

Annexes to: Public participation: contributing to better water management

Experiences from eight case studies across Europe



Cover design: EEA

Cover photo © APA/ARH do Norte (Rio Lima, Portugal)

Left photo © Confederación Hidrográfica del Ebro, Spain

Right photo © Landscape in the Venice Lagoon, Italy © Venice City Council. Photography competition: The seasons of the Lagoon — landscape, flora and fauna (*Le stagioni della Laguna — paesaggio, flora e fauna*), 2007

Layout: EEA/Pia Schmidt



European Environment Agency
Kongens Nytorv 6
1050 Copenhagen K
Denmark
Tel.: +45 33 36 71 00
Fax: +45 33 36 71 99
Web: eea.europa.eu
Enquiries: eea.europa.eu/enquiries

Contents

Annex 1 Case studies	4
Case study: Rhône Méditerranée River Basin Management Plans, France	4
Case study: Park of the northern Lagoon, Venice, Italy	9
Case study: Tidal Thames Catchment Pilot, United Kingdom	12
Case study: Warta River, Poznań, Poland	15
Case study: Stakeholder participation in Thuringia, Germany	19
Case study: Northern Portugal RBMPs, Portugal	23
Case study: Matarraña River Contract, Spain	27
Case study: Flood control in the Tisza River Basin, Hungary	31
Annex 2 Criteria to evaluate public participation in the context of WFD implementation	35
Annex 3 Case study working template.....	38

Annex 1 Case studies

Case study: Rhône Méditerranée River Basin Management Plans, France

I General information

Name of participation initiative: Consultation process for the Schéma Directeur d'Aménagement et de Gestion des Eaux (SDAGE)

Location: Rhône Méditerranée RBD (France)

Scale: RBD

Period covered: Consultation process for the SDAGE 2010–2015: 2005–2009 (with references to the consultation process for the SDAGE 2016–2021: 2013–ongoing)

Lead organisation(s): Comité de bassin (river basin committee) for the Rhône Méditerranée; Rhône Méditerranée Corse Water Agency

II Context

The Rhône Méditerranée RBD covers an area of 130 000 km², approximately 25 % of mainland France, and is home to about 14 million inhabitants. It extends over five regions (Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, Languedoc-Roussillon, Rhône-Alpes, Franche-Comté and in part, Bourgogne). A broad range of significant issues were identified in the preparation of the RBMP, including abstraction, pollution from industry and agriculture, and urban wastewater and hydromorphological pressures.

In France, the RBMP is called the Schéma directeur d'aménagement et de gestion des eaux (SDAGE), i.e. water development and management master plans. The SDAGE is adopted by the Comité de Bassin, (river basin committee) in each river basin — an assembly gathering public offices and private stakeholders — and then approved by the *préfet coordonnateur de bassin*, who represents national authority at river-basin level.

Each RBD has a water agency, which drafts the SDAGE/RBMP together with the regional offices of the Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy, i.e. the Direction Régionale, de l'Environnement de l'Aménagement et du Logement (Regional Directorate for Environment, Planning and Housing (DREAL)). The water agency and the DREAL are the lead bodies for implementation.

This case study focuses on two key consultation and participation activities in the Rhône Méditerranée RBD: information provision to members of the public and their consultation, in particular via surveys; and the participation of stakeholders as members of the river basin committee. It doesn't encompass other activities that were carried out, such as the consultation of regional councils and local water commissions and the process of written comments on draft documents.

III Purpose and objectives

For the public consultation:

- Gather opinions from members of the public.
- Increase transparency of decisions and actions.
- Raise awareness and inform members of the public on problems related to water resources and aquatic environments in the river basin.

For the the participation in the River basin Committee

- Ensure legitimacy and effectiveness of the objectives and measures defined by the SDAGE.
- Gather knowledge from local stakeholders to better adapt measures to local context.
- Facilitate the implementation of the SDAGE as stakeholders were involved from the outset.

IV Resources

- **Consultation 2005:** EUR 2.1 million for the two river basins (Rhône Méditerranée and Corsica).
- **Consultation 2008:** EUR 1.4 million.
- **Consultation 2012:** EUR 624 000.

V Public participation activities

Public consultations are organised at the two stages of the process, the first one on the significant water management issues, and the second on the draft SDAGE. The official terms of the consultation are defined at national level by the Ministry of Ecology. The consultations occur in all river basins at the same time. The consultations are supported by a communication campaign at national level, organised by the ministry and at river-basin level, organised by the water agencies, based on a common theme and logo.

First RBMP cycle

- **Consultation 'Tous pour l'eau' (May–November 2005)** on the main water management issues and the work programme of the SDAGE 2010–2015: questionnaire distributed in prefectures, in the water agency, enclosed in information magazines produced by regional and local authorities, and available online. Communication campaign: exhibition, website (results of the consultation see: http://www.eaurmc.fr/fileadmin/documentation/brochures_d_information/programme_inter_et_sdage/sdage/resultatsconsultation08.pdf), forums, calls for tender for partners institutions (publications, events, exhibitions).

Results: 82 420 multiple-choice questionnaires returned, plus 204 open comments received via email and letters; 32 000 visitors to the website during the 6 months; 1 300 participants at forums; 165 000 participants at partner institutions' events where information on the SDAGE was provided.

- **Consultation 'l'eau c'est la vie, donnez nous votre avis' (April–October 2008)** on the draft SDAGE 2010–2015 and the programme of measures: questionnaire distributed in mailboxes, available in prefectures and in the water agency, and online. Communication campaign: An invitation to tender was launched to local water management institutions. A total of 27 institutions were selected, and organised a 'water day' with several activities (exhibitions, field visits) targeting a large audience, and including a debate.

Results: 67 123 multiple-choice questionnaires completed (in addition to a telephone poll to a selected sample which checked representativeness of the returns), plus 2 244 open comments sent to the agency; 2 000 participants at debates; 4 000 participants in other activities.

Second RBMP cycle

- **Consultation on the future of water and aquatic environments (November 2012–April 2013)** on the main water management issues and the work programme of the SDAGE 2016–2021: questionnaire only available online, complemented by an online forum. Communication campaign: 28 projects were organised by partner institutions (online videos, exhibitions, etc.)

Results: 500 people commented on at least on one issue (a total of 1 600 contributions received across all issues); 170 people participated in the online forum (223 contributions).

VI Governance

Structure of the River basin committee

The river basin committee comprises 165 representatives who meet in plenary two or three times a year. The plenary is chaired by the president of the committee. The committee is supported by the bureau, a restricted group with the same proportion of each category of representatives, meeting four to five times a year to prepare the work of the plenary. The comité d'agrément (accreditation committee) provides an opinion on local management plans (SDAGE) and approves environmental contracts such as river and lake contracts. Additionally, four territorial commissions propose measures at the sub-basin level, and five geographic commissions meet once a year in the form of forums to discuss water policies in their area.

The representatives of stakeholders are chosen by the DREAL (regional offices of the Ministry of Ecology), which asks organisations to present candidates and select among them representatives to sit on the committee. Selection criteria are local importance and visibility of the organisation. Associations for the protection of the environment were also selected on the basis of their participation in the Grenelle de l'Environnement, a national environmental process. Nominated representatives can sit on the committee for several SDAGE sessions; some members have sat on the committee for more than 10 years.

VII Who participated

The participation of stakeholders as members of the river basin committee includes:

- the regular review of work carried out by technical experts in the water agency or the DREAL drafting the management plan;
- participation in meetings of various commissions (bureau, working groups, geographic commissions) and the plenary;
- voting on decisions, and on the official documents in plenary.

The preparation of the SDAGE lasts for 3 years before adoption, and involves regular input from members of the river basin committee across a wide range of topics. In some member organisations, technical staff are involved: for example, the technical services of the chambers of agriculture have in-depth knowledge of key issues and provide regular inputs. However, a representative of environmental NGOs found that the process is sometimes made difficult as deadlines for comments are usually tight; moreover, NGOs have few staff while the number of working groups and discussion spaces have multiplied, making it difficult for them to find members with adequate technical knowledge to attend all the meetings.

All stakeholders can participate in the debate. Written opinions can also be addressed to the president of the river basin committee. The president of the river basin committee moderates debate in the plenary; state offices also play a key role in incorporating comments and opinions in the final documents. Stakeholders can exercise more influence in the working groups, in the bureau, and through the regular input they are asked to provide. The final channel of expression is the vote. In 2009, a few stakeholders, including farmers, a few other water users (industry) and a group of water consumers, voted against the SDAGE 2010–2015.

To exercise more influence in the debates, some categories of members of the river basin committee have gathered into interest groups:

- an agriculture commission, gathering members of the chambers of agriculture (from all the départements — not only limited to representatives seating in the river basin committee), one technical expert per region, and one technical expert for the entire basin. This commission gathers between 3 and 4 times a year, usually before plenaries of the river basin committee or meetings of the bureau.
- a commission gathering commercial water including industry and agriculture meets before each plenary to define common messages. Members have sometimes different or conflicting interests, but the definition of common position helps these groups to exercise greater influence.

Several members of the river basin committees — including agriculture as well as local authorities — are involved in the implementation of the SDAGE. They work on specific measures, based on the objectives and budgets allocated in the plan. The level of cofinancing can vary greatly across measures.

VIII Providing information and gathering knowledge

The consultations had two stages, based on the WFD's requirements. In the first, two official documents were published for consultation: the work programme for the preparation of the RBMPs (SDAGE) and a draft summary of significant issues for the management of the river basin. The second consultation stage was a consultation on the draft plan including the programme of measures and its strategic environmental assessment.

The availability of consultation documents and especially of the questionnaire was an issue in Rhone-Méditerranée. Several methods were used to ensure that most people would be aware of the consultation and get access to the questionnaire. In 2005, the questionnaire was enclosed in regional or local authorities' magazines, which directly reach inhabitants' mailboxes. The agency paid for the additional publishing costs. This method aimed at rooting the consultation process at local level, but difficulties in involving local authorities limited the results. In 2008, questionnaires were mailed to all households in all river basins. The method had been chosen at national level, as it had previously proved efficient in Rhine-Meuse RBD. However, the mailing proved costly and many extra copies were printed, leading to a waste of paper that was criticised.

In 2012, the questionnaire was only available online, and no paper version was distributed. To ensure better access to the questionnaire and a higher response rate, more attention will be paid to dissemination on the web and social networks in the next round of consultation.

The complexity of the SDAGE is an issue for the consultation process, as the lengthy documents were inaccessible to some members of the public. Complementary information tools were thus prepared: in all consultations the website was a tool to provide information on the river basin and key issues such as water quality and pressures; a range of events, such as exhibitions and forums, including those organised by partner institutions, were also used to provide information to members of the public.

