



Voice of the Danube

ICPDR Stakeholder Consultation Workshop 2015

Workshop Report

2-3 July 2015, Zagreb, Croatia

Introduction

The ICPDR is developing the Danube River Basin Management Plan Update 2015 and the first Flood Risk Management Plan for the Danube River Basin for the period between 2015 and 2021. As of December 2014, the ICPDR provided the draft management plans for comments. The public is invited to submit comments to the ICPDR Secretariat until the 22nd of July 2015. To accompany the development of the Update 2015 DRBM Plan and the development of the first Flood Risk Management Plan, the public consultation workshop, entitled Voice of the Danube, was organized on July 2-3, 2015 in Zagreb, Croatia. The ICPDR invited GWP CEE to support the organization and the facilitation of the consultation. There were 85 registrants from different sectors representing governments, public sector, civil society organizations, professional associations, NGOs, businesses, research and academia. The stakeholders had an opportunity to discuss the two draft management plans and propose ways to adjust and improve them.

Background information

The EU Water Framework Directive establishes a legal framework to protect and restore clean water across Europe and to ensure its long-term, sustainable use. It requires an integrated approach (i.e. across all sectors including agriculture, industry, and spatial policy) to the sustainable management and protection of water resources. It impacts on, and is equally impacted by, a diverse range of environmental plans and regulations. Ensuring the integration of all the aims of these plans is a particular challenge in the Danube basin – the most transboundary basin in the Europe.

Both, the Danube River Basin Management Plan and Danube Flood Risk Management Plan indeed require a considerable amount of technical expertise. In addition to this, the planning process should benefit of the knowledge and perspectives of people who use water in their everyday lives, whether as a source of drinking water, agriculture production, for fishing or swimming or to support manufacturing or power generation or even just for its aesthetic appeal.

The ICPDR is committed to active public participation in its decision making. The consultation of stakeholders in the entire cycle of ICPDR activities as stipulated in the Article 14 of the EU Water Framework Directive. In practice, the ICPDR pursues public participation primarily through two avenues:

- through the involvement of observer organizations in its ongoing work

- through specific activities that are dedicated to public participation and information.

This report is a summary of the consultation.

Setting the stage

Prior to the workshop, the participants were invited to submit their statements, comments and suggestions to the DRBMP and FRMP. All participants have access to all online planning documents both at national and international levels. In addition, the public Surveys on DRBMP and FRMP were established. During the workshop, the participants were encouraged to post their questions to be addressed by the ICPDR. The agenda of the workshop is in Annex 1.

The workshop was organised in the form of interactive discussion – Danube Café; the participants were encouraged to discuss each element of the DRBMP and FRMP. Facilitators and reporters rotated and therefore, everybody had an opportunity to express opinions to each of the groups. Facilitators worked with organizers before the workshop to prepare short background information and a set of questions for the groups. Facilitators and rapporteurs were appointed from the ICPDR and GWP CEE experts.

The consultation themes included:

- Nutrient, Organic and Hazardous Substance Pollution in Surface and Groundwater;
- Hydromorphological Alterations & Integration Issues (Flood risk management, Hydropower, Navigation, Agriculture)
- Objectives and measures of Flood Risk Management Plans
- Measures to implement both plans, Financing of the measures
- Communication & Public Participation

The workshop

The consultation workshop was opened by Mr. Drazen Kurecic, president of the ICPDR. ICPDR's film clip to encourage public participation [Get active! Public participation for the Danube](#) was shown.

Key note presentation on Update 2015 DRBMP and DFRMP

The key note presentation was provided by Ivan Zavadsky, ICPDR Executive Secretary. He explained that ICPDR's role is to coordinate and develop the international Danube River Basin Management (DRBMP) and Danube Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMP).

The DRBMP Update 2015 has 140 pages, 35 maps and 15 annexes. It determines priorities for transboundary water management. The draft was submitted for public consultations in December 2014. Ivan Zavadsky gave examples of significant progress made in pressures with 900 urban waste water treatment plants completed by 2015. To solve hydromorphological alterations, 120-plus fish migration aids were completed or under completion by 2015. Regarding ecological and chemical status assessment, improved monitoring and data gaps are expected to be solved during finalisation of the plans. Water is a cross cutting issue and therefore, inter sectoral cooperation is mentioned in connection to floods, marine, nature protection, inland navigation, hydro power, sturgeons and adaptation to climate change. Economic analysis and financing of measures indicates trends in key economic indicators until 2021. Examples of Joint Programme of Measures

were given as well.

FRMP includes flood hazard and risk maps. Its Danube wide objectives are to avoid new risks, reduce existing risks, and strengthen resilience, and increase awareness and solidarity. FRMP deals with Level A issues - natural water retention, solidarity, links to Water Framework Directive, public consultation and climate change. It prioritises only strategic measures and provides examples of best practices.

Voice of the Youth - statement of a youth organisation

Mr Osman Hadzic, President of the Sava Youth Parliament made a statement on behalf of youth organisations. The Sava Youth Parliament is committed to implementation of the Sava Convention. He highlighted several water related issues relevant to the Sava River such as security, sustainable development, working with local communities, awareness raising and importance of communications. During the latest meeting of the Sava Youth Parliament on 29-30 May in Bihac, networking and social media (Facebook) were highlighted among topics that will be addressed in the future.

Statement of an artist

Radostina Doganova, explained what the Danube means to her – the river connects her home country Bulgaria with Slovakia where she currently works. In addition, the river means movement, process, direction, contains start and the end. The paintings displayed at the workshop were inspired by the Danube in different stages of her life. They showed the movements and diversity of the Danube River.

Overview on the interim results from the questionnaires

Danka Thalmeinerova (GWP) presented status of questionnaires on DRBMP - Update 2015 and Danube FRMP. The online survey was launched on 5 June 2015, comprising of two questionnaires posted on ICPDR website. Highlights of responses to the questionnaires until 30 June are summarised as follows.

