

Petersberg Phase II / Athens Declaration Process

International Roundtable on “Integrated Shared Lake Basin Management in Southeastern Europe”

12 - 14 October 2006, Ohrid

**Organized by
Global Water Partnership Mediterranean and
Lake Ohrid Watershed Committee**

With the support of

GEF IW:LEARN, Activity D2

Summary report from Participants Evaluations



For more information please contact

GWP-Med Secretariat

c/o MIO-ECSDE

12, Kyrristou str., 10556 Athens, Greece

T: +30210-3247490, -3247267, F: +30210-3317127

E-mail: secretariat@gwpmed.org

Web: www.gwpmed.org

Introduction

The International Roundtable on “Integrated Shared Lake Basin Management in Southeastern Europe” took place in Ohrid, FYR Macedonia, 12– 14 October 2006. It was jointly organised by the Global Water Partnership-Mediterranean (GWP-Med) and the Lake Ohrid Watershed Committee (LOWC), and supported by GEF IW:LEARN. The Roundtable was part of the activities within the Petersberg Process Phase II / Athens Declaration Process and GEF IW:LEARN Activity D2.

The Roundtable addressed issues of integrated management of lake basins and the linkages to river basin and coastal management; this has built on related ongoing work in the region and linked to the GEF supported Lake Basin Management Initiative. Case studies on a series of Lakes (i.e. Ohrid , Prespa and Shkoder) and the Drin River basins were presented and discussed.

Participants were representatives of competent authorities and organizations that work in the shared water bodies of focus from Albania, FYR Macedonia, Greece, Kosovo (under interim UN administration) and Montenegro; of Donor Countries (Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Switzerland) and International and Regional Institutions and Organizations (European Agency for Reconstruction, GEF, GWP, GWP-Med, International Sava River Basin Commission, MedWet, Peipsi Center for Transboundary Cooperation, REC, UNDP, UNESCO, World Bank, WWF).

The overall aim of the Roundtable was the promotion of cooperation for the management of the transboundary water bodies of the South Western Balkan Peninsula region. Among the objectives were the exchange of information and the communication of good practices and success stories in different aspects of management of shared Lake Basins, such as stakeholder involvement, exchange of scientific information, institutionalization of cooperation, financing etc. and the establishment of a peer network between persons working in the three shared Lake basins of focus.

An evaluation form was circulated at the end of the Roundtable in order for the participants to provide their views regarding the Roundtable’s results in terms of succeeding its objectives, and impact in terms of enhancement of the cooperation over Transboundary Water Resources Management issues in the Southeastern Europe. The feedback provided would be used for the better planning and realization of the future events.

This document presents a summary Evaluation Report of the Ohrid Roundtable based on answers given by the participants. The evaluation form along with the answers of the responders is provided in an Annex.

Who responded?

Forty (40) out of the fifty five (55) participants of the Ohrid International Roundtable submitted evaluation forms. Thirty eight (38) were submitted at the end of the Roundtable and only 2 in response to follow-up emails. Responders included:

- 8 High level staff of competent ministries of the SEE countries
- 9 UN agencies and international and regional projects high level staff and managers
- 7 High level staff of competent ministries and developmental agencies of donor countries
- 11 Local, regional and international NGOs Chairs and staff (some of them members of shared lakes basins coordination committees)
- 4 High level staff of local scientific institutes
- 1 Others

The expectations of the participants of the Roundtable were found to be met.

❖ The vast majority of the participants (90%) answered that their expectations were “*very much*” (35%) or “*enough met*” (55%) and 10% “*partially met*”. None of the participants answered that his/her expectation was “*little*” or “*not at all*” met.

The objectives of the roundtable were found to be met.

❖ The average responders’ rating with regard to the achievement of the objectives was 3.96 out of 5.