IX Outcomes

In the first cycle, the results of the **public consultations** generally followed the broad orientations of the draft documents. As such, they supported the approach taken and did not lead to major changes.

The consultation may have had results also in terms of raising awareness and improving the level of understanding of water issues. According to the water agency, the general public is more conscious now than in 2005 that the biological and physical status of rivers is an important issue. The fact that more press articles have discussed these issues is considered a good indicator.

The participation of stakeholders via the **river basin committee** has provided substantial contributions to the SDAGE, especially as they bring knowledge of local contexts and economic constraints. However, stakeholders interviewed mentioned that the state administration and local authorities played influential roles in the discussions, and that the final decisions are effectively made by the DREAL and the agency. It was also noted that reaching a compromise is difficult in a forum that brings together so many different interests.

Indeed, interests of the committee's members often conflict. The representatives of agriculture, a few other water users (industry) voted against the SDAGE 2010–2015. A range of disagreements with the state administration and local authorities represented in the committee were cited; these also involved their roles in the measures to be implemented.

Conflicts during the negotiations can also have an influence on implementation: all the economic sectors work with the adopted text, but when a group of stakeholders votes against the text, as the farmers did in 2009, there is less chance that this group will not be proactive in engaging its members in projects.

X/XI Impacts and analysis

The closed questionnaires used in the 2005 and 2008 **consultations** supported the main orientations of the SDAGE — as they were simple, they had a limited function in terms of discussing issues or raising new points. A questionnaire with open questions was chosen in 2012 to value quality over quantity: for example, for each significant issue, some explanation was given and an open question provided. The number of responses, however, was significantly smaller.

There are also concerns that members of the public do not see the overall picture for water issues and in particular of water governance. One interviewee felt that members of the public have a strong perception of threats to water quality (especially pollution), but less awareness of what actions are under way to remedy the problems.

Although significant resources were used in the consultation process, an NGO representative mentioned that the scale of the campaign is still very low in comparison to what would be needed to reach the general public. One issue is how to communicate a complex document like the SDAGE.

As it gathers the major stakeholders concerned with water management and creates space for discussion, the **river basin committee** can lead to a reduction of conflicts and enables stakeholders to reach a compromise. At the same time, one stakeholder representative said that agreement with a compromise does not always reflect a full buy-in.

In other cases, as with the vote of certain economic sector representatives against the SDAGE, a common solution may not be found: here, the results may have a negative impact on implementation.

However, stakeholders also said that the whole consultative process favours openness. Official debate usually favours well-argued and reasonable positions. The stability of the river basin committees (some representatives have been in the committee for more than 10 years) also facilitates discussions

XII Sources of information

Interviews

- Michel Dantin, president of the Rhône Méditerranée River Basin Committee (also city councillor in Chambéry and MEP): telephone interview, 14 November 2013.
- Sylvie Margot, communication manager at the water agency Rhône Méditerranée: completed questionnaire and telephone interview, 14 November 2013.
- Jacques Pulou, head of the water network at FRAPNA (Fédération Rhône-Alpes de Protection de la Nature) and member of the river basin committee representing environmental protection associations: completed questionnaire and telephone interview, 21 November 2013.
- Samuel Chanussot, member of the elected assembly of the Chamber of Agriculture of Saône et Loire, 22 January 2014.

Available documents and websites

- Report of the consultation 'Tous pour l'eau': see http://www.eaurmc.fr/fileadmin/documentation/brochures_d_information/programme_inter_et_sdage/sdage/resultatsconsultation08.pdf.
 - SDAGE 2010-2015, Bassin Rhône Méditerranée, 'Documents d'accompagnement': see http://www.rhone-mediterranee.eaufrance.fr/docs/dce/sdage/docs-officiels/HD/sdage-2010-2015_doc-accompnt_VF.pdf.
 - 'Analyse de la consultation du public 2012-2013', Bassin Rhône Méditerranée, June 2013: see http://www.eaurmc.fr/fileadmin/actualites/documents/rapport_ED_insittut_consultation_du_public.pdf.
 - Comité de bassin Rhône Méditerranée, 'Séance du 18 Décembre 2009, Extraits conformes des délibérations': see http://www.eaurmc.fr/infos-pratiques/deliberations-approuvees-par-les-instances-de-lagence-de-leau/conseil-dadministration-de-lagence-de-leau.html?eID=dam_frontend_push&docID=1116.
-

Case study: Park of the northern Lagoon, Venice, Italy

I General information

Name of participation initiative: Park of the northern Lagoon ⁽¹⁾

Location: The area of the Lagoon north of the historic centre of Venice

Scale: Local

Period covered: 2011–2013 (though the administrative process goes back to 2002 and before)

Lead organisation(s): Venice city administration

II Context

The Lagoon of Venice extends over 550 km² and contains the largest wetland area of the Mediterranean. The Lagoon is divided among the territories of several local governments; the city of Venice has the largest single section, which includes most of the Lagoon north of the city's historic centre.

The northern Lagoon — about one-third of the Lagoon as a whole — contains extensive salt marshes and mud flats along with minor islands and other features: it retains much of the wetlands morphology that has been greatly reduced in the southern and central parts of the Lagoon. Several inhabited islands, such as Burano, are also found in the northern Lagoon.

In 2004 via the urban spatial plan, the Venice City Council adopted a proposal to create a municipal park covering the northern Lagoon. This change to the spatial plan required approval by the Veneto region, which was granted in 2010. Following the region's assent, the city government launched a series of public meetings and other events in preparation for a final vote by the city council to approve the park. This finally came in mid-May 2014.

The role of the park will be limited to the city's powers, and other bodies also have jurisdiction over the northern Lagoon. The area for the park corresponds closely to that of a Natura 2000 site (SCI IT3250031 'Laguna superiore di Venezia') ⁽²⁾, to be managed by the regional government together with the Venice Water Authority, an office of the national Ministry of Infrastructure. Moreover, the entire Lagoon has been designated a Special Protection Area under the Birds Directive (SPA IT3250046 'Laguna di Venezia') ⁽³⁾. Some waterbodies designated under the WFD also cover much of the same area. In addition, several important activities, such as fishing and hunting, are mainly regulated by the regional and provincial governments.

III Purpose and objectives

The PP process mainly sought to inform stakeholders and the public about the park proposal, to gather support and also to engage them for future discussions: following the recent approval of the proposal, a more elaborate participation process will be launched for the preparation of the park's environmental plan.

IV Resources

Information is not available concerning this section. Several city officials worked on the participatory process, but the total time commitment could not be specified (it is estimated to be several months, at most).

V Public participation activities

- The city administration organised bilateral meetings at various stages with stakeholders.
- The city's consultation body for environmental and cultural NGOs discussed the proposal (in March 2013).
- Three commissions of the city council discussed the proposal in public meetings (in April and May 2013).
- A stakeholder, the Cooperativa San Marco, held a public meeting on the island of Burano (in May 2013) and debated the proposal in two regular council meetings (in June 2013).
- The environment commission of the neighbourhood council of Favaro Veneto, on the mainland, discussed the proposal (May 2013).
- The neighbourhood council held a public meeting on the island of Burano (May 2013) and debated the proposal in two regular council meetings (June 2013).
- A city councillor from the opposition organised a public conference in September 2013.

In addition, four meetings of a 'forum' of stakeholders in the northern Lagoon were organised by the city office for the park in 2007. This office has also organised yearly public festivals in the northern Lagoon under the theme 'a network of islands'. The city has also organised courses for the public on the environment of the Lagoon, and the park proposal has featured here.

⁽¹⁾ The initiative was approved by the City Council in mid May 2014. The official name given to the park was 'Parco regionale ambientale e antropologico di interesse locale della Laguna nord di Venezia'.

⁽²⁾ For more information, visit <http://www.silvenezia.it/?q=node/127>.

⁽³⁾ Ibid.

VI Governance

While offices of the city administration and city council have organised most events, a stakeholder and an opposition politician also organised meetings where city officials participated.

VII Who participated

The main stakeholders to participate have been private organisations and NGOs.

These have included:

- commercial fishermen, in particular from the island of Burano;
- shop owners and other commercial interests on the island of Burano;
- environmental NGOs (generally in favour of the park proposal);
- recreational hunting and fishing groups (concerned about possible restrictions affecting their activities);
- recreational boaters (both sail and motor, groups that are often opposed).

The meetings on Burano also attracted members of the local population not directly tied to stakeholder groups.

VIII Providing information and gathering knowledge

The city administration published information about the park proposal on its website. However, no documents or non-technical descriptions were prepared for the meetings or wider purposes. Thus, for stakeholders and the general public, presentations made at the public meetings appear to have been the main mechanisms for information dissemination. Stakeholders could also receive further information in the one-to-one meetings with city officials.

Although gathering stakeholder knowledge was not a focus of the participatory process, a leader of one environmental NGO has published two books in favour of the park. In an interview, he said that his proposals, including these books, were considered by the city administration. Moreover, he said that his group's interventions highlighted the park's potential for stimulating sustainable economic activities, as discussion tended to focus on possible restrictions on hunting, fishing and motorboat activities.

The city has nonetheless provided information on the Lagoon's environment and heritage over several years, in particular via a dedicate office, the 'Observatory', which carries out studies and has been a promoter of an online GIS portal on the Lagoon's environment, the Lagoon Atlas (see <http://www.silvенеzia.it>).

IX Outcomes

Stakeholders strongly in favour or opposed to the proposal were the most prominent participants. Nonetheless, a broad range of interests and members of the local public were involved, in particular in the two meetings on the island of Burano, in part as key stakeholders also sought to bring in other participants. Several interviewees reported that the process, in particular the meetings on Burano, strengthened support for the proposal by addressing concerns and also noting potential economic opportunities from the park.

One-on-one discussions with city officials helped to address the concerns of the some prominent stakeholders, for example for commercial fishing based on Burano, represented through the Cooperativa San Marco.

Stakeholders representing recreational hunting and fishing groups and some recreational motorboat groups remained strongly opposed throughout the process, and felt that their concerns had not been addressed. Thus, the process did increase understanding and trust among some stakeholders, but this was not the case for all involved.

X Impacts

As yet, it is not possible to identify impacts, as the park proposal was only approved by the city council in mid-May 2014. Moreover, impacts will only be seen once its environmental plan is prepared and implemented.

XI Analysis

Several participants felt that information for the public on the proposal could have been improved. While information was available on city websites, the basic ideas and objectives of the proposal were not summarised in documents for members of the public, and were instead presented orally by city officials at public meetings.

