

Petersberg Phase II / Athens Declaration Process

International Workshop on Principles for Multipurpose Management in the Sava River Basin”

15 - 17 November 2006, Zagreb, Croatia

Organized by the
German Ministry for Environment, Nature Conservation and
Nuclear Safety and the World Bank
with the assistance of the
International Sava River Basin Commission (ISRBC) and
in cooperation with
the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and
Development (BMZ), the
GEF IW:LEARN) and the
Global Water Partnership-Mediterranean (GWP-Med).

Summary Report from Participant Evaluations

For more information regarding this report please contact

IW:LEARN

1630 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 300

Washington, DC 20036

USA

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

E-mail: mish@iwlearn.org

Web: www.iwlearn.net

Introduction

The international roundtable “Workshop on Principles for Multipurpose Water Management in the Sava River Basin” took place in Zagreb, Croatia from 15 – 17 November, 2006. It was jointly organized by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety and the International Sava River Basin Commission. The Roundtable was part of the activities within the Petersberg Process Phase II / Athens Declaration Process, jointly coordinated by the German Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, the World Bank, the Hellenic Ministry of Foreign Affairs, GWP-Med, and GEF / IW:LEARN.

The roundtable focused on themes of multipurpose water management in river basins, with as background, the overarching context of IWRM (Integrated Water Resource Management) and the EU Water Framework Directive. Building upon ongoing work in the region, thematic sessions permitted participants to interconnect practical experience and linkages to other initiatives with actual management challenges in the Sava River Basin. Presentations and discussion centred on the following major themes in multipurpose water management:

- Aquatic and environmental ecosystems
- Flood mitigation
- Hydropower
- Navigation

Participants included government representatives with responsibilities in water management, infrastructure investment planning and financing, representatives from regional and local authorities as well as stakeholder representatives from various international organizations and financial institutions active in the region.

Information and documents (agenda, participants, presentations, conclusions etc.) emerging from the workshop information and can be downloaded from (http://www.bmu.de/english/water_management/conferences_symposia/doc/38313.php) and www.watersee.net.

This summary evaluation report of the Sava Roundtable on Multipurpose Management based on participant responses to an evaluation questionnaire. A tabulation of answers furnished by participants is included in an annex.

Analysis of Sava Roundtable Evaluations

Who responded?

Approximately half (24) of the 51 participants in the Sava River Basin workshop submitted evaluation forms. All were submitted at the end of the Roundtable (*no additional evaluations were received in response to subsequent email solicitation*).

Responders included:

- 1 anonymous contributor
- 3 members of multilateral river basin management organizations
- 12 participants from the region, NGOs and regional organizations
- 5 participants from outside the region, representing NGOs and other river basin organizations
- 2 participants from multilateral and donor agencies

Key Findings

- Overall, the workshop received high marks
- Participants felt on average (3.52/5.0) that the workshop did not contribute to their **knowledge and skills** gained for future work
- Participants did rate the workshop well on being **relevant, providing informal fora, networking opportunities, and identifying good practices**.
- Participants wanted to **learn more about planned activities** (*bold added*) in the basin
- The workshop's success at **fomenting cooperation** was rated a robust 4.04/5.0, however this might suggest room for improvement. Of course it's hard to say whether a workshop can engender additional cooperation in the face of exogenous political differences.
- Participants rated the session on **payments for ecosystem services** quite low, both in terms of identification of problems and exchange of experiences. Despite this four participants wrote they wanted to learn more about the ecosystem-approach.
- The session on **hydropower** received similarly weak ratings, although better.
- Whereas 95% thought the overall "Athens-Petersberg" process should continue, and 75% of respondents endorsed the **targeted workshop** format, just 54% envisaged the **exchange of information and dialogue** continuing through **roundtables**, only 45% through **field visits**, and 16% through inter-water body (i.e. lake, river) **working groups**. Although 79% of respondents endorsed **web-based dialogue**, only 62% said they would actually participate in such exchanges.
- **Flood mitigation** was the most-oft identified issue that participants want to learn more about (6 people), followed by groundwater (3) and identification of stakeholders (3).