DRBMP Update 2015

- 67% responders know about DRBMP
- 70% agree that quality of water improved moderately
- DRBMP contributed moderately to improvement of water quality
- Responders agreed that more investments are needed for waste water treatment plans and preferred decreased use of fertilisers
- More than 90% supported fish migration aids
- 93% believe that climate change is relevant for the Danube River Basin
- DRBMP and its contribution climate change is however varied
- 60% mentioned that national issues are not reflected the plans

DFRMP

- Personal networks are primary source
- Majority agreed that flood protection is not absolute
- Maps are easy to understand and strongly improved awareness on floods
- 54% of the respondents are aware of possibility to take own flood protection measures

Statements from stakeholders and observers

Several stakeholders and observers delivered their statements in the plenary - Danube Environmental Forum, Hydro-power Austria, GWP Central and Eastern Europe, Administration of Lower Austria and Danube Strategy Priority Area 4 (Water quality).

Danube Environmental Forum

DRBMP Update 2015 is big step forward and congratulated the ICPDR and its expert groups. However, some problems persist related to further deterioration of water status due to new hydro power generation, its impacts to biodiversity and aquatic fauna reproduction. Landscape planning and water management should be integrated and diffuse pollution from agriculture addressed. In order to avoid deterioration of water status in the future, river corridors, involvement of other sectors and cooperation with the Danube Strategy was mentioned.

Hydropower Austria

In Europe, hydro-power is the most important in energy mix of renewable (70%). Power generation systems are highly volatile due to photovoltaic (PV) and wind, so flexibility is needed. Hydropower plans in Alpine space were mentioned as the only solution to ensure stability of power generation. An example was given of a research project „Hydro-peaking in Austria river stretches“ implemented jointly by BOKU, hydraulic laboratories and utilities.

GWP Central and Eastern Europe (GWP CEE)

János Fehér recommended considering climate change and drought as a significant issue in the DRBMP Update 2015. Further international coordinated actions to address climate change and weather extremes are needed. Reduction of pollution by waste water treatment plants and sewage networks requires high costs. Therefore, natural treatment technologies were proposed, whenever feasible, in small settlements.

Administration of Lower Austria

Christian Steiner drew attention to sustainable land-use, planning and soil protection, since 2015 is FAO International Year of Protection of Soil. In Austria, 22 hectares of arable land is used every day for other land use. In order to deal with soil protection, partnerships and cooperation with agriculture and local municipality is needed.

Danube Strategy Priority Area 4

Lászlo Perger mentioned that the Danube Strategy has brought commitment and responsibility of Danube countries to work together since 2011. Programme of measures can be financed through Danube Transnational Programme, e.g. waste water treatment plants in less development parts of the basin and settlements under 2000 people and sediments.

ICPDR Public Participation Expert Group

Susanne Brandstetter underlined importance of social media, art and youth along with technical issues in both plans.

Summary of Danube Café discussions

The participants discussed each of the themes and responded to the questions as follows.

1. Which are the challenges that need to be addressed in the Danube River Basin Management Plan Update 2015 (DRBMP) and the 1st Floods Risk Management Plan for the Danube River Basin (DFRMP)?

Theme: Nutrient, Organic and Hazardous Substance Pollution in Surface and Groundwater

- Concept of ecosystem services should be considered and should be integrated into the plan at basin level.
- Water scarcity and water quality should be addressed in an integrated way as they are interconnected.
- Pollutions originating from sediment should be considered in the plan.
- Industry is a major polluter in many water bodies, ICPDR should take a lead in prioritization of actions to be addressed at international level.
- More attention should be paid in the plan to the possibilities of the new Common Agricultural Policy and its potential influence on the agriculture in the basin.
- ICPDR should consider to stress the importance of the small wastewater treatment facility applications when basin wide strategy of waste water sector development is harmonised with national priorities.
- More pressure should be put on national governments to tackle actions (legislation, financial support) on water sector (water supply, wastewater treatment). In the southern area of the Danube Basin more focus is needed on wastewater treatment.

Theme: Objectives and measures of Flood Risk Management Plans

- Implementation of the measures is the major challenge; problems arising on financing the measures and on responsible actors;
- International measures can be partially financed by projects but the national measures (and structural measures on international scale) require financing by national investment programmes and clear responsibility allocation at national level;
- Fund raising for international measures is essential;
- Better use of EU funds for projects on horizontal issues and EU funding should be eligible for structural measures as well.
- Natural water retention should be promoted in both international and national plans;
- Improve communication with AGRI sector (incl. PP);
- Some issues shall be addressed stronger in national plans (deforestation increases flood risk, organic farming has retention potential, missing local land use plans pose gaps for flood retention): inserting these into DFRMP would be helpful to promote development at national level;
- Harmonization of flood hazard areas shall be promoted in the next management cycle;
- Sedimentation in HPP reservoirs – spilling needed for retention capacity - non-compliance with WFD objectives.

Theme: Hydro-morphological Alternations & Integration Issues (Flood risk management, Hydropower, Navigation, Agriculture)

- Addressing hydro-morphological pressures is considered as a key issue;
- Topic is observed to be largely covered and progress in measures implementation is recognised, however, further specific improvements are suggested (see below);
- Emphasis on inter-sectoral cooperation was appreciated and the continuous need to work closely together with relevant sectors, in particular with Flood Risk Management (e.g. on Natural Water Retention Measures), Inland Navigation and Hydropower was highlighted;

- Importance of the ICPDR Guiding Principles on Sustainable Hydropower Development was confirmed, however progress with practical application was perceived as rather slow;
- The need to work closer together also with the agricultural sector was raised and identified as an existing gap;
- Working towards better planning is considered as an important issues, taking into account long-term perspectives and effects (e.g. climate change), transparency, a broader planning perspective on benefits and impacts, as well as public consultation and the involvement of stakeholders;
- Sediment management is considered as a key issue – the need for a basin-wide overview with site-specific solutions was emphasized;
- The fact that water scarcity and drought is addressed was appreciated, however, the lack of sufficient policies and guidelines was raised, causing a challenge for practical measures implementation.