In more detail, the average rating on the extent that each of the following objectives were met, was:

1. Promoting cooperation among stakeholders for integrated water resources and ecosystem management in the transboundary water bodies of the South Western Balkan Peninsula region i.e. Prespa, Ohrid and Shkoder Lake and Drin River Basins: 4 out of 5 (i.e. 80%);
2. Establishing the basis of a peer network for those working in the shared water bodies of this region: 3.98 out of 5 (i.e. 79.5 %);
3. Exchange of information and communication of good practices and success stories in relevant aspects of shared basin management, such as:
 - stakeholder involvement: 3.98 out of 5 (i.e. 79.5 %);
 - institutionalization of cooperation: 4.05 out of 5 (i.e. 81%);
 - sustainable financing: 3.73 out of 5 (i.e. 74.5 %);
 - multipurpose use of shared lake basin water resources: 3.73 out of 5 (i.e. 74.5 %);
4. Fostering the development of a set of recommendations to promote integrated water resources and ecosystem management in the transboundary basins of focus: 3.93 out of 5 (i.e. 78.5 %);
5. Participants gained a clearer picture of on-going shared water body management activities that will allow their better involvement in promoting joint management: 4.13 out of 5 (i.e. 82.5 %);
6. Identified key areas of action where Petersberg Process Phase II / Athens Declaration Process could enhance synergies with on-going and planned initiatives and activities in the region: 3.88 out of 5 (i.e. 77.5 %).

On average, the majority (76%) answered that these objectives were “*very much*” or “*enough*” met (25.3 % and 50.8 % respectively) and 23.5 % “*partly*” (19.5 %), or a “*little*” met (4.0 %) while 0.5 % answered that they “*weren’t met at all*”.

The event was useful to the participants. Varied answers on the benefits obtained from their participation.

The majority of the responders valued the overall usefulness of the event at either 4 or 5 on a five point scale. The average rating to the 5 relevant questions was 4 out of 5.

In more detail, the average rating of the degree of usefulness of the event to the participants in terms of:

- a. Relevance of theme and topic sessions to their work/area of expertise, was 3.98 out of 5 (i.e. 79.5%);
- b. Knowledge and skills gained for their current or future work, was 3.7 out of 5 (i.e. 74%);
- c. Providing an informal forum for exchange of information with other participants (at the margins of structured sessions), was 4.08 out of 5 (i.e. 81.5%);
- d. Providing an opportunity to establish new useful contacts, was 4.23 out of 5 (i.e. 84.5%);
- e. Identification of applicable good practices and lessons learned, was 3.88 out of 5 (i.e. 77.5%);
- f. Cases presented and discussed provided insights or lessons that are relevant to the watershed/s with which they work, was 4.15 out of 5 (i.e. 83%);

On average, the roundtable was “*extremely useful*” or “*very useful*” to the 74.6 % of the responders (28.3 % and 46.3 % respectively). It was “*useful*” to the 22.5% and “*somewhat useful*” to the 2.9% of the responders. No one answered that the roundtable was “*not useful*”.

❖ The Ohrid International Roundtable provided benefits both to representatives of the local stakeholders and the international organizations.

Sharing of information, experience and lessons learned on different aspects of management of the Shared Lake Basins in the region were the most often found constituents in the answers given by the responders.

Answers given by many of the representatives of the local stakeholders showed that they had the chance to acquire knowledge regarding different aspects of management of a transboundary lake. Among specific answers given by these participants, regarding the benefits gained, were: “capacity building on the competences and functions of a joint committee for a shared water body”, “acquiring useful tools for the management of lake basins”, “ways how to treat issues within a basin”, “knowledge and skills gained”, “intensive education on projects and activities at the field level”.

Answers given by representatives of international organizations and donor countries that work in the region showed that they had the chance to learn more about the realities regarding shared lake basin management in the area. Some answered that they had the chance to identify “success practices that can be transferred elsewhere” as well as “champions” in the region.

A benefit acknowledged by most of the responders was that they were provided the chance to make useful contacts and develop a network of people working in the area of Lake Basin management in SEE.

Some of the responders were referred to specific issues. Among such, being constituents of answers given, were: Cooperation processes in SEE; Joint commissions; Development of agreements; Involvement of stakeholders; WFD as a tool for the enhancement of cooperation for TWRM.