Conclusions

- Participants strongly endorsed the Athens-Petersberg process but advocated increased use of **targeted workshops** to help facilitate it.
- Participants expressed a **broad range of interests (topical)** and areas where they felt they learned or benefited from the workshop. This doesn't translate to specific themes for the next roundtable.
- The workshop succeeded in one of its primary goals: increasing the participants' knowledge on the International Sava River Basin Commission and its activities.
- Participants appreciated the workshop's function as a venue to exchange experience and as a first step for multipurpose water management in the Sava River Basin.

- Most participants rated the organizational arrangements as “excellent”.

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

The most common responses highlighted the utility of roundtable workshops to **exchange** ideas/experiences and provide **networking** opportunities. Participants appreciated the chance to learn more about the functioning of the **Sava River Basin Commission, activities in the Sava River Basin** and the **Water Framework Directive**. Participants also mentioned the value of including **international experts and experiences** and one specifically mentioned the **Elbe River** case study as being particularly valuable. See Annex I for a complete listing of responses for this section.

Question #2 How useful has this workshop been to you in terms of...?

a. Relevance of theme and topic sessions to your work/area of expertise:

At 4.2 out of 5.0, respondents generally found the workshop relevant.

b. Knowledge and skills gained for your current or future work:

Participants gave their lowest overall rating (3.52/5.0) to this section.

c. Providing an informal forum for exchange of information with other participants (at the margins of structured sessions):

Participants gave a healthy 4.13/5.0 to this question.

d. Providing an opportunity to establish new useful contacts:

Participants rated the workshop a robust 4.17/5.0 on this question.

e. Identification of applicable good practices and lessons learned:

Participants gave a 4.02/5.0 rating here.

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

Answers to the question covered an extensive range with little commonality.

Common answers centered on the desire to learn more about good practices and practical transfers of theories (covering the major workshop themes). In addition, many participants wanted to know more about the **Sava River Basin Commission** as well as planned **activities in the basin**.

Other responses roughly covered the broad themes of actual river basin management issues as well as legal and institutional frameworks and financing mechanisms.

Additional topics included:

- Water usage and environmental services
- Conditions and experiences for planning and implementing sustainable (social, ecological, economic) dam construction on transboundary level
- How are the roundtables in Petersberg Phase II organized?
- How good is the preparedness of cooperation in the region
- Who are the main players, and what is their quality

- Sava River Basin Commission: structure and inner workings and benefits for the region
 - Coordination between other international commissions
 - Methods to obtain financial and other support from international institutions
 - Ecologically sound rehabilitation of devastated morphology
 - Actual activities in IWRM on Sava River basin and activities of ISRB Commission in the field of protection of ecosystems, flood protection, navigation and others...
 - EC CARDS
 - Important priorities for the countries
 - Technical tools for RBM
 - Conflict Management
 - Experience on multipurpose water management in EU countries
- Possible interest of the international financial institutions for supporting the projects in the Sava river basin

4. To what extent do you consider this Roundtable achieved the following?

Promoting cooperation among stakeholders for integrated water resources and ecosystem management:

4.04/5.0

Establishing the basis of a peer network for those working in the shared water body of focus:

4.0/5.0

Identification of problems and challenges in relevant aspects of multipurpose management of Sava River basin, such as:

- aquatic and environmental ecosystems: 3.69/5.0
- flood mitigation: 4.04/5.0
- navigation: 3.81/5.0
- hydropower: 3.68/5.0

Exchange of information and experience in relevant aspects of multipurpose management of Sava River basin, such as:

- aquatic and environmental ecosystems: 3.5/5.0
- flood mitigation: 3.95/5.0
- navigation: 3.81/5.0
- hydropower: 3.64/5.0

Participants gained a clearer picture of on-going shared water body management activities that will allow their better involvement in promoting effective joint management

4.09/5.0

Were your expectations for this event met?