Theme: Support to implement both plans, Financing of the measures

- Support/help national actors with applying for available funds (*listed in Annex 18 and others*). Several difficulties were mentioned at the workshop: administrative complexity for applying and managing funds; co-financing requirements; timing of financing and planning process were not in line, etc.
- Better utilize local knowledge and experience and include local actors into prioritization process (usually they are excluded from the debate).
- Better understanding of financial flows: incentives for sustainable water use, economic instruments, and sustainability of investments that has worked in the past and can be improved in the future, cost-effectiveness of measures.
- More support from the Danube level for prioritization of the measures on a national level.

Theme: Communication and Public Participation

- There is a lack of designated communication people at international and local level, who can communicate the important messages to the public. The big question is who is really doing the communication work, which is very important.
- The plans in this form are not attractive to the general public who are not technical experts. They should be translated in a way that the common people could understand. The best solution would be to draft the Plans themselves from the beginning in a better and more attractive way, meant for a broader audience.
- There was not enough time for promoting the questionnaires. The questionnaires in this form are for the public, but the plans are for the technical people and these are 2 very different groups.
- Reaching the broad public and engage them in public consultation.

2. What specific recommendations and suggestions were given for revision of the DRBMP and DFRMP aiming at the improvement of both plans?

Theme: Nutrient, Organic and Hazardous Substance Pollution in Surface and Groundwater

Hazardous substances

- There are many inventories on hazardous substances, but these are separated. There is a need to develop a detailed integrated inventory, which could increase the information base about the real situation of hazardous substances in the production sector/economy.
- Higher level (fourth type) treatment would be needed to reduce impacts of hazardous substances. It is recommended to consider examples from Switzerland where 100 waste water treatment plants will be upgraded aiming the fourth technology (ozonation, UV treatment, activated carbon filters)

- Radioactive substances are considered as a serious issue in the Sava basin. There is no proper solution of dumping radioactive wastes in environmentally sound way in the basin. There is no information about radioactive wastes in the plan.

Nutrient pollution and agricultural issues

- Designated land is needed for nature conservation restoration purposes in active flood plains for nutrient pollution reduction.
- Better methods of the organic and inorganic fertilizers usage/application on land are needed.
- A regional/basin wide level organic material balance and management system for reduction of nutrient pollution is proposed.
- To achieve higher pollution reduction the respective subsidies should be more properly used focusing on better adaptation of land use. Better financial instruments are also needed.
- When reducing nutrients in the rivers this might result in reduction of the biomass (fish population) as well. More understanding is needed on the balance of the both sides of the issue.
- It is proposed to pay attention to different investment projects, not only focusing on wastewater treatment on big cities, but on smaller settlements (with less than 2000 PE) as well. This would decrease pollution loads of the groundwater.
- Phosphorous in middle term perspective would be looked at as resource, therefore P losses should be minimized.
- The timing and dosage of nutrients (organic, inorganic) applications should be compliant with the existing legislation in the practice.
- Agricultural practice should be appropriately managed to minimize nutrient loads to the surface and groundwater resources, this should get priority in the measures.
- Water corridors are good practical means to reduce pollutants transfer from catchment areas. At least 5 m or 15 m buffer zones should be created to reduce pollution from agricultural fields to the surface waters.
- High technology (state of the art) farming practices which could reduce pollution load from agriculture should be supported.
- More detailed knowledge would be needed on overnutrition of agricultural plants. Allocation of more resources for the solution of this problem is advised. Introduction of Best Practices in the daily farming activity would be needed.
- Support of clean agriculture is recommended by increasing or better utilizing the subsidies for clean agricultural production.
- Have dialogue with people in the agricultural sector.

Environmental aspects

- There is clear knowledge gap on solid waste issues and the related pollution problem.
- Improvement of monitoring network would be needed. Further improvement of devices and methods is also important.
- Scientific further investigations/research are needed to understand the potential combined effects of specific pollutants below limit (EQS) values, which might be present in the water environment and producing interactions or integrated effects, which are not known yet.
- Sediment behind dams should be managed. Sediment should be returned from the reservoirs back to the nature. There should be a solution how to return deposited sediment to the river system.
- Using the water for heating and cooling will be more problematic area in the future.
- Pollution is more and more considered as a security problem in terms of accidental pollution.

Programme of measures

- Cost-effectiveness and farmers' willingness to implement agricultural measures are very relevant issues. Dialogue with agricultural sector is a must. Targeting the hot spots and proper subsidization of the measures are essential.
- Concentration of land ownership/production should not be further encouraged, however, it is recommended to get around 10% of the population to be involved in the agricultural production sector for effective implementation of measures.

- Farmers need money to implement the environmental oriented measures in connection with agricultural production.
- "Trace back the sources" approach should be encouraged for the agricultural sector (and maybe linked that with polluter pay principle).
- The less developed countries in the basin need more effective support to revitalize their monitoring system to re-establish a baseline information system for better assessment and planning.

Theme: Objectives and measures of Flood Risk Management Plans

- Pilot projects to be carried out for river restoration providing more space for rivers
- Natural water retention measures shall be applied (e.g., in areas without settlements along Sava);
- Priority be given to horizontal cross-sectoral measures (WFD, FD, water scarcity), more NWR measures shall be presented in the Annex 2;
- Properly balanced combination of structural and non-structural measures is needed, ICPDR's priority are the natural water retention measures but limiting factors exist (geography, finances).
- Water capacity of soil is important especially for areas with no possibility for land use change - water infiltration shall be increased;
- Measures addressing flash floods shall be more promoted;
- Measures targeting floods in urban areas and the related urban planning methodology shall be upgraded to reflect current trends;
- Outcomes of GWP climate change related activities be included as best example text box;
- Information about influence of floods on soil from the AT/SK project shall be included either as a text box or as a subchapter on soil retention into the chapter on NWR;
- Putting more stress to potential of afforestation, organic farming and availability of local land use plans (IAD to contribute);