The full list of the answers given can be found in the respective section of the Annex.

Varied answers on what the responders wanted to learn more about, through their participation in the roundtable.

The answers given, showed that the participants wanted to a. be provided with practical information on aspects of TWRM in the region, b. understand the realities in the different shared lakes basins that were the driving forces of success or failure and c. identify, in order to replicate in their field of work, best practices and successful strategies.

Most often found constituents of answers were the following (ordered on the basis of the frequency of their appearance in the participants' responses):

- Experiences and lessons learned in the different shared lakes basins with regard to transboundary cooperation for their management;
- Aspects of financing transboundary cooperation, such as innovative financing tools and mechanisms used to secure the sustainability of the relevant schemes and institutions;
- Transboundary institutions, ways to organize them and their sustainability; public participation; stakeholder involvement and capacity building; and the relevance between TWRM and EU Water Framework Directive, were also issues that the responders wanted to learn more about.

As a result of their participation in the Roundtable many of the participants will recommend on thinks to be done differently in their field of work.

Most of the participants from the twenty one (21) that responded to this question, answered that a suggestion would be to use experience developed and apply successful models used in the other shared lakes basins – one answered “use the new network” for this. Fostering enhanced participation of and cooperation among stakeholders for the management of shared lakes basins; plan the sustainability of the transboundary schemes early in the process; and don't hesitate to foster transboundary cooperation on specific challenges, are among suggestions that will be made by some of the responders. These answers were given by participants strongly involved in the cooperation processes for the management of the different shared basins of the area.

Other answers given can be found in the respective section of the Annex.

All the responders think that the exchange of information and dialogue among people working in the management of shared water bodies should continue.

❖ The participants were asked for their opinion on how this should be realized. They were given the opportunity to choose between a. International roundtables; b. Targeted workshops; c. Establishment of inter-lake working groups; d. Field visits and training d. Other (there were asked to specify). Each of the participants could choose more than one of the above options.

The most preferable option was Targeted workshops (chosen by 31 responders) followed by Field visits and training (chosen by 26 responders), International roundtables (chosen by 20 responders) and Establishment of inter-lake working groups (chosen by 19 responders). Six responders thought that exchange of information should be realised through other means than the above.

❖ Twenty nine participants or 72.5% of the responders gave a clear positive answer that web-based dialogues and exchange of information among peers would benefit such a process. The comments made by 7 responders can be found in the respective section of the Annex.

❖ Twenty four of the participants or 60% of the responders gave a clear positive answer to the question: “Would you participate in such a web-based dialogue and exchange of information?”
The comments made by 9 responders can be found in the respective section of the Annex.

Varied proposals made by the responders with regard to important trans-boundary water resource management issues to be addressed in future roundtables.

❖ Twenty (20) of the participants or 50% of the responders answered that they would like to contribute to planning future meetings addressing issues of transboundary water resources management.

❖ There was a variety of trans-boundary water resource management issues (eighty seven in total proposals were made) that the 30 responders who provided their views, indicated as important to be addressed in future International Roundtables.

Specific aspects of institutional and legislative framework (e.g. transboundary institutions, their role and their sustainability, strengthening of managerial structures, enforcement of laws, bilateral and international agreements etc.) and bilateral, multilateral and regional cooperation (e.g. cooperation strengthening and coordination, the role of bilateral and multilateral bodies, experience exchange, information and data sharing, harmonization of monitoring programmes etc.) regarding shared water resources management were indicated by 18 participants. Issues related to EU Water Framework Directive (transposition into national legal frameworks, IWRM, its implementation and role in transboundary basins) were indicated by 5 responders.

Aspects of Public Participation (e.g. involvement of the civil society and its role in TWRM, strengthening of the local communities, participation of stakeholders etc.) were indicated by 14 responders.

Financing of institutions and activities regarding TWRM (e.g. sustainable financing, financing mechanisms including alternative and innovative financing mechanisms etc.) was also an important indication (7 participants).

Three (3) responders indicated issues with regard to shared groundwater management in the framework of IWRM.