The public festivals provided information on the natural and cultural heritage of the northern Lagoon: these and other information activities by the city appear to have raised public awareness; they were not, however, intended to be directly linked to the process for the park proposal.

A few stakeholder groups remained strongly opposed to the park throughout the process, even though city officials stated that it would not establish new restrictions on their activities (recreational hunting, fishing and motorboat use). Moreover, the regional and provincial governments manage hunting and fishing, not the city, while navigation outside inhabited areas is governed by the Venice Water Authority, a national office. These are, however, long-standing conflicts in the Lagoon of Venice, and throughout the public process, opponents claimed that the park would bring new restrictions. It appears that the park proposal became a lightning rod for opposition, perhaps partly because there was little space for public and stakeholder participation in other processes that may affect the northern Lagoon, such as Natura 2000 (work on the site management plan, including PP, has been delayed) or water governance under the WFD.

The city's park proposal has been under consideration for over 10 years (and proposals for a regional or national park across the whole Lagoon of Venice go back over 20 years). Overlapping jurisdictions among the different levels of government in a complex multilevel setting – city, provincial, regional and national – appears to be a key reason for delay. In early 2014, indeed, the city government was waiting for clarification from the regional administration on issues concerning the park's role as a city institution. The overlapping jurisdictions seen in this case study highlight a broader problem, which is the difficulty to coordinate such multilevel governance efficiently in any unified approach for the northern Lagoon and the Lagoon of Venice overall.

XII Sources of information

Websites of the city of Venice, including the park institution, and Lagoon Atlas website (see <http://www.silvenezia.it>)

Interviews:

- Marco Favaro, Venice city administration: Observatory of the Lagoon;
 - Luigi Vidal, president of the Cooperativa San Marco pescatori di Burano, with about 120 professional fishermen;
 - Giannandrea Mencini, member of the Venice chapter of Verdi Ambiente Società (Greens Environment Society), and national vice president of the organisation;
 - two anonymous interviewees.
-

Case study: Tidal Thames Catchment Pilot, United Kingdom

I General information

Name of participation initiative: Your Tidal Thames (YTT) Catchment Pilot

Location: Tidal Thames (London to the East Coast)/Thames RBD/United Kingdom

Scale: Sub-RBD

Period covered: January–December 2012

Lead organisation(s): Thames Estuary Partnership ⁽⁴⁾ (TEP) (partnership organisation) and Thames 21 ⁽⁵⁾ (NGO)

II Context

The YTT project covers the tidal area of the River Thames. This extends from Teddington Lock near Richmond-upon-Thames downstream to Haven Point on the north bank of the Thames Estuary in Essex and Warden Point, on the Isle of Sheppey, on the south bank in Kent. As a result, the YTT catchment area is affected by the most densely populated urban area in Europe, and is subject to a wide range of environmental pressures.

The waterbodies in the YTT catchment are all designated as heavily modified as a result of their location in a primarily urban environment. In this way, as well as in the size and complexity of the catchment, and due to the fact that the Port of London is a working port, the YTT catchment differs from many other British catchment areas.

The waterbodies in the YTT catchment are classified as having moderate quality overall, with a range of issues on the river including sewage pollution, road run-off, industrial effluents and many morphological issues.

III Purpose and objectives

The purpose of the PP was to support the development of an effective, deliverable and sustainable catchment plan to help achieve the WFD objectives for the tidal Thames by engaging the wide range of communities, residents, river users and interest groups, and utilising their experience, concerns and expertise.

The production of the catchment plan was not a formal process led by the competent authority. It was an exploratory pilot project intended to test an approach to involving stakeholders in catchment planning and learn about developing a catchment plan to provide input into the wider Thames RBMP. This initiative was one of 25 pilots that the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Areas (Defra) sponsored across the United Kingdom between July 2011 and December 2012, to test collaborative approaches to water-planning and management at the catchment level (the 'catchment-based' approach). The pilots were part of the government's review of river-basin planning strategy and were intended to explore the most effective ways to engage partners and achieve integrated, multiple environmental outcomes.

Participation was intended, among other things, to:

- set up a catchment stakeholder group and involve them in project decision-making;
- share information and help develop agreed joint action plans to deliver the best solutions to achieve WFD objectives;
- create a shared vision for the catchment;
- produce the tidal Thames catchment plan.

IV Resources

- GBP 32 000 (approximately) from Defra, mainly used to pay for two part-time coordinators (engaging with stakeholders and the public, developing the catchment plan).
- GBP 10 000 (approximately) from Defra/Sciencewise ⁽⁶⁾ to cover support from an independent facilitator on stakeholder and public engagement activities, and for overall design of engagement process.
- Staff time (involvement of leadership of partner organisations) and overheads contributed by pilot partners (GBP 33 000 approximately).

⁽⁴⁾ See <http://thamesweb.com>.

⁽⁵⁾ See <http://www.thames21.org.uk>.

⁽⁶⁾ The Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre provides co-funding and specialist advice and support to government departments and agencies, to develop and commission public dialogue activities in emerging areas of science and technology. It is based in the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS).

V Public participation activities

Summary of participation activities

The project carried out a review of water management issues in the catchment, and held a number of activities to gather the views of stakeholders and members of the public about what issues, solutions and actions for the area should be included in a catchment plan that would be the basis for a community approach to river management.

The main activities were:

- creation of a stakeholder strategy group;
- 11 'pop-up' workshops in different parts of London, run as part of other organisations' own events, to get stakeholder and public feedback on the proposed catchment plan for the tidal Thames;
- presentations and information stalls at 9 events;
- gathering information from stakeholders and members of the public using a Catchment Plan Template, both online and at public events;
- Nine one-to-one meetings with key organisations including businesses and NGOs.

VI Governance

The YTT project was led by two NGOs contracted by Defra, Thames Estuary Partnership and Thames 21. A strategy group made up of 26 key stakeholders was set up. This group did not see itself as a steering or decision-making group but as more of a sounding board for the project; the group only met twice during the 12 months of the pilot, due to lack of resources and time. The development of the engagement activities and planning was carried out by the teams of the two lead organisations, with the advice of members of the strategy group.

VII Who participated

A wide range of stakeholders participated, including private organisations and NGOs.

These included:

- government departments and agencies
- local authorities
- private sector
- recreational organisations (yachting, angling); environmental consultants (aquatic) and interest group representatives (houseboats).

The project activities also involved a significant number of members of the public. Generally the stakeholders felt that the cover of different stakeholder interests had worked well. However, it was recognised by the two lead organisations that there were gaps in the cover of some geographic areas. This is to a large extent because of the size of the area (which has a population of 7 000 000 people), and the time available.

VIII Providing information and gathering knowledge

The Environment Agency produced information about the water management issues for waterbodies across England based on results from official investigations and monitoring. Information from the Environment Agency about the water management issues for the catchment, based on official investigations and monitoring, was not available for the tidal Thames until the end of 2012, i.e. too late to inform the PP in this project. The two lead NGOs researched high-level information about specific pollutants and issues that were known to be facing the catchment, cross-checked their results with the Environment Agency and used this information in engagement materials (leaflets and website pages).

The main tool for gathering information was a Catchment Plan Template. This was an empty document made up of five sections, which prompted respondents to provide their views on the tidal Thames. The reason for this approach was to allow people to raise their personal or their organisations' concerns for the river and to avoid any sense of restriction. The template was filled in by members of the public and stakeholders during engagement activities; it was also sent out to stakeholders and could be completed online.

Members of the public who had not previously been involved were engaged through 'pop-up' events and information stalls, which put the catchment plan in the context of their own activities such as volunteer clean-ups or community initiatives, or through events such as the Thames Festival or NGO events.

The lead organisations were provided with several days of support from an independent facilitator. The facilitator helped the team to identify objectives for the process and clarify how these could be achieved; provided facilitation training; and gave support during large meetings where an independent voice was needed and conflict management could have been required.

The lack of any research data or prior information meant that many of the comments and suggestions received were not focused on actions or measures, and some were not directly relevant to RBMP; many members of the public focused on river access, the control of litter and refuse and other local priorities such as lack of consideration of riparian issues in local development plans. All comments made by stakeholders were made available for others to see, as templates were uploaded to the project website on a monthly basis. All comments were grouped into themes under headings, to make it easier for readers to identify the issues raised.

IX Outcomes

A draft catchment plan was submitted in December 2012. However, the draft catchment plan did not prioritise issues or address potential conflicts between proposals. This was because the strategy group was unwilling to prioritise any proposals without further discussion and greater clarity about the status of the pilot and of the catchment plan itself. As a result, although the deadline for producing a catchment plan was formally met, lack of steering from government meant that the plan was not produced in a form that could be used to manage actions in the catchment.

The online consultation form has been kept open so that individuals and organisations can continue to add comments and proposals. The stakeholder group will convene again once the data from investigations are made available; participants clearly stated they wanted to continue working together as the YTT strategy group and produce a final catchment plan.

X Impacts

It is too early to identify impacts because the final catchment plan has not yet been agreed.

XI Analysis

Costs and benefits: to what extent did the costs of the participation reflect the importance of the issues being addressed?

The input received from stakeholders through one-to-one meetings and the input from members of the public and local organisations at the 'pop-up' workshops was used to define key problem areas and issues for the tidal Thames. A long history of consultations on this section of the Thames had never received such extensive input, especially from members of the public and local stakeholders. It is hard to weigh up the value of this input against the cost of gathering it, before the results have been set out in a definitive catchment plan and the measures in that plan have been implemented. But the fact that other authorities, organisations and the regulator have provided additional funding imply that there was a perception that the process had value.

The lack of information about the issues in the catchment may have meant that public participants were less able to give focused views on catchment management. It may also have been a factor in the unwillingness of stakeholders to become involved in prioritising the actions proposed to be included in the catchment plan.

XII Sources of information

Interviews

- One focus group interview.
- Interviews with four members of the YTT project team over three different periods.
- Interview with the regulator (Environment Agency).
- Previous research on this case study can be found at http://ccmhub.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/DF-Appendix-E_2-Case-Studies-Appendix-to-Report-FINAL.pdf.

Case study: Warta River, Poznań, Poland

I General information

Name of participation initiative: Partnership 'Na rzecz Warty' (For the Warta River)

Location: Poznań

Scale: Sub-RBD, the initiative relates to Warta RBD, which is a tributary to a larger river, Odra. More specifically, the initiative relates to the fragment of the Warta RBD in Poznań. This is a heavily modified waterbody according to WFD definitions (information from the Water Management Board in Poznań)

Period covered: January–December 2012

Lead organisation(s): City of Poznań, two consulting firms: KuiperCompagnons and Royal HaskoningDHV, and SwedeCenter as developer.