Theme: Hydromorphological Alternations & Integration Issues (Flood risk management, Hydropower, Navigation, Agriculture)

- Progress and best practices in hydromorphological measures implementation are proposed to be better communicated;
- Further harmonising approaches on hydromorphology between countries (strengthening of methodologies for hydromorphological assessments and HMWB designation); this would lead to a more comprehensive and consistent DRBM Plan;
- River continuity is proposed to be broader addressed, including next to fish migration also other aspects of connectivity, i.e. disconnection of semi-aquatic habitats, sediment transport, reduced river dynamics and impacts on related species, next to the issue of downstream fish migration;
- The list of Future Infrastructure Projects (FIPs) is proposed to be updated by the countries since not all relevant FIPs are considered to be yet included;
- Proposal for guidance on the application of exemptions for new projects according to WFD Art. 4.7, taking into account work already performed in the frame of the Joint Statement on Inland Navigation and the Environment, Guiding Principles Sustainable Hydropower and on Sustainable Flood Risk Management;
- Better using synergies between Flood Risk Management and improving river hydromorphology (example Lonjsko polje), i.a. by reconnecting wetlands/floodplains; more areas with potential for re-connection are expected to be in place – countries were asked to

- check and updated the data; clarification of ‚no net-loss principle‘; not only to maintain ‚status-quo‘ but to expand reconnected wetland/floodplain areas;
- Proposal to raise awareness also on negative impacts of flood protection measures and river training works;
 - Addressing the issue of spatial planning - problems of deforestation, land use and soil compaction, leading to increased risks for flash floods;
 - Approaches for public consultation and stakeholder involvement should be strengthened towards better planning - proposal for support and exchange of experiences in the frame of the ICPDR;
 - Suggestions to further work on improved cooperation with relevant sectors - WFD and Flood Risk Management, Joint Statement Inland Navigation and Environment, Guiding Principles Sustainable Hydropower;
 - Proposal for discussion on the practical application of the Hydropower Guiding Principles, i.a. regarding obstacles and solutions; potential for multi-purpose uses and enabler for other forms of renewable energy by balancing supply and demand, the already utilised potential and the need for a balanced approach and environmental impacts should be taken into account;
 - Proposal to work closer with the agricultural sector - several issues considered as relevant (reduction of nutrient and hazardous substances pollution, use of agricultural land for water retention, soils – role as linkage between agriculture and water, erosion and relevance for sediment transport, etc.);
 - Need for a sediment management tool;
 - Proposal to work more on water scarcity and drought, i.a. towards practical implementation of measures;

Theme: Support to implement both plans, Financing of the measures

- Concrete recommendations for DRBMP Update 2015: Make a connection with EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR) and Danube Transnational Programme.
- Recommendations for future years: There should be exchanges of experiences at the basin-wide level on following:
 - o regarding interaction with different administrative levels for the measures implementation (better communication with higher level);
 - o better understanding (based on the 1st RBMP experiences) of »financing that worked«; how were successful projects implemented, what were benefits, where did they get funding, etc.
 - o case studies of using funding possibilities;
 - o better understanding of cost-effectiveness of measures (examples based on the 1st RBMP experiences);
 - o how to involve private sector financing;
 - o examples of win-win situations (flood protection, energy, biodiversity, etc.).
- Transparency of the funding/spending should be improved. A better understanding is needed regarding what was the benefit/„profit“ of the money which was already invested in the measures in the past, how have investments in the past been done, what were the financial flows, etc.
- Various financing mechanisms exist; however, fundraising requires capacity, skills, resources for co-funding, etc. There should be bigger support/help from the basin-wide level to national-actors get access to funds. So called „Funding Help Desk“ was proposed:
 - o supporting search for funding possibilities (e.g. list of calls);
 - o supporting funding applications (at various levels – focus on local);
 - o getting national co-financing;
 - o communication with different levels (authorities) and sectors; interaction between different

- levels of authorities and different sectors is usually not working);
 - o supporting public participation;
 - o to create basin wide small fund for small projects that integrate public active players – small NGOs, municipalities, SMEs, etc.
- Clearer guidance to prioritization of measures needed to improve chances of national actors to gain funding:
 - o to break down „big steps“ in the plans into smaller, concrete ones as recommendations on concrete actions for countries;
 - o to identify priority areas for investments regarding problems which have transboundary effects. To identify „hot spots“, where finances should be channelled to (priorities connected for examples with country’s natural hazards, etc.)
- Concrete pledges/commitments of countries for each SWMI could be added to the plan.
- Better utilization of the Common Agricultural Policy 2nd pillar for water management measures is crucial. To finance those measures which address sustainable land use.
- Creation of win-win solutions with broad stakeholder support.

Theme: Communication and Public Participation

- Create concerns and interest about the plan.
- Clear actions and clear messages are needed in terms of the Plans.
- Policy makers need short and precise information about the Plans.
- It is not explained who participated in the preparation of the Plans. It has to be written who is responsible for the data. It has to be clear who will be responsible for the facilitation of the public participation connected with the plans at local level.
- To train the planners and the decision makers and people who are responsible for the planning and the implementation of the plans how to involve the stakeholder groups and public and to make trainings for better wordings.
- More sectors should be engaged in the preparation and public consultation phase of the Plans.
- Prepare communication packages for different target audiences (teachers, farmers, etc.)
- Organise forums for territories and also thematic forums (fishery, agriculture, etc.) where to invite specific stakeholder groups. Choose and translate certain messages to local level.
- If the aim is to reach the general public, it is necessary to have a short summary of the Plans, simple and clear, with infographics and photos within the timeframe of the consultation.
- It is important to have a face of the message. Celebrity with a simple message. Show the ICPDR faces also, make it more personal. Use more media, TV, organise interviews. Check which communication channel works in each country.
- It could be easier to bring simple messages to the general public – we need the public to push the policy makers – bottom up approach.