Several other issues, all within the framework of transboundary water resources management, such as sustainable development, strategic planning, joint basin management plans, anticipated impacts of climate variability, contribution and role of science, pollution prevention techniques, capacity building, monitoring systems, land use planning, agriculture, eco-tourism, environmental education, biodiversity conservation and protected areas management, multipurpose use of water, etc. were among the proposals made by the responders.

A number of responders proposed for future roundtables to focus on specific shared basins such as Drin river and Shkoder lake basins.

The full list of the answers given can be found in the respective section of the Annex.

Few varied suggestions were given on how upcoming Petersberg Process Phase II / Athens Declaration Process International Roundtables on Trans-boundary Water Resources Management in South Eastern Europe could be improved.

Seven of the participants responded. Two of them suggested that the working groups should be smaller providing the opportunity to the people participating in these to be more involved in the discussions.

The other five suggestions are given bellow:

- *“More clearly address why successes and failures happened in past transboundary activities/initiatives”*
- *“Keep it focused and not general”*
- *“After having exchange of experiences and practises more sound inter-disciplinary approaches and multi-stakeholders working hypothesis should be generated to be worked out in the next meetings”*
- *“Build on the outcomes of similar processes experiences in other areas outside SEE regarding stakeholder involvement”*
- *“More clarify on the outcomes of the roundtable wanted to obtain”*

ANNEX. Compilation of the answers given by the Participants in response to the Evaluation Form

Petersberg Process Phase II / Athens Declaration Process

GEF IW:LEARN Activity D2

International Roundtable on Integrated Shared Lake Basin Management in Southeastern Europe

12-14 October 2006, Ohrid

Organized jointly by the GWP-Med and Lake Ohrid Watershed Committee with the support of GEF-IW:LEARN

1. Describe 2 most important benefits of participation in this roundtable to your work.

- *Acquiring useful tools for management of lake basins*
- *Transparent Presentation of the common problems*
- *Valuable exchange of information and best practices*
- *Learned about several issues regarding shared lake basin management*
- *WFD as a tool for the enhancement of transboundary cooperation for the management of shared water bodies*
- *Lessons learned in other basins regarding transboundary water resources management*
- *Learned about experiences on integrated management of lake and river basin Establishment of new useful contacts*
- *Experience exchange*
- *New useful contacts*
- *Exchange of experience in establishing and working with the joint commissions for transboundary management*
- *Information about on-going processes in the SEE - Identification of weaknesses in these processes / challenges for the future*
- *Networking*
- *Learning about other processes (study areas)*
- *Intensive education on projects and activities at the field level – new knowledge of project issues*
- *Identification of success practices which can be transferred elsewhere*
- *Exchange of experience in the region and in Europe*
- *Level of achievements and possibilities for resolution of different problems*
- *Hearing from project proponents their issues and challenges*
- *Identification of “champions” (change “agents” in the region)*
- *Greatly increased knowledge on the regional lake water issues*
- *Made solid professional contacts for future collaboration in the region*
- *Express opinion about the possibility of sharing the experience*
- *Discussing for getting the right way to manage the transboundary water resources*
- *Opportunity to gain more information on water management issues in the area*
- *Opportunity for new contacts and future work*
- *Enabling contacts with other transboundary systems in the area*