4.5/5.0

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

Specific Steps:

- Involve more **national authorities** for environmental protection

- Better **involvement** of relevant users and stakeholders into every day work of water managers
- Use of the holistic approach, as well as **risk-based management**, is really crucial for the multipurpose water management.
- Strengthen of **cooperation** between ICPDR and Sava Commission
- Pay more attention to ways how to **manage expectations** of the different stakeholders of the Commission

General Steps

- Focus more on **practical tools** and steps
- Contacts with relevant institutions (more focused) to bring more **experience from the field** - from the other's sub-basins

Site Visit

One participant mentioned that an **excursion** would have been a good idea in addition to **pre-event distribution** of handouts and materials, answering a different question

6. Question Six: Yes/No Questions

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

23/24 respondents or 95% of respondents thought this process should continue.

How do you envisage this to be realized?

- International roundtables: 13/24 or 54%
- Targeted workshops: 18/24 or 75%
- Establishment of inter-lake working groups: 4/24 or 16%
- Field visits and training: 11/24 or 46%

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

19/24 or 79%

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

15/24 or 62%

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

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?

- Flood protection/mitigation (6) (including information and early warning systems)
- Hydropower
- Role of protected areas/natural areas and ecosystem services (4) (including economic instruments)
- Decentralized water purification
- Management of natural resources in floodplains including Karst areas (2)
- Rural areas development including tourism and agro-environmental schemes

- Industrial accidents (2)
- Transparency in decision-making
- Adaptive Management
- Risk Based Management
- Decision Support Systems
- Groundwater (3)
- Cooperation between commissions
- Navigation development
- Adriatic
- Transboundary RBM in difference economic circumstances
- Pressures and impacts
- Water Supply (2)
- Integration of issues (flood control, hydropower, navigation, nature protection)
- Clear **information base** on navigation, hydropower and flood
- Reconciliation of economic values vs protecting ecosystem
- Drought management
- Transboundary project planning
- Sociological methodologies applicable for the (1) improvement of public participation and (2) identification of stakeholders (3) identification of public sensitivity and knowledge of WM problems, issues

Question #8. How would you rate the event in terms of:

1. Clarity of presentations:

3.77/5.0

2. Organizational arrangements for and during the event:

4.31/5.0

Other Comments

Additional support is needed to support the Sava Commission in carrying on its work

Annex I. Tabulation of Answers Given by Participants

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

- To get information about practical experiences from others
- To get information on how other countries in the Sva River Basin think about the Water Framework Directive
- Compare international standards with work done at Sava
- Bring local people together and widen the scope of work
- Contacts to key persons
- Comparing problems and advantages re: TWM in this region with other regions
- Learning about the knowledge and participants in the ICSRB
- Clarifying the applicability of PES schemes in the region
- Networking
- Saring experiences
- Awareness of challenges and opportunities in the region
- Potential exchange of experiences with other river basin authorities in borrowing partners of the World Bank
- Fomenting a community of practice in SE Europe/Athens-Petersberg
- Learning more about Sava as a model
- Experiences from other basins
- Understanding and integrated different resources in transboundary river view on flood management, navigation, environment, etc.
- Insights into Sava Water Management issues including cooperation difficulties
- The experiences given in presentations in implementation on WFD-EU.
- Common activities in the Sava River Basin
- General overview regarding diverse topics in the Sava River Basin
- Interaction and good exchange of information between countres sharing the basin and international organizations
- Get lessons learned in international river basin management
- Personal contact with official representatives
- Sharing experiences with one another
- I got to know many experts in Sava Commission
- I expect many activities in the future
- To see the example of Elbe's watershed management
- Decision for putting stronger mandate to Sava Commission
- Exchanging views and experiences with foreign experts
- Expertise from the outside of the Sava Basin
- Information from the Sava country participants
- Strengthen partnership between my institution (ICPDR) and Sava Commission
- Overview of current situation in Sava region
- Clarification of the Sava Commission tasks and priorities
- Building knowledge/understanding of multipurpose use of waters in transboundary basins
- Personal contacts
- Exchange of ideas and information