3. What are the key messages from the discussions

Nutrient, Organic and Hazardous Substance Pollution in Surface and Groundwater

- There is a knowledge gap regarding hazardous substances pollution. This issue would require a centralized basin wide programme to get more focused attention on the issue.
- Additional legal instruments are needed at national level for reduction of diffuse pollution (nutrients, erosion, organic matters, etc.) ICPDR should point out the bottlenecks, hotspots should be targeted in legislative frameworks, even at national level.
- Mechanisms are needed to encourage/persuade farmers to do restrictive/environmentally sound farming (cost-effective approach should be used).
- Inclusion of land use planning and biodiversity issues in cross-sectoral activities (e.g. management of agricultural sector) are important and should get more attention in the plan.
- Financial instruments are key elements of implementation of a strategy or plan. Clearer picture should be given in the plan on how measures will be financed.

Objectives and measures of Flood Risk Management Plans

- Natural water retention is a better environmental option in flood risk management, which provides win-win solutions for the implementation of WFD and FD and it should be strongly promoted on both national and international level;
- Practical implementation of measures is the major challenge of DFRMP and it requires identification of funding possibilities as well as of the responsible institutions at the national level;
- Stronger dialogue with the other sectors (WFD, agriculture) and improved public participation at the national level is needed.

Hydromorphological Alternations & Integration Issues (Flood risk management, Hydropower, Navigation, Agriculture)

- Efforts on hydromorphological measures implementation are appreciated and progress should be better communicated, however further efforts are still needed towards more comprehensive measures implementation;
- Better harmonised and strengthened methodologies on hydromorphological assessments are needed;
- Clear support was expressed towards the reinforcement of inter-sectoral cooperation activities with flood risk management, inland navigation and hydropower; the need to launch a similar activity on agriculture was raised;
- Better and strengthened coordinated planning activities were proposed, including spatial planning and taking into account long-term effects and a broad range of stakeholders, benefits and impacts;
- Addressing sediment management was considered as a key issue and the need for further work on water scarcity and drought was expressed.

Support to implement both plans, Financing of the measures

- Facilitation of win-win solutions is crucial for the implementation/financing of both plans, but also for integration of sectors and different levels of administration as well as for involving the private sector.
- Various financing possibilities exist for the implementation of both plans (EU, international, Danube-specific), however, no »rainfall« of money can be expected. In addition, certain difficulties were mentioned for utilising these financing possibilities (administrative complexity for applying and managing funds, co-financing requirements, »timing« of financial programs vs. timing of the implementation of the plans etc.).
- Various ideas for supporting actions at the basin-wide level for the implementation of both plans discussed, for example financing bottom-up activities for implementation of both plans/utilising local knowledge and experience; exchange of experiences between Danube countries regarding e.g.: interaction of different administrative levels for the measures implementation, better understanding (based on the 1st RBMP experiences) of »financing that worked«/case studies of using funding possibilities, better understanding of effectiveness of measures (examples again based on the 1st RBMP experiences), involving private sector financing, improving the understanding of financial flows, incentives, economic instruments and sustainability of investments has worked in the past and can be improved in the future;
- While the strategic, general prioritisation of »types« of measures at the basin-wide level found in both plans is considered useful, requests voiced for more specific, practical recommendations for prioritisation of measures (regarding topics, »hotspot« areas etc.) in order to »lead« and support the national administrations in prioritising measures and in order to provide support/legitimation for financing proposals – political feasibility?
- Proposal for commitments by countries to be included in the plans regarding actions to be taken/«benchmarks« for each »significant water management issue«/flood risk management at the national level – political feasibility?

Communication and Public Participation

- Communication is a very important issue, and it has to be recognised as such. Communication officers at local level are needed to communicate the plans hand in hand with technical experts.
- The Plans should reach out to different target audiences –They should have a simplified and clear version for each target group including policy makers and the general public, because in the actual form they are not attractive. They should also have versions (summaries) in local languages, since the aim is to reach to the people at local level.
- Questionnaires: the time frame was very tight, and people were not given a lot of time to fill them in. They should be simpler and clearer. The questionnaires are for the public, but the plans are for the technical people. These are 2 very different groups and that is why they don't fit together well.
- One of the main challenges is how to really reach the wide public, the people at home.
- FRMPs - there should be preparedness to communicate floods to the public and once they come, we should immediately communicate them, not wait for a week or more to do so.

4. Quotes:

Hydromorphological Alternations & Integration Issues (Flood risk management, Hydropower, Navigation, Agriculture)

- "The concept of 'More space for the rivers' is well known, but there is no strategy in place to do this in practice. We should work on that."
- "Following the last year's flood disaster people decided to reconstruct their houses at the same place, what is a complete nonsense but the state is even supporting that."
- "In 50 years no one will know the local politician anymore who took the decision, but the structures will remain for hundreds of years."
- "Agriculture is really missing."
- "A sediment management tool is needed. Rivers should also be passable for sediments."

Support to implement both plans, Financing of the measures

- Governments are not able to decide on the priorities for water management.
- What is the profit of the money which we already invested in the measures in the past?
- Danube level can support "prioritization" with recommendations on concrete actions.
- With only "top-down" approach we are losing local actors.
- Implementation of the measures with strong private initiative "attracts" also governmental or other "funds".

Communication and Public Participation

- "The Plans are technical and boring" and "the Plans are not attractive for the common person."
- "It has to be clear who will be responsible for the facilitation of the public participation connected with the plans."
- "The Questionnaires are for an insider club"
- "We need a communication person + a planner working very tightly together".

5. Session summary comments or any other comments for the workshop report (optional)

Nutrient, Organic and Hazardous Substance Pollution in Surface and Groundwater

- The workshop was well organised.
- The programme went well.
- More time should have been allocated for topic discussion in the Danube Café. 30 minutes were not enough to collect and briefly discussed suggestions of the participants.
- Some of the participants were not aware of the content of the plans in question.
- It is recommended to put focused efforts on ensuring participation from all Danube countries and

all major stakeholder groups.