- *Getting new information on different issues regarding transboundary water resources management in other systems*
- *Exchange of information with other projects*
- *Capacity building on the competences and functions of a joint committee for a shared water body*
- *Good practices*
- *Contacts*
- *More knowledge on the 3 lakes systems*
- *Contacts made and ideas shared*
- *Learned which are the priorities of SEE countries and which are the local-driven tools identified to address them*
- *Networking with project promoters and people in charge of the implementation*
- *Better understanding of the common issues to developing in a sustainable way*
- *Seeing the dynamics of this conference and the true complexity involved in each of the case studies*
- *Sharing of experiences with similar systems*
- *Ways how to treat issues within a basin*
- *Sharing experiences of different regions*
- *Meeting a good group of people from the region*
- *Learning about transboundary lake management from a new perspective*
- *Sharing lessons from on-going and past experiences on transboundary cooperation*
- *Developing cooperation with experts from the “Greater” Drin river basin countries*
- *Understanding issues and challenges regarding management of transboundary waters*
- *Expanding network of contacts*
- *Getting ideas for work in the shared water basin that I work*
- *Chance to compare experiences*
- *Chance to identify opportunities for future synergies*
- *Comparative lessons learned and experiences from transboundary cooperation*
- *Institutionalizing cooperation and stakeholder involvement*
- *Discussing issues regarding transboundary cooperation*
- *New information regarding transboundary cooperation*
- *Good opportunity to assess previously undertaken actions in the region by the listening to the presented stories of involved participants*
- *Identification of new needs and problem areas*
- *Information on what is being done in other areas*
- *Putting my work in perspective*
- *Implementation of integrated basin management*
- *Connecting partner lake regions*
- *Learning more about management in other basins of the region*
- *Learned how agreements are developed and how to involve stakeholders in the process for the management of a shared lake basin*
- *Exchange of information on transboundary lakes of the region*
- *Meet stakeholders from the other basins*
- *Knowledge and skills gained*
- *Establishment of new useful contacts*

2. HOW USEFUL HAS THIS ROUNDTABLE BEEN TO YOU IN TERMS OF:

<i>Please rate on scale: 1 (not useful), 2 (somewhat useful), 3 (useful), 4 (very useful), 5 (extremely useful):</i>	1	2	3	4	5
a. Relevance of theme and topic sessions to your work/area of expertise:	0	3	9	14	14
	0%	7,5%	22,5%	35%	35%
b. Knowledge and skills gained for your current or future work:	0	3	14	15	8
	0%	7,5%	35%	37,5%	20%
c. Providing an informal forum for exchange of information with other participants (at the margins of structured sessions):	0	0	11	15	14
	0%	0%	27,5%	37,5%	35%
d. Providing an opportunity to establish new useful contacts:	0	0	4	23	13
	0%	0%	10%	57,5%	32,5%
e. Identification of applicable good practices and lessons learned:	0	1	10	22	7
	0%	2,5%	25%	55%	17,5%
f. Cases presented and discussed provided insights or lessons that are relevant to the watershed/s with which you work:	0	0	6	22	12
	0%	0%	15%	55%	30%

3. What 2-3 things did you most want to learn more about in this roundtable workshop?

- *Concrete experience in building capacities for transboundary management*
- *Transboundary basin management*
- *Successful models of innovative financing*
- *Practical experience from transboundary cooperation*
- *Sustainable Financing*
- *Multipurpose use of lake basin resources*
- *Innovative financing instruments for funding the transboundary waters / lakes*
- *Lessons learned in terms of mutual cooperation*
- *Status of on-going transboundary processes in the SEE*
- *Lessons learned to be transferred between basins*
- *Collaboration and funding schemes*
- *Successful stakeholder input at all levels (buy-in, ownership)*
- *“Real” observable success stories*
- *What are the on-the-ground realities, who are the actors, what are the opportunities, what create follow up*
- *More successful case studies to be introduced*
- *Legal structures for management of international water resources*
- *Sensitive political impediments to signing transboundary agreements*
- *Level of human and financial resource commitments ministries willing and able to commit to point management structures*
- *Some experiences to analyze the problems, to get applied experiences from Lake Ohrid case and what can be planned in other basins*
- *Get new experiences to find the possibility for participating in a project as a stakeholder*
- *The relevance of WFD with water resources management at national level and relevant policies*
- *Financial mechanisms / innovative options*
- *What and who other do this*