Question #2 How useful has this workshop been to you in terms of...?

a. Relevance of theme and topic sessions to your work/area of expertise:

1 – not useful	2 – somewhat useful	3 - useful	4 – very useful	5 – extremely useful
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------

0	0	4	10	9
0%	0%	17.3%	43.5%	39.1%

b. Knowledge and skills gained for your current or future work:

1 – not useful	2 – somewhat useful	3 - useful	4 – very useful	5 – extremely useful
0	1	9	13	0
0%	4.3%	39.1%	56.5%	0%

c. Providing an informal forum for exchange of information with other participants (at the margins of structured sessions):

1 – not useful	2 – somewhat useful	3 - useful	4 – very useful	5 – extremely useful
0	1	5	7	10
0%	4.3%	21.7%	30.4%	43.4%

d. Providing an opportunity to establish new useful contacts:

1 – not useful	2 – somewhat useful	3 - useful	4 – very useful	5 – extremely useful
0	0	6	7	10
0%	0%	26.1%	30.4%	43.4%

e. Identification of applicable good practices and lessons learned:

1 – not useful	2 – somewhat useful	3 - useful	4 – very useful	5 – extremely useful
0	1	5	8	9
0%	4.3%	21.7%	34.7%	39.1%

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

- Learn more about good practices and practical transfers of theories (covering the major workshop themes).
- Sava River Basin Commission
- Activities in the Sava River Basin
- Water usage and environmental services
- Conditions and experiences for planning and implementing sustainable (social, ecological, economic) dam construction on transboundary level
- How are the roundtables in Petersberg Phase II organized?
- How good is the preparedness of cooperation in the region
- Who are the main players, and what is their quality
- Sava River Basin Commission: structure and inner workings and benefits for the region
- Coordination between other international commissions
- Methods to obtain financial and other support from international institutions
- Ecologically sound rehabilitation of devastated morphology
- Actual activities in IWM on Sava River basin and activities of ISRB Commission in the field of protection of ecosystems, flood protection, navigation and others...
- EC CARDS
- Important priorities for the countries
- Technical tools for RBM

- Conflict Management
 - Experience on multipurpose water management in EU countries
- Possible interest of the international financial institutions for supporting the projects in the Sava river basin

4. To what extent do you consider this Roundtable achieved the following?

1 (not at all), 2 (a little), 3 (partly), 4 (enough), 5 (very much)

Promoting cooperation among stakeholders for integrated water resources and ecosystem management:

1 – not at all	2 – a little	3 - partly	4 – enough	5 – very much
0	1	6	7	9
0%	4.3%	26.1%	30.4%	39.1%

Establishing the basis of a peer network for those working in the shared water body of focus:

1 – not at all	2 – a little	3 - partly	4 – enough	5 – very much
0	0	8	7	8
0%	0%	34.8%	30.4%	34.8%

Identification of problems and challenges in relevant aspects of multipurpose management of Sava River basin, such as:

Aquatic and environmental ecosystems: 3.69/5.0

1 – not at all	2 – a little	3 – partly	4 – enough	5 – very much
0	3	6	9	5
0%	13.0%	26.1%	39.1%	21.7%

Flood mitigation: 4.04/5.0

1 – not at all	2 – a little	3 – partly	4 – enough	5 – very much
0	0	5	11	6
0%	0%	22.7%	50%	27.2%

Navigation: 3.81/5.0

1 – not at all	2 – a little	3 – partly	4 – enough	5 – very much
0	0	8	10	4
0%	0%	36.3%	45.4%	18.1%

Hydropower: 3.68/5.0

1 – not at all	2 – a little	3 – partly	4 – enough	5 – very much
0	1	8	10	3
0%	4.5%	36.3%	45.4%	13.6%