Objectives and measures of Flood Risk Management Plans

- Better communicate the meaning of low probability on hazard map to public;
- Current description of natural water retention in BA should be revised to promote this issue;
- Public consultation at national level has still room for improvement;
- DFRMP is a good document identifying the common goals for flood risk management in 14 countries and provides good examples for inspiration.

Support to implement both plans, Financing of the measures

- Morphology: too much focus on longitudinal connectivity for fish; more on biodiversity and migration.
- Too much focus on non-structural measures; should be included also effects of structural measures and especially effects from combination of both of them.
- There should be special focus on the projects which are supporting or implementing measures for getting land along rivers (for flood protection, biodiversity, etc.).
- It has to be built a better link to drought risk situations and include drought management needs/efforts into RBMP.

Communication and Public Participation

- Why was agriculture not represented? It is one of the most important sectors for water quality. There is not enough information exchange with agriculture.

Day 2 (Friday, 3 July)

The Voice of the basin - presentation of the key-messages of the whole event and next steps by ICPDR Executive Secretary

Summary and the next steps

The ICPDR planning process timeline is as follows:

- Public consultation process until 22 July 2015
- Over summer: Collection of all comments & condensed report until end of summer, provided to relevant Expert Groups (RBM, FP, PP)
- Autumn: Discussion of comments & revision of management plans
- December 2015: Finalisation and adoption of plans at 18th ICPDR Ordinary Meeting, consultation report published
- 9 February 2016: Endorsement of plans at Danube Ministerial Meeting, Vienna

Methodology of the report:

- Feeds information from all 4 public consultation activities
- Part 1 includes raw data & documents
- Part 2 features table with key points of all comments received
- Following revision, Part 2 will be extended in autumn
- Comment accepted: how?
- Comment dismissed: why?

Key messages: Nutrient, Organic & Hazard. Substance Pollution

- There is a knowledge gap regarding hazardous substances pollution. This issue would require a centralized basin wide programme to get more focused attention on the issue.
- Additional legal instruments needed at national level for reduction of diffuse pollution (nutrients, erosion, etc.).
- ICPDR should point out the bottlenecks, hotspots should be targeted in legislative situation, even at national level.
- Mechanisms needed to encourage / persuade farmers to do the restrictive / environmentally sound farming (cost-effective approach should be used).
- Inclusion of biodiversity issues in cross-sectoral aspects are important and should get more attention in the plan.

Key messages: Hydromorphology Alterations & Integration Issues

- Efforts on hydromorphological measures implementation appreciated & progress to be well-communicated, but:
- More efforts needed towards more comprehensive measure implementation
- Support for better harmonised & strengthened methodologies on hydromorphological assessments
- Clear support towards reinforcement of inter-sectoral cooperation activities with FRM, navigation & hydropower
- Need to launch similar activity on agriculture
- Need for better coordinated planning activities, including spatial planning and taking into account long-term effects and broad range of stakeholders, benefits and impacts
- Further efforts needed on water scarcity and drought
- Sediment management considered a key issue

Key messages: Objectives & Measures Flood Risk Management Plan

- Natural water retention is a better environmental option in flood risk management, which provides win-win solutions for the implementation of WFD and FD and it should be strongly promoted on both national and international level;
- Practical implementation of measures is the major challenge of DFRMP and it requires identification of funding possibilities as well as of the responsible institutions at the national level;
- Stronger dialogue with the other sectors (WFD, agriculture) and improved public participation at the national level is needed.

Key messages: Implementation & financing of measures

- Creation of win-win solutions with broad stakeholder support crucial (administration, private sector)
- Various financing mechanisms exist, but no “money shower” – funds may require capacity, resources, etc.
- Concrete ideas for basin-wide level to help national-level actors get access to funds were proposed
- Clearer guidance to prioritisation of measures needed to improve chances of national actors to gain funding
- Concrete pledges/commitments of countries for each SWMI could be added to the plan

Key messages: Communication & public participation

- Communication is important & must be recognised – but who does the communication? (responsible actors)
- Language issue: plans are in English. Translations of summaries?
- Questionnaires: low returns; mismatch between questions/plans; required people to have read plans; too complicated. In general, questionnaires would need improvements, but show a strong recognition for PP
- Main challenge for future: how to reach general public
- Preparedness to communicate immediately when flood event occurs is required

Written “post it” questions from the audience

- Most of them covered in discussion, except:
- Question: Do the plans reflect transport in short and medium term horizon? Answer: Joint Statement Process, next JS meeting 10/11 September in Vienna
- Question: How to make the management plans more understandable for non-experts? Answer: Publication under preparation, will be available for Ministerial Meeting, 9 February 2015 in Vienna

Most frequently keywords from the discussion were summarised in the following “Tag cloud”

- Integrative approaches
- Strategic planning
- Stakeholder involvement
- Land-use
- Wetland & river restoration
- Inter-sectoral processes
- Ecological values
- Agriculture

Several comments, questions and issues were raised by the audience that are summarised below:

- Viktor Bilejic, Aarhus Center, Bosnia and Herzegovina informed that rivers in Balkans can be influenced by hydro-power projects in the future.
- WWF expressed appreciation for both plans that were improved in comparison to previous versions. Regarding stakeholder involvement, WWF organized public consultation processes in Hungary, Slovakia and other countries. It proposed to involve farmers during winter time when they are free. Measures related to flood risk management are well described in the DFRMP, however, countries need to implement them on the national level. Wetland restoration still has a low profile in Central and Eastern Europe.
- Include organic farmers and agriculture sector, harmonize planning documents such as land use plans, agriculture and forestry plans.
- Richard Muller, GWP CEE, pointed out to look for synergies with landscape planning that is developed in some Danube countries and measures, such as territorial systems of ecological stability and eco-stabilization measures.
- IADR gave an example of workforce employed by agricultural sector - 30% worked in agriculture 60 years ago in comparison to 1% today. In order to produce high quality food, 10% population should work in agricultural sectors mostly as part time farmers. If you want to use large parts of land for retention, involvement of agriculture is therefore crucial.
- Tomas Orfanus, Slovak Academy of Sciences asked about long term planning horizon until 2050 and communication with the Danube Strategy

- Danube Environmental Forum is missing river corridor concept that could be upscale into an international pilot project. It proposed to have a close look on deterioration issue due to hydro-power construction. Integrated planning should integrate land-use not around rivers but in broader areas. We also have to keep in mind an overall goal of achieving a good water status.
- Eduard Interviews added that farmers should be involved in the national processes and commitments of the national levels should feed in the plans
- Martina Zupan, GWP CEE Chair has mentioned experience from Slovenia where stakeholders are active but governmental support is limited. In this respect she enquired whether there is any way to encourage countries to involve stakeholders?
- Susanne Brandstetter mentioned an example of good communications and public participation work of the ICPDR Public Participation Expert Group.