- *Connection between TWRM and WFD or international conventions*
- *Representatives from relevant institutes*
- *How operationally joint committees can work*
- *Ways to enhance the effectiveness of joint committees*
- *Difficulties in stakeholders' involvement*
- *Balancing economic/development sectors sustainably (tourism vs. traditional primary sector)*
- *Financing mechanisms and financial incentives*
- *Success models to follow*
- *Ways how structures can be self-sustained after external support is gone*
- *How to raise capacities of local organizations*
- *Activities combined with capacity building*
- *Experience from a region "recently became transboundary"*
- *Experiences/challenges from transboundary lake management*
- *Sustainability of transboundary institutions*
- *Drivers to enhance transboundary cooperation*
- *Transboundary cooperation*
- *Stakeholder involvement*
- *Real life problems of transboundary cooperation projects*
- *How projects are implemented in different political settings*
- *Ways of setting up transboundary commissions in areas outside SEE*
- *The actual status of Lake Ohrid Watershed Committee*
- *The weaknesses of the participation processes in the 3 lakes*
- *Transboundary cooperation*
- *Lake basin management*
- *Practical issues on the activities control and law enforcement for the protection of a water body*
- *Practical results rather than described processes*
- *What other basins do to obtain progress with transboundary cooperation*
- *New ideas of integrated management*
- *Financing models by regional funding*
- *Sustainable financing*
- *Exchanging of information among the participants*
- *Transboundary cooperation on lake protection*
- *Setting up the institutions for joint work between littoral countries*
- *Role of local population in the transboundary cooperation on lake management and protection*
- *Interaction among different institutions*
- *Petersberg Phase II / Athens Declaration Process*
- *Conceptual approaches adopted by the various partners*
- *Good practices and lessons learned, institutionalization of cooperation and stakeholder involvement*

4. To what extent do you consider this Roundtable achieved these objectives:

Check your choice:

<i>Please rate on scale: 1 (not at all), 2 (a little), 3 (partly), 4 (enough), 5 (very much)</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
Promoting cooperation among stakeholders for integrated water resources and ecosystem management in the transboundary water bodies of the South Western Balkan Peninsula region i.e. Prespa, Ohrid and Shkoder Lake and Drin River Basins	0	3	6	19	12
	0%	7,5%	15%	47,5%	30%
Establishing the basis of a peer network for those working in the shared water bodies of this region	0	2	6	23	9
	0%	5%	15%	57,5%	22,5%
Exchange of information and communication of good practices and success stories in relevant aspects of shared basin management, such as:					
stakeholder involvement;	1	1	8	18	12
	2,5%	2,5%	20%	45%	30%
institutionalization of cooperation;	0	1	7	21	11
	0%	2,5%	17,5%	52,5%	27,5%
sustainable financing;	0	3	10	22	5
	0%	7,5%	25%	55%	12,5%
multipurpose use of shared lake basin water resources.	1	1	11	22	5
	2,5%	2,5%	27,5%	55%	12,5%
Fostering the development of a set of recommendations to promote integrated water resources and ecosystem management in the transboundary basins of focus	0	2	10	17	11
	0%	5%	25%	42,5%	27,5%
Participants gained a clearer picture of on-going shared water body management activities that will allow their better involvement in promoting joint management	0	1	7	18	14
	0%	2,5%	17,5%	45%	35%
Identified key areas of action where Petersberg Process Phase II / Athens Declaration Process could enhance synergies with on-going and planned initiatives and activities in the region	0	2	9	21	8
	0%	5%	22,5%	52,5%	20%
Were your expectations for this event met?	0	0	4	22	14
	0%	0%	10%	55%	35%

This roundtable was an introduction to current issues and approaches to support Lake Basin Management. It was more about encouraging new ways to think about integrated and ecosystem-based management, rather than learning specific techniques (that specialists can be hired for).

5. As a result of what you learned here, what will you recommend to be done differently (when you return to work)?

- *Using experience developed in the other shared basins of the area*
- *Recommend to the project staff of the Prespa project to look different examples and lessons learned from other watershed projects*
- *Better transboundary cooperation and adaptation of the legislation*
- *Including all stakeholders as much earlier as possible in the process (cooperation over transboundary water resources management) for of ideas to implementation*
- *Secure enough funds at the beginning of the process (cooperation over transboundary water resources management)*
- *Planning the sustainability of transboundary schemes right from the start (concept phase)*
- *Broad (not sector – specific) approach to transboundary collaboration*
- *Use the “new network”*