II Context

The Warta River lies in western-central Poland and is a tributary of the Odra river. The Warta Basin is affected by common water protection problems in Poland, mainly eutrophication and flooding. These hinder attempts to achieve good water status. The largest water user in the region is industry, and the main source of drinking water is surface water, leading to competing uses.

Throughout history, Poznań, the largest city situated at Warta River, has been frequently damaged by floods, leading to the decision to canalise the river from 1966 through 1969. The canalisation caused the river to become an isolated area with no connection to the historic city centre. Potentially attractive areas at the river banks after canalisation became dull and lacked any visitor-friendly infrastructure.

The floods in 1997 and 2006 revealed many shortcomings in flood protection in Poland. Over recent years (especially in 2010), high water levels of the Warta River have been observed again in Poznań, and some areas were flooded. These events indicate that the Warta River has insufficient capacities to accommodate large volumes of water during floods. Creating more space for the river and allowing the river to flow at a slower pace might alleviate these problems.

The Na rzecz Warty partnership is a joint project between the city of Poznań, two Dutch consultancies (Kuiper Compagnons and Royal HaskoningDHV) and a real estate developer (SwedeCenter, part of the Inter IKEA group). The partnership formulated a long-term strategy for the section of the river flowing through the city (Development Strategy of the Warta River 2012–2030), drawing urban development of Warta-adjacent areas in Poznań.

The key objectives are as follows.

- Improving the flood safety system of the city of Poznań. Currently, the risk of flood is assessed at 1 per 100 years. The strategy aims at improving this indicator to 1 flood per 125 years (Dutch standards).
- Defining the role of the Warta River in Poznań and the directions of its development as the starting point for recovery of the Warta River by the city of Poznań and its inhabitants.
- Improving land use by facilitating the planning of investments and boosting the attractiveness of waterfront areas.
- Giving an economic incentive to the city through consistent coordination of land use and development projects of areas situated on the Warta River.

Several meetings for local stakeholders were organised when the strategy was being created. City planners and architects in cooperation with the consultancies paid particular attention to involving residents. The strategy outlines the main activities planned and provides an analysis of economic and social aspects related to these activities. The river development strategy is integrated with a broader development strategy of the city. All partners, including the developer, had a role in formulating the strategy. SwedeCenter is implementing the first pilot project, Portowo. Specialists from KuiperCompagnons have been advising the city from 2008 on, providing analyses regarding ecological, economic, and tourist interdependencies between the city and the river. Work on the Strategy for the Warta River started in January 2012 and finished in February 2013.

For strategy implementation, several projects will be combined to create synergy and to spread the costs. So far three pilot projects have been planned. The first location addressed in 2013 is Portowo, which is an old, abandoned river port, closed to the general public and with very limited contribution to the city of Poznań. A new river arm will be created to increase flood safety, while the area of Portowo will be transformed into an attractive living, working and leisure environment. Further plans cover Chwaliszewo, which is an area in the city centre. This project envisages excavating additional river channels, constructing a marina and setting up a tourist tram, among other plans. Within the third project, Northern Island, several islands with diverse urban structures will be created on the river.

III Purpose and objectives

The purpose was to involve inhabitants in the process of creating a strategy of better integration of the Warta River into city life. The objective was to create a possibility for stakeholders to express their opinions regarding the planned projects, to voice their proposals, and to express any concerns and doubts related to the strategy of managing the Warta River valley and to specific projects.

IV Resources

There were no specific monetary contributions allocated to this initiative. The city organised the consultations using its regular resources (staff and equipment). Moreover, the consultants hired for preparation of the Strategy for the Warta River also participated in the consultations (these were the experts from KuiperCompagnons, DHV and SwedeCenter), so a part of these costs could be attributed to PP activities.

The total costs of preparing the strategy amounted to EUR 400 000, with approximately half of this amount financed by the consultancies, and the other half by the Dutch governmental programme 'Partners for water', aimed at promotion of Dutch expertise in water and flood management. Although details are not available, only a small share of these costs could be attributed to public consultation-related activities.

V Public participation activities

The main activities were as follows.

- Information about the strategy and about PP events are provided on a special website (see <http://www.dorzeczni.pl>) and on the website of the city of Poznań (see <http://www.poznan.pl>).
- Approximately 30 members of the expert group (representatives of the partnership organisations plus representatives of various scientific institutes, city council, academia and regulatory bodies such as Water Management Board, Institute for Meteorology and Water Management, Regional Land Drainage Directorate) had three meetings in the period from February through July 2012 with ongoing contacts in the meantime.
- Three open consultation meetings were held in the same weeks as the meetings of the expert group. 180 people attended (1st meeting: 100 people, 2nd: 60 and 3rd: 20). The members of public (not representing various organisations) numbered approximately 50. These people were the most interested at the beginning of the process; at the last meeting, most of the participants represented institutions or organisations (e.g. councils of inhabitants' districts). Business representatives included representatives of a power plant and other firms situated in the vicinity of the river.

VI Governance

An advisory expert group was created. The role of this group was to prepare the documentation, which was summarised in the form of presentations, and then presented to the public in open sessions. The members of this group were also present during the open sessions so that they could respond to questions from the public. Questions were also directed to the coordinator of the consultations process (a city council officer), who either replied or directed the questions to the experts. The changes resulting from the consultation process were incorporated in the next presentation showed during the subsequent open session. The revisions to the initial proposal of the strategy made by the members of the expert group were not made public (the final version of the strategy is publically available).

VII Who participated

All stakeholder groups were represented: residents, businesses, sport organisations, ecological organisations, regional water management body, city administration, representatives of the neighbouring municipalities, etc.:

- the water regulator: Regional Board for Water Management (RBWM), Institute for Meteorology and Water Management, Melioration Directorate;
 - the WFD-competent authority (RBWM);
 - regional or local government(s): representatives of the city administration and local communes, higher level authorities were also invited but did not attend;
 - private sector: developers, business associations;
 - NGOs (including sports associations);
 - local inhabitants;
 - higher education institutions.
-

VIII Providing information and gathering knowledge

The stakeholders and the public were involved at an early stage of preparing the strategy so that their opinions could contribute to its formulation. Information about the activities was clearly communicated and announced through various media including local television and press. The information was prepared using a simple language. An agenda of the consultation meetings was placed online (see <http://www.dorzeczni.pl>) and information was also sent via email to many stakeholders who were identified by the city administration.

The participants were informed that they could voice their comments either during the meetings, or use the website or email addresses of the coordinators of the participation process. The meetings were structured to have presentations of the main aspects and assumptions first, and then to open the floor for comments, questions and discussion. City administration officials set out these rules.

Comments and proposals voiced during the consultation meetings or via email were analysed by members of the team preparing the strategy. During the next meeting, the experts or coordinators explained how the comments/proposals had been included in the strategy or why they had not been included.

Journalists (television, press, radio) were notified and invited to all the meetings. News briefs for the press were prepared and some articles were published in the local press. A large illustrated article about the initiative was also published in one of the most popular nation-wide newspapers (*Gazeta Wyborcza*). Information about the consultations was also spread via Facebook (the city has its own Facebook page and website also has a Facebook profile). Several articles and news briefs published in various newspapers and on various websites can be downloaded online, under the heading *NAPISALI O NAS* (see http://www.dorzeczni.pl/pl/biuro_prasowe.html). Published documents for consultation included outlines of the strategy, main directions of the planned investments and presentations related to the main aspects. After each round of consultations, the presentations were also published on the website. Two of the public consultation sessions were broadcast live on the city website; however, the number of people participating online was very low (about 10 people).

IX Outcomes

Thanks to the participation process, more trust from the members of the public towards the representatives of the city administration and the engaged developer company was created. At the beginning of the process, people had the impression that the business sector (i.e. the developer and the consulting firms) are only profit driven. During the consultations, it became clear that both the city and the developer together with the consultancies are interested in making the strategy as suitable and acceptable for the inhabitants as possible. Another aspect is related to the perception of the Regional Board for Water Management, representatives of which were also present during the meetings. The public seemed to be confused about the division of roles between the city administration and the water management board. People expected that all issues related to the river in the city belong to the competencies of the city, while in fact this is not the case (flood management, for example, falls under the water management board's competencies). This was explained during the meetings.

Relations between the investors, the city and the Regional Board for Water Management improved as a result of the consultations. For example, investors are more willing to take the advice of the city administration before embarking on a planned investment.

There is no evidence of continued dialogue between those involved in the PP, but it is planned that as subsequent projects planned for implementation according to the strategy are implemented, consultations and dialogue will be continued at project level.

Furthermore, this dialogue is indirectly continued during the meetings of the Council for Revitalisation of the City. The council was created in 2011; in early 2012 the council launched the process of development of an integrated programme of revitalisation of the city centre. Creating the strategy for development of the Warta River (which covers the whole section of the river in the city, not only the city centre) overlaps with this revitalisation strategy, and the two processes have been integrated. The revitalisation strategy will be completed by the end of 2013; the document directly and indirectly refers to the 'Development Strategy for the Warta River'. Preparation of this document was accompanied by an open public debate (March–May 2012), during which various stakeholders and the residents voiced their opinions about needs and problems related to management of the city centre.

Certain economic and financing aspects of the strategy have been changed in response to the comments. City inhabitants proposed a few solutions which were added to the strategy and which will be implemented. These include the following.

- Temporary management of the Chwaliszewo area: while in the longer term, this area will be more drastically changed (there are plans to rebuild the old canals connecting with the main river arm), the inhabitants requested temporary management of this area to make it more attractive for walking and cycling (to clean it up and arrange green zones and walking paths). See pp. 120 and 121 of the Strategy (English version): these plans result from consultations. See http://www.dorzeczni.pl/upload/articles/pdf/strategy_en.pdf.
- Construction of small bridges over the river arms for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Creation of ecological zones along river banks. These ecological zones are not planned according to any specific ecological standards, but are basically strips of plant vegetation.

The residents also requested that the historical connection of the old city centre with an island on the river (Ostrow Tumski) be restored; this wish is reflected in the strategy and will be implemented in future.

X Impacts

It is too early to identify any ecological benefits. PP could have only a very marginal impact on ecological conditions (this could be related to the postulated ecological zones, i.e. additional green strips of vegetation along the river). Also, the quality of water is beyond competencies of the city administration (this aspect is overseen by the water management board).

The costs were very low (covered partly from the budget of the project shared by the consultancies, a subsidy from the Dutch government and a contribution from the real estate developer. According to the representative of the city administration, the value of the effects considerably exceeded the costs.

SwedeCenter, the developer who participated in the PP project, is implementing the first pilot project in Portowo – building a living and leisure area in an abandoned port. Some decisions emerging from the participation are implemented in this project, such as small bridges for the pedestrians and cyclists.