ICPDR answered some of the questions from the audience. ICPDR guiding principles for hydropower is a valuable resource addressing deterioration issue. ICPDR also works on a concept paper related to agriculture that aims to develop a guidance document with best agricultural practices. ICPDR is an observer to relevant areas of the Danube Strategy and Permanent Secretariat cooperates with JRC on long term modelling of the region.

In addition, Ivan Zavadsky stressed that the ICPDR will treat each comments with great respect. He concluded with appreciation of active participation of stakeholders at the workshop and thanked to facilitators & rapporteurs, moderators & GWP team.

Conclusions, next steps and closing of the Stakeholder Workshop

Steven Downey asked the participants about their suggestions to the workshop structure. WWF appreciated Danube Café format and workshop overall, however, proposed to target agriculture, tourism and navigation and allow a more time for Danube Café discussion. Other comments concerned the presentations that will be summarised in the report, suggestions to use the second day to work on hot spots identified during Day 1 and to list names of national experts and authors who provided data for the plans. ICPDR Executive Secretary Ivan Zavadsky mentioned again that comments can be submitted by email to ICPDR icpdr@unvienna.org by any organization to any issue related to the plans. The comments can be submitted by 22 July. An update of the DRBMP Update 2015 and DFRMP will be prepared in the autumn of 2015. The final versions will be endorsed by the 18th ICPDR Ordinary Meeting in December 2015 and consequently on 9 February 2016 at the Ministerial Meeting in Vienna.

Steven Downey mentioned in his closing part that all issues were addressed, highlighted active participation, constructive spirit of the workshop and responsibility for the basin. There is an opportunity to provide comments and participate in the online survey until 22 July 2015.

ANNEX 1

Voice of the Danube ICPDR Stakeholder Consultation Workshop 2015

Agenda

2-3 July 2015, Zagreb, Croatia

Day 1 (Thursday, 2 July)

09:00 – 09:30 Registration

09:30 – 10:30 Morning session 1

- Film clip produced by ICPDR (5 min.)
- Key note presentation by ICDPR President on the management plans (30 min.)
- Voice of the Youth - statement of a youth organisation (15 min.)

10:30 – 11:00 Coffee break (30 minutes)

11:00 – 12:00 Morning session 2

- Overview on the interim results from the questionnaires and statements from observers and stakeholders (20 min.)
- Discussion with stakeholders (35 min.)
- Introduction to the Danube Café (5 min.)

12:00 – 13:00 Lunch break (60 minutes)

Danube Café: **Stakeholders will be divided in 5 groups** to work on specific topic. Each group will have a facilitator, a rapporteur and up to 20 participants. The groups will rotate.

Topics:

- Nutrient, Organic and Hazardous Substance Pollution in Surface and Groundwater;
- Hydromorphological Alterations & Integration Issues (Flood risk management, Hydropower, Navigation, Agriculture)
- Objectives and measures of Flood Risk Management Plans
- Measures to implement both plans, Financing of the measures
- Communication & Public Participation

13:00 – 15:00 Afternoon session 1

Three Danube Café topics per participant

15:00 – 15:30 Coffee break (30 minutes)

15:30 – 16:30 Afternoon session 2

15:30 – 16:45 Danube Café (continuation)

Two Danube Café topics per participant

16:45 – 17:00 Closing the first day of the Stakeholder Workshop.

Day 2 (Friday, 3 July)

09:00 – 10:30 Morning session 1

- Summary of Day 1 and outlook of Day 2 (10 min.)
- Rapporteurs' reports on the Danube Café from the previous day (10 min. each, total of 50 min.)
- General discussion on these reports (30 min.)

10:30 – 11:00 Coffee break (30 minutes)

11:00 – 12:30 Morning session 2

- The Voice of the basin - presentation of the key-messages of the whole event and next steps by ICPDR Executive Secretary (20 min.)
- Conclusions, next steps and closing of the Stakeholder Workshop (70 min.)