- *Don't re-invent the wheel. Good models already exist*
- *Introduce new approaches*
- *May want to limit invitation list less for the next roundtables – to ensure scope of participation*
- *Become part of the network of research institutes for IWRM*
- *Enhanced participation of the municipalities on the process for cooperation over shared lake basins*
- *More focused discussions that will lead to action*
- *Promotion of cooperation among stakeholders*
- *Institutionalization of cooperation*
- *Some of the activities in focus*
- *Integrated and ecosystem based management to be combined with local capacity building*
- *Lessons learned in other basins regarding development and implementation of joint management of transboundary bodies to be used in the lake basin that I work (regarding transboundary institutions, networking etc.)*
- *Continue the work carried out within Petetsberg/Athens Process*
- *Encourage and lobby for the advancement of the work and the status of the commissions*
- *Nothing since the practical knowledge provided was not enough on order to recommend something to the ministry I work for*
- *Point out identified needs in the area*
- *Not to hesitate too much to try to get transboundary cooperation on specific issues going*
- *Focus more on stakeholders involvement and develop models of institutionalizing*
- *Apply models developed in other shared basins on the lake I'm working*
- *Institutional framework for the transboundary cooperation on lake management and protection*

6. Do you think the exchange of information and dialogue among people working in the management of shared water bodies should continue?

Yes: 40

No: 0

Comment made by a responder: *There should be a mechanism established*

How do you envisage this to be realized?

International roundtables: 20

Targeted workshops: 31

Establishment of inter-lake working groups: 19

Field visits and training: 26

Other (please specify): 6

Comments made by responders:

- *On specific issues of expertise*
- *Use for planning next steps*
- *Yes, but only if gained knowledge is disseminated*

Do you feel that web-based dialogues and exchange of information among peers would benefit such a process?

Yes: 29

No: 8

Comments made by responders:

- *To a certain degree yes, but time is limited access to internet in the region (especially for stakeholders at local level) is a constrain.*
- *Yes, but not self standing, workshops are needed*
- *It is not the most popular way to of doing it*
- *Only if participants of the roundtable would want to do so*
- *It really depends on how keen key people are to invest their time in web-based dialogues which can be tricky (conflictual, etc.)*
- *Yes, but not stand alone. Too much happening on the web. Need to be combined with face-to-face meetings*
- *No for dialogues, yes for the exchange of information*

Would you participate in such a web-based dialogue and exchange of information?

Yes: 24

No: 12

Comments made by responders:

- *Indirectly*
- *Personal communication is the key*
- *I would support any discussion/theme stressed by participants to follow up*
- *No time*
- *I would use a first period as a trial, if it is productive I would continue participating, otherwise I would quit*
- *Not directly involved in the area, but might be very useful for those who are*
- *Only if experience from abroad is needed*
- *Not sure. I would rather skip this way of working, but if necessary I will participate*
- *I'd like to see some other expected outcomes before starting this exercise*

7. Would you like to contribute to planning future meetings addressing issues of transboundary water resources management?

Yes: 20

No: 11

What are the 3-4 most important trans-boundary water resource management issues you would like to see addressed in a future roundtable or regional workshop?

- *Stakeholder – based vision development process for a large basin – how?*
- *The role of IWRM planning (WSSD target at national and basin level) in the transboundary vision development process*
- *The real linkage between national and transboundary basin political developmental principles*
- *The role of EU directives/legislation in transboundary basins in pre-accession countries*
- *Transboundary legislation*
- *Involvement of the governmental institutions at national and local level to the lake basin management*
- *Institutional and legal frameworks regarding the management of transboundary watersheds*
- *Sustainability (financial, capacity etc.)*
- *Effective stakeholder dialogue and participation*
- *Transboundary cooperation*
- *Legislative framework at international level*
- *Cooperation between stakeholders*

