

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your request for environmental information. We appreciate your interest, and we want to let you know that your request has been carefully considered in accordance with the Environmental Information Regulations (EIR).

**Your request:**

At our meeting of 1pm on 3rd Dec 2024 (attached), you kindly agreed to share a file with me covering the times/dates of necessary CSOs (EDM data) that covers the period of our development of a new type of PO4-P and NO3-N sensor (the PO4-P sensor is first unit in UK/globe) at two locations in Cumbria (UUG0770 Near Sawrey and UUG1194 Grasmere).

The critical period of data we are interested in is 15th October 2024 to 30th June 2025 (when the first field test of the PO4-P sensor was undertaken – this sensor on Cunsey Beck completed its testing, and is now back at [REDACTED] for servicing before moving to a new type of location on farm for further evaluation).

These are the EDM data that you make public for a short period of time (via the UU website). You also thought that the time-series per site would be made public by March 2025, but I still cannot see these.

These data are needed purely for technical academic purposes to understand if the novel microfluidic sensors are delivering meaningful dynamics.

Is it possible to receive a file(s) containing these EDM data please – we would not share the file beyond me and my two researchers ([REDACTED]).

When we are happy with the quality of the outputs from these microfluidics PO4-P and NO3-N sensors, maybe UU may find this type of sensor useful.

**Our response:**

Please see attached a copy of the requested data. This is also publicly available on our website, under the drop down on the [Storm Overflow Performance](#) page. This page also provides details of the 5-step process that water companies use to review and validate the raw data that is received from Event Duration Monitors (EDMs) located at each overflow. As some of the data has not been through the 5-step validation process, please note the following important points when reviewing the data:

- This data is raw sensor signal data which has not been analysed to remove anomalies or errors. Therefore, any analysis conducted using these raw, unvalidated signals could give rise to misleading conclusions if treated as validated EDM sensor data.
- The raw sensor signals are those referred to in step 1 of our 5-step process to report on spills from storm overflows. This process is described [here](#). During the subsequent steps, quality checks and data validation is carried out to convert the raw signals into our annual EDM data return which is available on the same webpage.
- These raw sensor signals cannot be used as an accurate basis for how many actual discharges there were. This is because some of the raw unvalidated sensor signals are subsequently found to be inaccurate or unreliable once inspected and assessed as a result of water motion in storm tanks, fluvial flooding, abnormal weather conditions, animal interference or sensor failure.
- The raw signals are subject to an auditable process of data validation and analysis before the regulatory EDM return is produced, which is the only source of data from which conclusions about storm overflow operation can accurately be made.

For additional information, the [Storm Overflows Data | Stream - Portal](#) provides a Hub, which is designed to be a source of open data on the operation of storm overflows in England. The data provided on the Hub – produced via an Application Programming Interface (API) – is near real-time data detected via Event Duration Monitors (EDM) and sent to each company's cloud storage system, where it is then transmitted to the map. Companies aim to transmit data on a discharge within an hour of the outfall operating.

We hope that this response answers your request. However, if you're not satisfied with how we've handled it, you can request an internal review. To do this, please write to us at Environmental Information Office, Haweswater House, Lingley Mere, Warrington, WA5 3LP or email us at [EIRRequests@uuplc.co.uk](mailto:EIRRequests@uuplc.co.uk), addressing your request to [REDACTED], and explaining why you're unhappy with our response. We'll be very happy to review your request and ensure we've done everything we can to assist you.

Any request for an internal review should be made within 40 working days of receipt of this response, and we will reply within 40 working days from receipt of the request for internal review.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

We'd love to hear your feedback on how we handled your request! If you have a moment, please complete our short survey [here](#) – your input helps us improve our service.