmental data
- Hosting and providing access to environmental data (that you do not produce)
- Using environmental data in your work / activities
- None of the above
- Other

For what purpose do you use environmental data? Please select all that apply.

- Research and development
- Policy making
- Planning
- Reporting
- Business decision making
- Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Due Diligence
- Corporate sustainability reporting
- Advocacy
- Public awareness and education
- None of the above
- Other

What types of environmental data do you most frequently use? Please check all that apply.

- Climate and weather data
- Air quality data
- Water quality and quantity data
- Soil quality data
- Industrial emissions data
- Land use/land cover data
- Biodiversity data
- Circular economy and waste management data

- Energy consumption and production data
- Marine and coastal data
- Agricultural data
- Forestry data
- Hydrology data
- Noise pollution data
- None of the above
- Other

How do you usually access environmental data?

- Viewing services (e.g., online maps or visualisation platforms)
- Downloading processed data files (e.g., from government or research portals)
- Using raw data for analysis in your own tools or systems (e.g., APIs, cloud platforms)
- Through mobile applications (e.g., weather or air quality apps)
- Other

What are the main benefits of making public environmental data more accessible? Please check all that apply.

- Innovation, scientific research and technological development
- Monitoring of environmental impacts
- Reporting of policy implementation
- Transparency and information for civil society
- Development of new business models and economic opportunities
- Business competitiveness
- None of the above
- Other

PART A: Better availability and accessibility of green data

For the purpose of the impact assessment of the GreenData4All initiative environmental data is classified in several key types:

Reference Data

Think of reference data as the foundation for all environmental analysis. It includes things like maps, country codes, and chemical registers. This data provides a consistent framework for comparing information across different areas and topics.

Monitoring Data

Monitoring data is all about tracking changes (continuous or periodic) in the environment over time. It

includes measurements of air and water quality, weather patterns, and animal populations. This data helps us spot trends and respond quickly to environmental issues.

Thematic/Domain Data

This type of data focuses on specific environmental topics. It might include information about land use, biodiversity, or waste management. Thematic data helps us dive deep into particular environmental issues.

Analytical Data

Analytical data is the result of processing and combining other types of data. It includes predictive models and policy impact analyses. This data helps us understand complex environmental systems and make informed decisions.

Problem definition and specific objectives

In your view, how important is it to make environmental data available to authorities/administrations, citizens and organisations (NGOs, research institutions, businesses etc.)?

- Very important
- Moderately important
- Neutral
- Slightly important
- Not at all important
- Do not know

Do you believe that current environmental data offerings meet your information needs?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Do not know

Do the following issues prevent the reuse of non-personal environmental data?

	Strongly prevents	Moderately prevents	Neutral	Slightly prevents	Does not prevent at all
Limited accessibility of monitoring data (e.g. air quality data)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Limited accessibility of reference data (e. g. data on protected sites)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Limited accessibility of analytical data (e. g. data on the health impacts of environmental factors)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Real-time data is lacking, or datasets are not updated at regular intervals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Available datasets are incomplete or have significant gaps in geographical or social coverage	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Data sources are fragmented across many data producers making it difficult to find comprehensive data	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Datasets shared by different data producers have different formats, structures, and standards and cannot be easily integrated	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Data is provided in ways not suitable for direct reuse	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Data is provided in ways that require too much digital and expert skills to turn it into actionable information	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Confidentiality or intellectual property rights constraints	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
End user applications are not sufficiently available	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other - please specify below	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please specify

Data sometimes fall under confidentiality requirements, also with the purpose to ensure protection of essential services/critical entities, and are therefore not available.

In your opinion, which environmental data should be prioritised for improving accessibility and reusability? Please check all that apply.

- Climate and weather data
- Air quality data
- Water quality and quantity data
- Soil quality data
- Industrial emissions data

- Land use/land cover data
- Biodiversity data
- Circular economy and waste management data
- Energy consumption and production data
- Marine and coastal data
- Agricultural data
- Forestry data
- Hydrology data
- Noise pollution data
- None of the above
- Other

Please specify

Data concerning water quantity that are not being held by water operators. This concerns, for example, groundwater abstraction from various users (e.g. agriculture sector, energy sector and industrial sector) in order to be able to draw up a detailed water balance. This is necessary for the efficient management of the available water resources.

Policy measures, options and impacts

How beneficial do you think it would be that all types of environmental data (reference data, monitoring data, thematic/domain data, analytical data) are shared through a common portal or data marketplace?

- Very beneficial
- Somewhat beneficial
- Neutral
- Somewhat detrimental
- Very detrimental
- Do not know

What incentives would encourage you or your organization to share more environmental data?