XI Analysis

According to the city administration, dialogue with all the stakeholders was very helpful in making all the interested parties involved in the decision-making process and in creating an atmosphere of trust. Involving experts to explain various aspects of the planned activities was beneficial for the process of consultations. Organising the meetings outside the city administration offices (as in this case) is recommended: this helped the participants feel that they were on 'neutral ground'.

Engagement of foreign know-how thanks to the subsidy of the Dutch government was very much appreciated. Dutch expertise in water management helped in examining some aspects in more innovative and creative ways (urban and hydrological solutions).

It was important that consultations focused not only on long-term strategy but also on some immediate activities, like temporary management of the Chwaliszewo area. In this way, people could see the effects of their suggestions quite rapidly. However, the number of participants could have been higher.

Live broadcasting of the consultation sessions could be considered an innovative technique. However, because of very low interest, this was not considered to be a success, and the city has decided not to implement this technique in the near future.

XII Sources of information

Interviews

- Szymon Błażek, Real Estate Management – Strategy Branch of the Poznań city administration, 7–25 October 2013.
 - Mariusz Wisniewski, chair of the Council for Revitalisation of the City and a member of the city council, 16 October 2013.
 - Ewa Wisniewska, KuiperCompagnons, 10–25 October 2013.
 - Email communication with Halina Owsiana, chair of the housing district Stare Winogrody, 24 October 2013.
-

Case study: Stakeholder participation in Thuringia, Germany

I General information

Name of participation initiative: Thüringer Gewässerbeirat (Thuringia Water Advisory Panel) and related initiatives

Location: Thuringia, Germany

Scale: Federal state level, subnational and sub-RBD

Period covered: 2003–present

Lead organisation(s): Thüringer Ministerium für Landwirtschaft, Forsten, Umwelt und Naturschutz (TMLFUN) (Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Nature Protection)

II Context

Thuringia is one of Germany's federal states. Most of its territory lies within the Elbe RBD, although some territory is also in the Rhine and Weser RBDs.

The Elbe connects central Europe with the North Sea and flows through four countries. In Germany, the federal states are responsible for the implementation of the WFD. Therefore, the institutional setting of the Elbe River Basin Management is highly complex, as it involves four countries as well as 10 federal states within Germany. Coordination at the international level is carried out by the International Commission for the Protection of the Elbe (IKSE); at national level it is carried out by the River Basin Association (Flussgebietsgemeinschaft (FGG)) Elbe is responsible for coordinating the activities of federal states. In Thuringia, PP for the implementation of the WFD is organised at federal state, catchment and local levels. The overall responsible government body is the state's Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Nature Protection (TMLFUN).

At state level, selected stakeholders participate in the Gewässerbeirat (Water Advisory Panel); furthermore, selected stakeholders participate at river-catchment level through three forums, the Saale-Weisse Elster Forum, the Werra-Main Forum and the Unstrut-Leine Forum. At local level, stakeholders and the public participated in Gewässerwerkstätten (water workshops), which discussed measures for specific river stretches in the Elbe RBD as well as the Rhine and Weser RBDs.

This case study focuses on stakeholder participation, in particular at state level via the Gewässerbeirat. It also provides some information on the other participation activities. The case study looks overall at the panel's work; in doing so, it also considers activities within Thuringia to develop the RBMP under the WFD.

III Purpose and objectives

Since 2003, the purpose of the Gewässerbeirat has been to support the management of the implementation of the WFD and later also of the FD. In addition, the Gewässerbeirat is sometimes used by stakeholders to discuss water management topics that do not directly relate to the WFD.

The three catchment-level forums are intended to serve as information platforms, to interlink catchment activities, and to identify concrete problems and develop solutions in the regions in the realm of the implementation of the WFD (?). The Gewässerwerkstätten inform the local public and stakeholders of measures proposed for specific waterbodies and provide an opportunity for discussion. The calls for written comments provide a formal process for the public and stakeholders to comment on draft plans. Involvement in the preparation (and implementation) of the RBMP is one of the key objectives.

IV Resources

Information not available.

V Public participation activities

The main activities were:

- two or three meetings per year of the Gewässerbeirat: participation of stakeholders at federal state level, representation of main interest groups;
- three annual catchment-level forums (Saale-Forum, Werra-Main-Forum, Unstrut-Leine-Forum), run by the Thuringia Environmental Agency (Thüringer Landesanstalt für Umwelt und Geologie (TLUG)): these support the participation of stakeholders at catchment level and liaison with Gewässerbeirat;
- Gewässerwerkstätten (water workshops); organised by the TLUG for local sections of the Elbe river basin; workshops serve to discuss the measures which have been developed by the Planungsbüros (planning offices); the aim is to involve responsible and affected actors in the planning process of hydromorphological measurements; they were only active in the first year, during the planning of measures;
- Aktion Fluss is the 'brand' used to communicate and promote measures and activities on hydromorphology by the TMLFUN since 2008.

(?) See information provided in the 'Gewässerforen' section of the TMLFUN website, at <http://www.thueringen.de/th8/tmlfun/umwelt/wasser/euwr/beteiligung/gewaesserforen>.

VI Governance

Compared to the other stakeholder platforms and public consultations, the Gewässerbeirat has the most influence at federal state level on development of plans, decisions and implementation, as it is the most high-level group of stakeholders on WFD implementation. It has much more influence than the three catchment-level Gewässerforen. Even though the results of the forums are presented in the Gewässerbeirat by the TLUG, these forums do not have much influence directly on decisions at federal level.

The Gewässerbeirat does not have decision-making powers. Its members can only present statements. After each meeting of the Gewässerbeirat, the TMLFUN sends out working papers to which stakeholders can then submit statements within four weeks. These statements are then taken into account in the development of measures and plans. The Gewässerbeirat also can submit a common statement, which must be agreed by a majority vote. This method, however, is rarely used.

The fact that the Gewässerbeirat is hosted by the TMLFUN may restrict the influence of its members. The organiser is responsible for bringing stakeholders together to form a common statement. However, this does not seem to be in the interest of the organiser, who himself belongs to the staff of the ministry and therefore has to represent and defend their interests. Therefore, the organiser role is reportedly slightly conflicting, as both facilitator of the Gewässerbeirat, and also one who represents certain interests. The TMLFUN official is well aware that these two functions are at odds, but does not consider this to be an issue hampering the influence of the Gewässerbeirat.

VII Who participated

The following organisations and stakeholders participate in the Gewässerbeirat:

- WFD-competent authority (TMLFUN)
- communes, counties
- water industry, energy sector, hydro power plants
- environmental protection organisations
- anglers
- chamber of commerce
- engineers.

VIII Providing information and gathering knowledge

For the members of the **Gewässerbeirat**, information is provided initially through oral and PowerPoint presentations. These presentations alongside the protocols of the meetings are then sent to all the members and are published on the internet. If necessary, individual meetings with the ministry can be arranged. Members are sometimes also in contact outside the meetings, happening twice a year to work on specific issues.

Therefore, for members of the Gewässerbeirat, information is easy to access. Upon request, members can receive any additional information they need.

For **the public at large**, the state ministry organised events to raise awareness about the WFD: presentations in schools, a public competition for outstanding ideas for water protection, and exhibitions. However, in general, events were sparsely attended and interest was low. For this reason, the state ministry will not organise further events in future, as the benefits outweigh the costs.

Under Aktion Fluss, the TMLFUN organised four information events in order to inform, support and encourage the communes to implement the measures. For example, participation at 'water neighbourhood days' (Wassernachbarschaften) of the German Association for Water Management, Wastewater and Waste (Deutsche Vereinigung für Wasserwirtschaft, Abwasser und Abfall e.V.) was promoted. Some 70 % of the communes attended information events and many took part in the 'water neighbourhood days' ⁽⁸⁾.

The formal, written public consultation for the RBMP was announced through press releases and in the Official State Gazette (Staatsanzeiger) of Thüringen. Announcing texts were also given to stakeholders, mayors and other organisations or people who would disseminate the information.

Formal public consultation via written comments was carried out within the RBMP process:

Phase 1: timetables and working programmes

Phase 2: important questions of water management

Phase 3: draft RBMP, programmes of measures and environmental assessment reports as well as background documents; the Thüringen state report (Thüringer Landesbericht), which targets the general public and is therefore more illustrative and less technical, and water framework plans (Gewässerrahmenpläne), which provide maps and detailed information at local level (they are prepared for the Gewässerwerkstätten).

⁽⁸⁾ Protocol of the 22nd meeting of the Gewässerbeirat on 19 October 2013.

IX Outcomes

The implementation of the RBMP is currently under way. The Gewässerbeirat is a permanent body with ongoing participation and a good platform for exchange. Even though stakeholders who are members of the Gewässerbeirat do not represent the total population in Thuringia, they represent key sectors that are interested in and/or directly affected by the WFD.

Several examples were provided to show influence of stakeholders participating in the Gewässerbeirat.

- The representative of environmental protection organisations had suggested to pay more attention to small waterbodies and to carry out more measures in these areas. Authorities took the criticism into account: they organised the funding of three regional advisers in order to support the financing and implementation of measures.
- Concerning the FD, the ministry had presented the Gewässerbeirat with the draft guidelines and asked them for input. In the final version, which was presented recently, a stakeholder could see that some points outlined had been taken into account.
- The same stakeholder could also see influence in terms of the designation of the heavily modified waterbodies during the preparation of the first water management plan; several issues had been taken into account.
- Stakeholders in the Gewässerbeirat developed ideas of how to finance certain measures under the WFD. For example, funding by the World Wide Fund for Nature was acquired.

In addition, written statements submitted under the formal **public consultation** influenced the RBMP ⁽⁹⁾:

- objections related to water structure and continuity (in total 172) were taken into account: less in the programmes of measures and more so in the 'water framework plans';
- objections related to agriculture (45) were treated as follows: objections related to the agricultural measures themselves were not taken into account in the development of measures, because they are on a voluntary basis; objections related to the designation of areas with heavy loads of pesticides were taken into account in the form that the wording of the designation was adapted;
- objections related to wastewater (25) were partly taken into account in the actualisation of the programmes of measures;
- other objections to hazardous sites/mining, groundwater and other issues were partly taken into account in the measures.

X Impacts

Impact of participation on ecological conditions: members assessed weaknesses in nitrogen management and soil erosion protection and developed approaches to optimise nitrogen management, which they presented at the meeting of the Gewässerbeirat ⁽¹⁰⁾. According to the stakeholder from the agricultural sector interviewed, these analyses are of great importance, because businesses can see from the balance sheets what the measures have contributed.