12:30 End of the Workshop

ANNEX 2

Voice of the Danube

ICPDR Stakeholder Consultation Workshop 2015

List of registrants

| | | | |
|-----|----|------------------------|---|
| 1. | Mr | Benedikt Mandl | ICPDR Secretariat |
| 2. | Mr | Raimund Mair | ICPDR Secretariat |
| 3. | Mr | Károly Gombás | ICPDR FP-EG |
| 4. | Mr | Igor Liska | ICPDR Secretariat |
| 5. | Mr | Zoran Stojanovic | Serbian Environmental Protection Agency |
| 6. | Ms | Susanne Brandstetter | Austrian Ministry for Environment |
| 7. | Mr | Otto Pirker | Verbund AG |
| 8. | Mr | Knut Beyer | Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety |
| 9. | Mr | Popescu Liviu Nicolae | GWP-CEE - Regional Council member and GWP-Romania President |
| 10. | Mr | Michal Hazlinger | Ministry of Environment of Slovak republic |
| 11. | Ms | Martina Zupan | GWP CEE |
| 12. | Mr | Rudolf Hornich | Office of the Styrian Government, Dep 14, Watermanagement, resources and Sustainability |
| 13. | Mr | Richard Muller | Global Water Partnership Central and Eastern Europe |
| 14. | Ms | Danka Thalmeinerova | Global Water Partnership |
| 15. | Ms | Laurice Ereifej | WWF Danube-Carpathian Programme Office |
| 16. | Ms | Sabina Bokal | Global Water Partnership Central and Eastern Europe |
| 17. | Mr | László Perger | Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Hungary |
| 18. | Mr | Steven Downey | Global Water Partnership |
| 19. | Mr | János Fehér | GWP CEE Region |
| 20. | Mr | Tomas Orfanus | GWP Slovakia, Institute of Hydrology, Slovak Academy of Sciences |
| 21. | Mr | Peter Matt | Vorarlberger Illwerke AG |
| 22. | Mr | Sandor Szalai | National Committee of ICID |
| 23. | Ms | Sophia Beck-Mannagetta | CEHAPE |
| 24. | Mr | Gerhard Nagl | Danube Environmental Forum |
| 25. | Mr | Helmut Belanyecz | EAA - ÖKF |
| 26. | Ms | Imola Koszta | Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe |
| 27. | Ms | Jelena Zigic | Institute for materials and construction testings of Republic of Srpska |
| 28. | Mr | Eduard Interwies | InterSus - Sustainability Services |
| 29. | Mr | Harald Kutzenberger | International Association for Danube Research |

| | | | |
|-----|----|-------------------------|--|
| 30. | Mr | Dragan Zeljko | International Sava River Basin Commission |
| 31. | Mr | Mirza Sarač | International Sava River Basin Commission |
| 32. | Mr | Edin Lugić | EU Strategy for Danube Region - Priority Area 6 |
| 33. | Ms | Ana Kobašlić | EU Strategy for Danube Region - Priority Area 6 |
| 34. | Mr | Georg Frank | DANUBEPARKS |
| 35. | Ms | Marija Pinter | Croatian Ministry of Agriculture |
| 36. | Mr | Vladimir Tausanovic | IAWD |
| 37. | Ms | Valeriya Gyosheva | ICPDR Secretariat |
| 38. | Ms | Gergana Majercakova | GWP CEE |
| 39. | Mr | Viktor Bjelic | Center for Environment/ Aarhus Center Network of Bosnia and Herzegovina |
| 40. | Ms | Stephanie Blutaumüller | Danube Competence Center |
| 41. | Ms | Boska Trbojevic | Coca-Cola HBC |
| 42. | Mr | Bujac Victor | Basin Water Management Authority, Agency Apele Moldovei |
| 43. | Mr | Peter van Puijenbroek | PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency |
| 44. | Ms | Monika Ericson | Global Water Partnership |
| 45. | Ms | Veronika Koller-Kreimel | Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, Austria |
| 46. | Mr | Stefan Polhorsky | Slovak Water Management Enterprise, Branch Bratislava |
| 47. | Mr | István Szilvássy | Danube Pearls Trans-national Multi-project Partnership coordinator |
| 48. | Ms | Amra Memić | JU "Medicinska skola" Bihac |
| 49. | Mr | Hadžić Osman | JU "Medicinska skola" Bihac |
| 50. | Mr | Jefferson Andrade | Regional Environmental Center - REC |
| 51. | Ms | Irena Brnada | Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe (REC), Country Office Croatia |
| 52. | Mr | Daniel Gomez | Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe |
| 53. | Ms | Jovanka Ignjatovic | Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe |
| 54. | Ms | Renata Fuert | ICPDR Secretariat |
| 55. | Ms | Lara Bušić | Sava Youth Parliament |
| 56. | Mr | János Tamás | University of Debrecen, GWP CEE |
| 57. | Ms | Andreja Sušnik | Slovenian Environmental Agency |
| 58. | Mr | Christian Steiner | Administration Lower Austria |
| 59. | Mr | Ivan Zavadsky | ICPDR Secretariat |
| 60. | Mr | Ivan Milovanovic | ICPDR Secretariat |
| 61. | Mr | Mitja Bricelj | Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning |
| 62. | Mr | Bojan Jakopič | Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning |
| 63. | Mr | Tomaž Grilj | Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning |
| 64. | Mr | Tibor Mikuska | Croatian Society for Birds and Nature Protection |
| 65. | Ms | Vera Shiko | Albanian Institute of Transport |
| 66. | Mr | Aleš Vidmar | Fundacija Okolje smo vsi |
| 67. | Mr | Kristjan Lapuh | Fundacija Okolje smo vsi |
| 68. | Ms | Daniela Stojkovic | Danube Civil Society Forum |

| | | | |
|-----|----|------------------------|--|
| 69. | Mr | Ovidiu Agliceru | Hydroelectrica SA |
| 70. | Mr | Adam Kovacs | ICPDR Secretariat |
| 71. | Mr | Drazen Kurecic | Ministry of Agriculture |
| 72. | Mr | Ivica Plisic | Hrvatske vode (Croatian waters) |
| 73. | Ms | Sanja Genzic Jurisevic | Croatian Ministry of Agriculture |
| 74. | Ms | Elizabeta Kos | Croatian Ministry of Agriculture |
| 75. | Mr | Alan Cibilić | Hrvatske vode (Croatian waters) |
| 76. | Mr | Maldini Kresimir | Hrvatske vode (Croatian waters) |
| 77. | Ms | Dagmar Šurmanović | Hrvatske vode (Croatian waters) |
| 78. | Ms | Tausanovic Mina | ELSA - European Students of Law Association |
| 79. | Ms | Jasmina Ancovic | Hrvatske vode (Croatian waters) |
| 80. | Mr | Dadecic Gligor | Croatian Society for Birds and Nature Protection |
| 81. | Ms | Jovana Raseta | PWMC "Serbiavode" |
| 82. | Ms | Martina Egedusevic | PWMC "Serbiavode" |
| 83. | Ms | Radostina Doganova | Artist |
| 84. | Mr | Dimitar Doganov | Consultant |
| 85. | Mr | Tomislav Majerovic | Hrvatske vode (Croatian waters) |