- *Funding of joint activities*
- *Sustainable development*
- *Development of joint water management plans*
- *Stakeholder involvement*
- *Strategic planning*
- *Collection and sharing of scientific data*
- *Stakeholders input*
- *National / international cooperation*
- *More detailed results on “real/substantial” achievements (not just on organizations, studies etc.)*
- *Dispute resolution mechanisms*
- *Socioeconomic aspects of IWRM*
- *Obtaining stakeholder buy-in at municipal/communal levels*
- *Implementation of WFD in different countries*
- *Experiences exchange of organizational set-up at national level*
- *Comparison of national legislation*
- *Surface water/groundwater hydrology of SEE region (basic intro)*
- *Challenges to integrated management of surface/groundwater (existing separate structures)*
- *Anticipated impacts of climate variability on SEE region*
- *GEF Strategic Partnership IWRM component and how groundwater management has to be addressed*
- *Institutional structure and responsibilities of lake basin management organizations*
- *Building political and financial support*
- *Development of a vision for the Greater Drin Basin*
- *Drivers for Greater Drin river basin (EU? WFD? hydropower?)*
- *The procedure of Environmental Impact Assessment strategies for the projects*
- *Harmonization of the monitoring programmes*
- *Self financing of management activities at local level*
- *Water legislation and its harmonization with EU standards*
- *WFD transposition into national policies*
- *River Basin Management: using as a tool of approach*
- *Bilateral agreements for international waters*
- *Establishment of permanent joint commissions*
- *Strategies for strengthening the basins’ local communities (municipalities, communes, etc.)*
- *Strategies for strengthening the water agencies*
- *Focus also at the Vardar/Axios and Dojran Lake integrated water resources management*
- *Stakeholders participation*
- *Hydropower development*
- *Development of Skadar lake transboundary committee*
- *Skadar lake*
- *Danube river*
- *Developing common information between local populations and stakeholders sharing the basin*
- *Technology –based or non-traditional solutions that have relevance to the area “Appropriate Technology”*
- *Focus on pollution prevention techniques rather than a treatment –only approach*
- *Self-sustainability of the managing structures - Institutionalization and status-quo of this organization*
- *How to raise capacities of local community*
- *Stakeholders’ analysis to identify key drive*

- *Innovative financial and economic instruments*
- *Integrated water basin management and WFD*
- *Instruments to promote behavioral change among users*
- *Transboundary cooperation structures*
- *Involvement of stakeholders at local and national level*
- *Interregional networks of Lake Basin as a platform of information exchange*
- *Prerequisites for success / institution funding*
- *Stakeholder cooperation*
- *Multi-annual programmes/action plans*
- *Scientific contribution/monitoring*
- *Capacity building for transboundary water management*
- *Strategic planning for Drin*
- *Sustainable financing*
- *Formalizing cooperation (institutional level) for TWRM for the Drin River basin*
- *Monitoring systems*
- *Law enforcement and government inspectorates*
- *Legal authorities responsibility and participation*
- *EU involvement in transboundary cooperation over shared water bodies*
- *Land use planning*
- *Agriculture*
- *Eco-tourism*
- *Environmental Education*
- *Role of local population on transboundary cooperation*
- *Promotion of sustainable development at local levels (local communities)*
- *Biodiversity conservation and protected areas management*
- *Integrated territorial development*
- *Transboundary scientific approach*
- *Scientific awareness methodology*
- *Multipurpose use of water*

Please feel free to contribute further comments or suggestions on how upcoming Petersberg Process Phase II / Athens Declaration Process International Roundtables on Trans-boundary Water resources management in South Eastern Europe could be improved.

Comments made by responders:

- *Should have broken into smaller groups so that more people could have become involved. The same 6-8 people did most of the talking. Large groups do not allow involvement of all participants.*
- *More clearly address why successes and failures happened in past transboundary activities/initiatives*
- *Smaller working groups*
- *More clarify on the outcomes of the roundtable wanted to obtain*
- *Build on the outcomes of similar processes experiences in other areas outside SEE regarding stakeholder involvement.*
- *Keep it focused and not general*
- *After having exchange of experiences and practises more sound inter-disciplinary approaches and multi-stakeholders working hypothesis should be generated to be worked out in the next meetings*