	Extremely important	Very important	Neutral	Slightly important	Not important
Financial incentives or funding opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Recognition and visibility in publications and platforms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Improved data infrastructure and easy sharing tools	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Access to reciprocal data from other organizations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Reduction of administrative burden associated with data sharing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Support in verifying and validating data quality, enhancing the credibility and usability of shared information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

How beneficial do you think it would be to extend the scope of a common portal or data marketplace beyond public sector data to include publicly funded research data, non-open environmental data and citizen-generated environmental data?

- Very beneficial
- Somewhat beneficial
- Neutral
- Somewhat detrimental
- Very detrimental
- Do not know

In your view, how important are the following services to improve data reuse?

	Extremely important	Very important	Neutral	Slightly important	Not important
A centralized data platform to integrate and consolidate environmental data from various sources	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Data visualisation tools	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Data integration services that combine multiple data sources into a unified view	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Real-time data access	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Secure data exchange to protect confidentiality and privacy	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
User feedback mechanisms to capture evolving information needs and use cases	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Do you wish to respond to the second part of the questionnaire, which focuses on the revision and simplification of the current INSPIRE Directive, technical requirements and governance structure?

- Yes
- No

PART B: Revision and simplification of the current INSPIRE Directive
Specific questions (respondents with knowledge of current data governance system)

The [INSPIRE Directive](#) creates an EU Spatial Data Infrastructure (SDI) for the purposes of EU environmental policies and policies or activities, which may have an impact on the environment. This SDI enables the sharing of environmental spatial information among public sector organisations, facilitates public access to spatial information across Europe and assists in policy-making across boundaries. The Directive addresses 34 spatial data themes needed for environmental applications.

The [Open Data Directive](#) provides common rules for a European market of government-held data, based on transparency and fair competition. It introduces the concept of High Value Datasets (HVDs), which should be made available to the public free of charge, in machine-readable format, via APIs, and, where relevant, as a bulk download, given their high value for society and the economy. The HVDs include environmental and spatial data among others.

Policy measures, options and impacts

In your view, would a potential alignment of INSPIRE with the Open Data Directive contribute to...

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know
To simplify data sharing rules?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To promote wide accessibility and reuse of geospatial data?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To reduce the administrative burden on public data providers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain your answer

The obligations of the Open Data Directive and the INSPIRE Directive should not be aligned. Geodata differ significantly from the data contained in the Open Data Directive and require different handling.

Do you support the establishment of a common governance structure for data sharing that would integrate INSPIRE governance with governance structures under horizontal legislation such as the Open Data Directive or the Interoperable Europe Act?

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neutral
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose
- Do not know

In your opinion, how beneficial would it be to involve data intermediaries in the creation of harmonised High-Value Datasets based on the data shared by public sector bodies?

- Very beneficial
- Somewhat beneficial
- Neutral
- Somewhat detrimental
- Very detrimental
- Do not know

Please explain your answer.

The involvement of independent intermediaries could simplify the harmonization process and reduce the workload for the bodies concerned. However, as this would represent another layer of data process and storage, adequate measures should be put in place in order to prevent exposure to security risks.

If INSPIRE would be fully aligned with horizontal legislation (Open Data Directive, Data Governance Act, Interoperable Europe Act) regarding governance structures, provisions on data sharing and technical requirements (e.g. minimal harmonisation and interoperability requirements), how valuable do you think it would be to keep INSPIRE as a stand-alone instrument?

- Highly valuable

- Somewhat valuable
- Neutral
- Slightly valuable
- Not valuable
- Do not know

Please explain your answer.

The data contained in INSPIRE cannot be compared with the data of other legal acts and should continue to be treated separately. Geodata differ from general environmental data. The INSPIRE Directive should therefore remain in force as an independent directive. Furthermore, the annex to Directive 2022/2557 on the resilience of critical entities defines drinking water and wastewater sectors as essential services. Public access to geospatial data on their infrastructures is therefore limited. In addition, access to information for the costumers is already a requirement under the sectoral EU rules (e.g. the Drinking Water Directive). So the increase of the amount of open data could lead to an overload of unguided information and misleading interpretations.

CONCLUSION: Additional comments

If you have any further comments on the GreenData4All initiative, please provide them below.

Please upload a document if you wish to share a more extensive contribution or any background materials that will help us to understand your answers.

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

4abddee2-b457-4db2-88f0-d1d2574fe581

/EurEau_Appendix_to_Public_Consultation_INSPIRE_Impact_Assessment.pdf

Contact

ENV-INSPIRE@ec.europa.eu