Cost-effectiveness of participation: the Gewässerbeirat were cost-effective in the sense that ideas were developed concerning how to finance certain measures under the WFD (e.g. the funding opportunity by the World Wide Fund for Nature). According to the TMLFUN official interviewed, participation in the first rounds of public consultation was low in Thuringia. As a result, the ministry will prioritise tasks for the second phase of the RBMP, and invest less effort in the initial phases of the public consultation.

Implementation of decisions emerging from the participation: the participation process has increased the acceptance of the measures and therefore the willingness to implement them. The participation has certainly contributed to awareness and reflection of issues of water protection. Some agricultural businesses may be more willing to implement measures for water protection; however, if these conflict with economic interests, implementing them is not easy. But farmers had already considered water protection issues, before the PP process in the realm of the WFD.

⁽⁹⁾ See Thüringer Landesbericht zu den Bewirtschaftungsplänen und Maßnahmenprogrammen online (TMLFUN, 2009).

⁽¹⁰⁾ See Protocol of the 22nd meeting of the Gewässerbeirat of 19 December 2012.

XI Analysis

There were several main innovations.

- A system that operates at three levels (federal, catchment and local). These bodies have different roles and levels of influence on decision-making; however, they are linked both by the organising bodies as well as by stakeholder organisations.
- The high continuity of the presence of the same actors in the Gewässerbeirat. This seems to ensure a good climate for open discussion as well as technical competence among the members.
- The fact that the Gewässerbeirat can provide a common statement, which impacts decision-making.
- The Gewässerwerkstätten, which promote the participation of stakeholders and members of the affected public at local level.
- In the first years of the Gewässerbeirat, the ministry organised a **competition among members of the public for outstanding ideas** for projects on water protection. The proposals were assessed by the Gewässerbeirat and the best projects were selected.
- Water cooperation in the agricultural sector seems to be of high value, as this ensures communication and exchange between practitioners, engineers as well as administrative bodies. This has a positive impact on the analysis of problems and of feasibility of measures.

XII Sources of information

Interviews

- Stephan Gunkel, Flussbüro Erfurt.
 - Beate Kirsten, Thuringian Farmer Association.
 - Holger Diening, Thuringian Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Conservation.
-

Case study: Northern Portugal RBMPs, Portugal

I General information

Name of participation initiative: Participação e Discussão Pública do Plano de Gestão das Regiões Hidrográficas do Norte

Location: Northern Portugal

Scale: Regional

Period covered: January 2009–June 2012

Lead organisation(s)

- Administração da Região Hidrográfica do Norte, IP (ARH do Norte, IP) (Regional Water Administration of the North; 'IP' is 'Instituto Público', i.e. public institute).
It is now the Administração da Região Hidrográfica do Norte and no longer a public institute but a decentralised service of the Agência Portuguesa do Ambiente, I. P. (Portuguese Environmental Agency). The Portuguese Environmental Agency is currently the WFD-competent authority at national level.
- Escola Superior de Biotecnologia da Universidade Católica Portuguesa (ESB-UCP).

II Context

The ARH do Norte, IP was the regional body responsible for the protection and enhancement of the environmental components of water in northern Portugal, including the implementation of the WFD and, in particular, the production of the RBMPs for the RBDs within its area of competence, during most of the PP period.

The territorial scope of the ARH do Norte, IP covers three RBDs (Minho e Lima; Cávado, Ave and Leça, and Douro) across a total area of 24 622 km² with 92 municipalities and 3 700 000 people. The region borders Spain and shares a considerable number of water resources with the country. More than 500 waterbodies are currently identified in the region, including 6 425 6 km of rivers, as well as also lakes, estuaries and coastal waters. Of these, 346 were classified as being in good or high status, 172 in moderate, poor or bad status, and the remaining 22 are unclassified. The area in question is considerably large and very heterogeneous, and the water uses are therefore very diverse. As a consequence, the waterbodies in this area are affected by a series of issues: pollution (organic, microbiologic and diffuse), eutrophication, drought and water scarcity, floods, compliance of the ecological flows, insufficient monitoring, insufficient supervision, coastal erosion and inflows from Spain (quantity and quality of water).

As the entire process of producing the first RBMPs was delayed, the process of PP also took place later than expected. Nevertheless, the PP comprised the three stages described in Article 14 of the WFD, with the formal period of public consultation on the draft plans taking place between 3 October 2011 and 3 April 2012. The ARH do Norte, IP contracted an external consultant (ESB-UCP) to provide support during the whole period of PP. The methodology of the PP process involved the following methods: communication, consultation, active involvement, awareness and capacity-building. The main innovations are related to these last two methods, which had the objective of opening the debate to new participants, and reinforcing the knowledge of the participants so they could effectively contribute to the debate.

III Purpose and objectives

The purpose of the PP process was to engage stakeholders and members of the public to actively contribute to the production and execution of the RBMP, in order to support the successful implementation of the WFD and reach the environmental objectives established therein. The main objectives of the PP process are described in the Chapter 3 in each of the RBMPs:

- to increase a shared understanding of the environmental problems and the role of the different stakeholders involved in water management;
- to promote decision-making processes that are more sustained and transparent;
- to reduce potential conflicts due to the lack of knowledge, through the pursuit for agreement in different topics;
- to make the most of the knowledge, competence, experience and initiatives of the stakeholders, in order to increase the quality of the RBMP, the programmes of measures and water management in general.

IV Resources

Monetary contributions comprised 85 % EU regional funds via the National Strategic Reference Framework (Quadro de Referência Estratégico Nacional (QREN)) and 15 % from the ARH do Norte, IP funds.

The ARH do Norte, IP signed a series of partnerships with municipalities (e.g. Municipality of Viana do Castelo, Municipality of Chaves), public entities (e.g. Universidade do Porto) and private companies (e.g. Lipor) with a view to better dissemination of the RBMP content. This network of partnerships allowed the free use of venues and equipment for some of the events. In addition, the ARH do Norte, IP hired an external consultant (ESB-UCP) to carry out a series of tasks within the scope of the PP process.

V Public participation activities

- A total of 10 meetings of the Conselho de Região Hidrográfica (regional water council), the consultative body of the ARH do Norte, IP, were held between February 2009 and June 2012 in 7 different locations. There were 481 participants in total: beside the water council members, these included representatives from the relevant ministries and other administrative bodies, local governments, organisations of the main water users, scientific organisations and NGOs. Due to a change in institutional arrangements, the activity of the council is currently on hold, but it is expect to resume work in early 2014.
- Between April 2009 and May 2009, during the preconsultation process, five PP 'journeys' discussed with approximately 300 participants significant water management issues (Questões Significativas de Gestão da Água – QSiGA) to be addressed in the RBMP in different localities, including two on the Spanish side of the RBDs.
- From April 2010 to December 2010, a series of meetings entitled 'As Naturezas da Água' (Water Natures), divided into four sessions (Body, Soul, Ingenuity and Art), sought to engage a broad public. The meetings had the purpose of showing the importance of water and a good water management to a broader public by addressing water issues from a different perspective. The meetings were open to the members of the public, took place in several universities in Porto and featured renowned personalities from different fields. The meetings were held at the initial stage of the PP process with the objective of raising public awareness in time for their effective participation in the consultation. Around 135 persons participated in total.
- A total of 4 sectoral workshops with 27 participants overall were held between January 2011 and February 2011 on the following topics: agriculture, livestock, fisheries and aquaculture; energy; industry; tourism and leisure activities. The workshops focused on specific questions of a more technical nature and had the purpose of gathering knowledgeable input in time to include any amendments to the draft plans. The workshops were held in the premises of a university in Porto, and were only open to invited stakeholders previously identified as main actors in each of the sectors.
- In May 2011, one public presentation of the preliminary versions of the Spanish RBMPs for Duero e Miño-Sil in Portugal was held, including a discussion of the main aspects of transboundary cooperation in water management. Some 70 persons participated in total.
- Six meetings of the Fórum Regional da Água (Regional Water Forum), a series of informal meetings to present and discuss the preliminary versions of the RBMP took place between June 2011 and March 2012. The purpose of the meetings was to foster the debate between the administration the stakeholders and the members of the public during the last stage of the PP process (with the exception of the first meeting that took place before that period). The meetings were held in six different cities and were open to all members of the public (408 participants in total). The meetings addressed different topics related to water management and included talks, visits to relevant sites and the setting of informal working groups.

VI Governance

No working groups of a more permanent basis were set up during the PP process. However, the role of the regional water council, as the consultative body of the ARH do Norte, IP, should be mentioned. Also, within the context of the meetings of the Regional Water Forum, a series of informal working groups were set to discuss specific topics. Most of the activities (sectoral workshops, meetings of the Regional Water Forum) followed roughly the same structure. The ARH do Norte, IP set a main topic for each activity in advance. As a result, there was no need to take decisions about what to discuss or what to prioritise. The participants were randomly divided into ad hoc working groups to debate the most relevant issues related to the topic. Each working group had a rapporteur who had the task of summarising the main conclusions of the debate and then presenting them to the audience. Even though each of the PP activities was focused on a particular topic and followed a pre-designed structure, the participants were always able to present their views on other matters. The debates were often also held at horizontal level, as stakeholders discussed not only the views of the ARH do Norte, IP, but also the views of other stakeholders.

VII Who participated

- Water regulator.
- WFD-competent authority.
- Central government department(s) or ministries: environment, energy, agriculture and tourism sectors.
- Regional or local government(s): a number of municipalities and associations of municipalities.
- Private sector (individual companies, business associations, etc.): a number of companies from the energy sector and associations of farmers.
- NGOs: including local and national organisations.
- Other: scientific community, educational community and members of political parties.

The insufficient participation of the general public is one of the main weaknesses of the PP process. The main reason according to ARH do Norte, IP was the difficulty in reaching the general public and attracting them to a discussion of issues perceived as overly technical and as not directly affecting them in the short term.

VIII Providing information and gathering knowledge

Press releases, advertisements published in the main newspapers, the website, an online platform specially designed for the PP process, short films made available online, newsletters and leaflets were all used to inform people about the PP process and the events. It was also the first time that the ARH do Norte, IP resorted to social networks, namely Facebook, as part of their strategy of communication.

An online platform was set specifically for the purposes of the PP process, with access to georeferenced information and templates for the submission of contributions. During the meetings of the Regional Water Forum, the access and use of this platform were explained to participants. Special email addresses to receive written contributions were also created. The meetings of the Regional Water Forum and other activities permitted direct contact between the staff of the ARH do Norte, IP and the stakeholders, namely those not so familiar with IT tools. During the meetings of the Regional Water Forum, the ARH do Norte, IP presented a series of movies which focused on particular rivers, and described their relevance in terms of history, nature conservation and economy.