Exchange of information and experience in relevant aspects of multipurpose management of Sava River basin, such as:

Aquatic and environmental ecosystems: 3.5/5.0

1 – not at all	2 – a little	3 - partly	4 – enough	5 – very much
----------------	--------------	------------	------------	---------------

0	3	8	8	3
0%	13.6%	36.3%	36.3%	13.6%

Flood mitigation: 3.95/5.0

1 – not at all	2 – a little	3 - partly	4 – enough	5 – very much
0	1	3	14	4
0%	4.5%	13.6%	63.6%	18.1%

Navigation: 3.81/5.0

1 – not at all	2 – a little	3 - partly	4 – enough	5 – very much
0	1	6	11	4
0%	4.5%	27.2%	50%	18.1%

Hydropower: 3.64/5.0

1 – not at all	2 – a little	3 - partly	4 – enough	5 – very much
0	2	7	10	3
0%	9%	31.8%	45.4%	13.6%

Participants gained a clearer picture of on-going shared water body management activities that will allow their better involvement in promoting effective joint management

1 – not at all	2 – a little	3 - partly	4 – enough	5 – very much
0	0	5	10	7
0%	0%	22.7%	45.4%	31.8%

Were your expectations for this event met?

1 – not at all	2 – a little	3 - partly	4 – enough	5 – very much
0	0	0	16	7
0%	0%	0%	72.7%	31.8%

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

Specific Steps:

- Involve more **national authorities** for environmental protection
- Better **involvement** of relevant users and stakeholders into every day work of water managers
- Use of the holistic approach, as well as **risk-based management**, is really crucial for the multipurpose water management.
- Strengthen of **cooperation** between ICPDR and Sava Commission
- Pay more attention to ways how to **manage expectations** of the different stakeholders of the Commission

General Steps

- Focus more on practical tools and steps
- Contacts with relevant institutions (more focused) to bring more experience from the field - from the other's sub-basins

One participant mentioned that an **excursion** would have been a good idea in addition to **pre-event distribution** of handouts and materials, answering a different question

6. Question Six: Yes/No Questions

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

23/24 respondents or 95% of respondents thought this process should continue.

How do you envisage this to be realized?

- International roundtables: 13/24 or 54%
- Targeted workshops: 18/24 or 75%
- Establishment of inter-lake working groups: 4/24 or 16%
- Field visits and training: 11/24 or 46%

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

19/24 or 79%

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

15/24 or 62%

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

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?

- Flood protection/mitigation (6) (including information and early warning systems)
- Hydropower
- Role of protected areas/natural areas and ecosystem services (4) (including economic instruments)
- Decentralized water purification
- Management of natural resources in floodplains including Karst areas (2)
- Rural areas development including tourism and agro-environmental schemes
- Industrial accidents (2)
- Transparency in decision-making
- Adaptive Management
- Risk Based Management
- Decision Support Systems
- Groundwater (3)
- Cooperation between commissions
- Navigation development
- Adriatic
- Transboundary RBM in different economic circumstances
- Pressures and impacts
- Water Supply (2)
- Integration of issues (flood control, hydropower, navigation, nature protection)
- Clear **information base** on navigation, hydropower and flood
- Reconciliation of economic values vs protecting ecosystem

- Drought management
- Transboundary project planning
- Sociological methodologies applicable for the (1) improvement of public participation and (2) identification of stakeholders (3) identification of public sensitivity and knowledge of WM problems, issues

Question #8. How would you rate the event in terms of:

1. Clarity of presentations:

1 – poor	2 – below average	3 - good	4 – very good	5 – excellent
0	0	5	12	4
0%	0%	22.7%	54.5%	18.1%

2. Organizational arrangements for and during the event:

1 – poor	2 – below average	3 - good	4 – very good	5 – excellent
0	0	1	3	16
0%	0%	4.5%	13.6%	72.7%