During the earlier stages of consultation, the preliminary version of the *Significant Water Management Issues* was published. During the final stage of consultation, a preliminary version of the RBMP, including a technical report, a non-technical summary and additional supporting reports, was made available online on the ARH do Norte, IP website and on paper in the ARH do Norte, IP facilities in Porto, the offices of Viana do Castelo and Mirandela, as well as in the facilities of the former National Institute for Water (i.e. Instituto Nacional da Água (INAG)) in Lisbon. In addition, 2 000 pen drives with all the relevant documents were distributed to the participants in the meetings of the Regional Water Forum and in other activities. Other documents, such as the summary of the characteristics of the RBDs, lists of measures or the summary of the strategic environmental assessment, were also made available. It seems that the documentation provided was useful and in fact was used by the participants — the ARH do Norte, IP estimated that around 3 0% of the participants commented on specific questions included in the documents or suggested corrections to some of the data presented therein.

In the initial stage of consultation (February–July 2009) 63 opinions were submitted; in the final stage of the PP process (October 2011–April 2012), around 900 opinions were submitted. The high number of contributions suggests that stakeholders and the members of the public found it easy to access the information and to participate in the consultation and participation activities.

IX Outcomes

Participants in the PP activities were representative of specific sectors of activity, with particular interests in water management issues. Although the total numbers of participants is considered good for a PP process of this kind, the lack of participation of members of the public is perceived by the ARH do Norte, IP as one of the main weaknesses of project. For the first time, a number of individuals participated in the activities in their role as members of political parties. This was because of the controversy surrounding some of the hydroelectric projects envisaged for the region.

Through its different stages, the PP process ran for a long period of time. Many of the participants attended more than one activity, and by the end of the process people were acquainted. This led to an increase in trust between different stakeholders and between stakeholders and the members of the public, and eventually formed the basis for a series of informal discussions that took place subsequent to the PP process between stakeholders representing different (and sometime conflicting) interests. In the view of the ARH do Norte, IP, interactions in the final stages of the PP process were less 'aggressive' and more constructive. Some participants became more well disposed in the process.

Contributions received during the process of PP led to a significant number of clarifications, corrections of data and changes in some of the measures proposed. All the comments received by stakeholders and members of the public, as well as their analysis and follow-up, are included in one of the annexes to the RBMP. The financial schedule for the execution of some of the measures was amended and some of the investments initially planned were postponed, after some of the authorities responsible for such measures declared that they would not be able to execute them, mainly due to economic constraints. Consequently, the measures included in the plans are more realistic.

Some participants provided the ARH do Norte, IP with their own studies on particular topics. When stakeholders wanted to present their own documents they did not make use of the public discussion activities to do so, but preferred to use the other tools/spaces available to them (namely the online platform or direct contacts). For example, the Grupo Águas de Portugal, a state-owned company operating in the sector of water supply and wastewater sanitation, produced a document proposing changes to the plan of investments and the programmes of measures; the Faculdade de Engenharia da Universidade do Porto – FEUP (Engineering Faculty of the University of Porto) undertook their own environmental study for a specific beach in the district of Viana do Castelo. Both studies were made available to the ARH do Norte, IP.

The final list of significant water management issues was amended to incorporate new issues that had been raised during the initial stage of the PP process, namely the destruction and fragmentation of habitats, reduction of biodiversity, reduction of fisheries resources and overexploitation of aquifers.

X Impacts

It is still too early to draw any conclusions on the ecological impact, as the first RBMPs entered into force very late. Regarding the cost-effectiveness of the PP, the investment has been worth it. The PP process for the next RBMP will make use of the knowledge and experience acquired and there should be no need to hire an external consultant.

XI Analysis

The PP process for the first RBMP was the first PP process run by the ARH do Norte, IP. Since the moment of its creation, the production of the RBMP, including the PP process, was the main priority. It is expected that the budget for the PP process for the next RBMP will be substantially reduced due to the current economic situation in Portugal. All the interviewees expressed their concern that some of the positive activities designed by the ARH do Norte, IP would not be followed up in the PP process for next cycle of RBMPs.

One innovative feature of the PP process is that it was, effectively, decentralised. The activities took place in several localities of northern Portugal, including some located in the interior of the country, and not only in Porto, as was expected. The interactive nature of these meetings and their contribution to a constructive dialogue at horizontal level was stressed by all the interviewees.

The effective transboundary cooperation between the ARH do Norte, IP and the Spanish competent authorities must also be noted. In fact, two of the activities within the first stage of PP took place in Spanish municipalities, namely Tuy and Valladolid. In addition, the preliminary versions of the RBMP for Duero and Miño-Sil were presented to the public in Portugal.

A new approach to PP by investing in attracting new participants who would not normally participate is one of the main innovations of the project. Activities such as the meetings 'As Naturezas da Água' had the purpose of showing the importance of water and of good water management by addressing water issues from a different perspective.

The weak spot, the insufficient participation of the members of the public, has already been mentioned (even though bringing them to the debate was one of the objectives of the PP process).

All the stakeholders interviewed expressed a very positive opinion on how the process of PP was run by the ARH do Norte, IP. One of the NGOs interviewed stressed that contrary to expectations, this was not a 'discrete' PP process.

XII Sources of information

Literature:

- Administração da Região Hidrográfica do Norte, IP, 'Plano de Gestão da Região Hidrográfica do Minho e Lima – Part B: Participação Pública', August 2012, 296 pp. See http://www.apambiente.pt/_zdata/planos/PGRH1/PB%5CPGRH1_RPC_ParteB_PP.pdf.

Interviews:

- Ms Dora Barros, communication and planning officer of the Agência Portuguesa do Ambiente, I. P. (Portuguese Environmental Agency), 4 October 2013.
 - Mr Pedro Teiga, facilitator and national coordinator of the 'Projeto Rios'/CPADA - Confederação Portuguesa das Associações de Defesa do Ambiente (Project Rivers / CPADA – Portuguese Confederation of the Associations for Environmental Protection), 17 October 2013.
 - Ms Ana Cristina Costa, president of the Braga Regional Centre of Quercus – Associação Nacional de Conservação da Natureza (Quercus – National Association for Nature Conservation), 23 October.
-

Case study: Matarraña River Contract, Spain

I General information

Name of participation initiative: Matarraña River Contract

Location: Ebro River Basin in northeast Spain

Scale: Sub-RBD; The River Contract covers parts of three autonomous communities and 36 municipalities on the Matarraña River

Period covered: 2009–ongoing

Lead organisation(s): Matarraña River Contract is an association of 57 organisations in the Matarraña basin.

ECODES, a local NGO, provides the Secretariat for the Matarraña River Contract. CHE is the organisation responsible for the RBMP for the Ebro basin. CHE represents the national Ministry of the Environment in relation to river basin management, including the WFD. At the local level, CHE is a member of the Matarraña River Contract.

II Context

There is a history of stakeholder participation in river management in Spain. The Water Law of 1985 established water confederations in 18 river basins. These confederations have a number of bodies which allow for the participation of all those who have abstraction rights⁽¹¹⁾. Given that the major use of water in Spain is for farming, farming is more represented in the participatory bodies of Confederaciones Hidrográficas.

The SMI, promoted by ECODES, a private non-profit-making foundation, was launched in January 2002⁽¹²⁾. In the case of the Matarraña River, 38 people with recognised professional and social credentials were invited by ECODES to consider a document that expressed shared principles for building a shared vision for the Matarraña⁽¹³⁾.

The SMI involves:

- recognising the legitimacy of the different positions held by people in the river basin: group members met with a range of organisations to hear their views, clarify their interests and objectives in relation to the use and management of water, identify and explore points of agreement between stakeholders, and identify and catalogue areas of conflict;
- the SMI was not intended to replace other initiatives taking place at the same time;
- after four months, the SMI produced a list of the positions of the different groups and organisations contacted; this was shared with these groups, who were asked to identify which of these positions they could agree to, as the basis for building a common platform for the management of the Matarraña River.

This process encouraged dialogue between the different sectors and interests and led to an agreement between all those involved in 2005. The consensus-based approach has been supported by CHE. From 2006, CHE developed the RBMP for the Ebro RBD (Plan Hidrológico del Ebro) in order to comply with the requirements of the WFD. CHE organised an intense programme of stakeholder participation at sub-basin level, with sectoral meetings for the following four sectors: social actors (cultural and environmental organisations, etc.); economic actors and water abstractors; local authorities; and government agencies. Organisations in the Matarraña participated in the process. In 2010, the process of creating a River Contract⁽¹⁴⁾ for the Matarraña began.

III Purpose and objectives

The members of the Matarraña River Contract, seek to **'be involved in the management of the river basin in order to design what they want done with the river, including agreeing what sort of farming, urban development and land use planning models they want to see'**⁽¹⁵⁾. Contributing to river basin planning is part of the work of the River Contract, but that is not all it does.

The objectives of the River Contract are:

- to restore, improve or conserve the river;
- to involve all local actors: public sector, private interests and the community;
- to agree on actions by consensus;
- to include local knowledge and expertise in the planning process.

⁽¹¹⁾ Espluger, J. et al., 2011, 'Participación pública e inercia institucional en la gestión del agua en España', Reis, (1334) April–June 2011, pp. 3–26.

⁽¹²⁾ Celaya, N., 2006, 'Experiencia del Matarraña', presentation, p. 15.

⁽¹³⁾ Battalla, J. L., n.d., 'Iniciativa Social de Mediación en los conflictos del agua en Aragón'.

⁽¹⁴⁾ A River Contract is a management and participation mechanism that originated in France around 1990, and is a means to restore, improve or conserve a river through a series of actions that are agreed in a broad participatory process involving all basin users, private and public entities involved in water management. Under the scheme, both public and private sector interests commit themselves to implement a consensus action program to restore the river and its water resources. The contract involves defining management objectives and guidelines and developing a plan of action which benefits from the input of local expertise.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Interview with Cristina Monge, external director of ECODES (Diario El Teruel, 13/11/2012).

IV Resources

CHE provided resources for the initial development of the idea of a River Contract. CHE also financed the PP process for the first round of WFD river basin planning. This was considered a significant investment, involving CHE's entire planning department in one way or another. CHE does not think it will be necessary to carry out such intensive engagement of this kind in the next round of planning.

V Public participation activities

Activities carried out as part of the second and third phases of development of the River Contract included:

- development (setting up of working groups to develop proposals for action on different themes, public launch and signing of the River Contract);
- implementation and monitoring (implementation of the Action Plan; regular meetings to assess progress and plan actions).

Main activities

- The River Contract Outreach Group (Grupo Promotor), in which over 60 organisations were involved, had regular meetings from 2009 until the launch of the River Contract in November 2010; Activities included publicity on the initiative, invitations to participate, identification of interests, agreement of objectives and strategy.
- The River Contract Executive Council holds ongoing meetings every two months.
- The River Contract theme-based working groups have regular meetings.

VI Governance

The Matarraña River Contract is seen as a model of open governance with 'proactive citizen participation' ⁽¹⁶⁾.

It came out of the SMI process, and so is rooted in a long history of stakeholder involvement. The decision-making model for the **River Contract** is a bottom-up process of participation, with all members having a say.

Staff from ECODES facilitated the SMI consensus-building approach, acted as technical secretariat for the River Contract, coordinated the organisations involved, and facilitated the work of the group. ECODES uses a methodology based on mediation in environmental and social conflicts.

At RBD level, CHE implemented a model of participatory planning for the first round of river basin planning. CHE divided the Ebro river basin into 32 sub-basins or participation areas, and held four sector-based rounds of discussion ('mesas de trabajo') in each.

Decisions on what went into the overall **RBMP for the Ebro** were taken on the basis of all the information that was received from the sub-basins (including the Matarraña). The information from the meetings in each sub-basin was recorded and transcribed. Stakeholders at the meetings were encouraged to set out their vision and preferences for the river and to propose measures. This information was collected and passed on to the members of the Ebro District Water Council, where stakeholders are represented. This council made the final decisions about the plan. No attempt was made to achieve consensus on these proposals at the sub-basin level.

VII Who participated

As a result of the SMI work carried out since 2002 by ECODES, all the relevant stakeholders seem to have been involved both in contributing to the working groups at the sub-basin level of the first Ebro RBMP and as members of the ongoing Matarraña River Contract. Information on the river basin planning process suggests that participation was overall limited to stakeholders, with little effort to involve a wider public.

Stakeholders

- Water regulator and WFD-competent Authority: CHE (responsible for water management).
- Central government department(s) or ministry: the Ministry of the Environment is represented by CHE.
- Regional or local government(s): regional administrations (e.g. for Aragon and Catalonia): local councils.
- Private sector: farmers, agricultural businesses, irrigation associations, energy companies, other businesses.
- NGO(s): environmental NGOs, social organisations.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Casajus Murillo (2009) p. 3.

VIII Providing information and gathering knowledge

The SMI process was built on a two-way process of communication, with stakeholders being invited to provide information on their own views and initiatives. This means that information was developed on the basis of input from stakeholders, which is likely to increase trust in the information.

The River Contract uses different forms of communication with members and the public, including considerable use of press releases and articles in local media; these written in accessible language.

The River Contract process was supported by training for local people in water management.

To develop the RBMP, CHE provided information in the form of water registers and river reports ⁽¹⁷⁾, and in form of a question and answer structure, in order to make it easily understandable. However, some sources referred to difficulties for non-experts in using the provided information ⁽¹⁸⁾. There were three stages of consultation on the Ebro RBMP that involved consultation on written documents and complied with WFD requirements. This formal consultation was carried out at the RBD scale, not at sub-basin level. In the first round of river basin planning, CHE carried out 40 interviews with stakeholder organisations as part of its consultation process. This was seen as an innovative approach which facilitated input ⁽¹⁹⁾. For the river basin planning process, CHE provided stakeholders with technical information about significant water management issues.

IX Outcomes

The Matarraña River Contract is a new practice, which is proving to be appropriate to its context. It is the main agreement and its implementation is just starting. The creation of the River Contract has built on a process of bringing stakeholders together to find agreement that has been ongoing for many years. Here, the level of consensus in the Matarraña contrasts with the conflicts over water management that exist in other parts of the Ebro basin. There is considerable trust between the sub-basin stakeholders and CHE. The fact that CHE is a member of the Matarraña River Contract is evidence of this.

The longer-term participation process changed three major aspects:

- 1) it shifted the focus from conflict to consensus-building around actions that could be achieved;
- 2) it created confidence that if the stakeholders could find consensus, the actions they agreed would be implemented as far as possible (financial constraints have meant that some actions have not yet been fully implemented);
- 3) it gave a voice to the communities (social, cultural and environmental) that had previously not been considered significant stakeholders in RBM.

X Impacts

CHE dedicated a lot of resources to participation in the first round of river basin planning. It is unlikely that this level of resources will be available for participation in later rounds of planning. However, this is not because CHE felt that the level of participation in the first round was not cost-effective, but rather because spending on intensive participation in the first round meant that stakeholder concerns and priorities had been documented and understood: CHE staffs feel that these issues and positions are unlikely to change much for the next round of planning, taking into account that final approval of Ebro RBMP took place in February 2014.

XI Analysis

Two innovative approaches to PP were as follows.

1. Social Mediation Initiative

The key characteristics of SMI are that it extends the range of actors considered 'stakeholders' in water management (traditionally viewed as public institutions and agencies, technical experts, business/private sector and irrigation associations) to include local affected communities who experience impacts on their way of life as a result of irrigation projects and agricultural practices, and environmental groups. The approach documents the positions of all the actors, thus demonstrating that their voices are heard and their positions valued. The mediation sought to 'facilitate agreements which help to rebuild a shared vision of how the river basin should be managed' ⁽²⁰⁾. The underpinning principle is that river management lies at the heart of development.

2. The River Contract

A River Contract is a management and participation mechanism that originated in France around 1990. It is a means to restore, improve or conserve a river through a series of actions that are agreed in a broad participatory process that includes all basin users, and private and public entities involved in water management.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Espluga, J. et al. (2011) op. cit., p. 10.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Ibid, p. 11.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Barrenechea et al. (2007), referred to in Espluga et al. (op. cit.), p. 12.

⁽²⁰⁾ Nacho Celaya, ECODES, 2006.

XII Sources of information

Interviews

- Lourdes Casajus-Murillo. Expert on water conflicts in Aragon.
- Rogelio Galvan. Ebro Basin Water Confederation (CHE).
- Two anonymous interviewees, from the Catalan water agency and from Fundación Ecología y Desarrollo (NGO).

Publications

Casajus-Murillo, L., 2012, Conflictos del agua en Aragon. *Ambiente y Desarrollo* 16 (31), 9-24.

Confederación Hidrográfica del Ebro, 2011, *Propuesta de Proyecto de Plan Hidrológico de la Cuenca del Ebro. Anexo XII Participación Pública*.

Guerra, S., 2013, 'Disputed or Shared Territory? The Italian Experience of River Contract: New Relationship between River and its Region', *Planum, the Journal for Urbanisation*, (27) 2/2013.

Omedas Margeli, M., Benitez Sanz, C., Mora Navarro, B. and Galvan Plaza, R., n.d., 'Draft Report: River Basin Organizations in the 21st Century'. Draft report for Confederación Hidrográfica del Ebro.

Rosillon, F and Lobet, J., 2008, 'Transboundary River Contract Semois-Semoy between Belgium (Wallonia) and France', in: P. Meire et al., (eds) *Integrated Water Management. Practical Experience and Case Studies*, pp. 199-206.

Viñuales, V. and Celaya, N., n.d., 'La Iniciativa Social de Mediación para los conflictos del agua en Aragón', Fundación Ecología y Desarrollo.

Case study: Flood control in the Tisza River Basin, Hungary

I General information

Name of participation initiative: Renewal of the Vásárhelyi Plan (VTT)

Location: Middle-Tisza Valley (Hungarian part of the Danube RBD HU1000), Hungary

Scale: Sub-RBD

Period covered:

Planning phase I: from May 2001 to March 2002; Planning phase II: from March 2002 to the end of 2003;

Implementation phase I: from 2004 to 2014.

Lead organisation(s):

- Ministry of Rural Development (former Ministry of Environment and Water);
- National Water Authority (former Central Directorate for Water and Environment (Vízügyi és Környezetvédelmi Központi Igazgatóság (VKKI)); VKKI was responsible for coordinating the following: (i) the preparation of the overall concept, (ii) research, (iii) design and implementation on behalf of the Ministry of Environment and Water;
- VIZITERV Consult Zrt.; lead organisation, technical design, conceptual planning, detailed design of VTT.

II Context

Extreme weather events with flood and drought occurrences in the period from 1998 to 2002 drew attention to the fact that the former water management practice is unsustainable. The total costs of flood-fighting, emergency measures and reconstruction have amounted to some HUF 120 billion. Despite these high costs of flood-fighting, a flood protection levee broke in the Upper Tisza Valley section of the Bereg Region, inundating large areas in Hungary and Ukraine.

Both public awareness of the hazard potential and the demand for a higher level of safety have grown. The 'fighting against the floods' approach had to be changed to a 'living with the floods' approach. A similar change was required in inland water and drought management, requiring an appropriate change in land use. Water had to be given a place and it had to be retained as much as possible, or areas of water shortage would result.

This new approach was reflected and implemented in practice through the government programme VTT. Its goals were not just flood protection, but — among other things — minimising the duration of periods of water shortage with appropriate water retention and water governance methods. The VTT had to serve the purpose of improving national flood protection and flood protection safety along the River Tisza. The VTT concentrates on two areas: enhancing the transmissivity of the high-water riverbed, and the usage of flood retention basins. The land within the flood retention basins remains in use by the actual owners who can continue their activities (e.g. farming or forest management). In the event of flooding, gates can be opened to divert excess water into the flood retention basins.

PP was intensified during the elaboration and finalisation of the VTT. The previous tradition was one of involving stakeholders and members of the public in important nation-wide water management issues. In addition, PP was required by law, as Hungary was already in the accession process with the EU when the VTT planning process started in 2001. At the end of the VTT planning process, a national law was adopted by the Hungarian parliament that determined the implementation of the VTT.

III Purpose and objectives

The main objective of the project is to achieve multipurpose water management in the Hungarian part of the Tisza valley by rebuilding the flood bed drainage capacity, by increasing the safety of flood protection levees, and through the construction of flood retention basins, to mitigate extreme flood levels and reduce drought effects. The purpose of the participation initiative was to provide forums for stakeholders and members of the general public to express their views, comment on the elements of the plan and represent their interests.

The objectives of participation were:

- 1) to acquaint stakeholders and members of the public with the concept of VTT;
- 2) to find agreements on:
 - a) how the flood retention basin sites should be selected and their area secured;
 - b) how compensation should be awarded to farmers when fields are temporarily used for water storage;
 - c) related farming methods, new types of agro-ecological land use in areas of flood retention basins;
 - d) infrastructure modernisation in the settlements along the Middle-Tisza Valley.

IV Resources

The cost of PP events varied depending on the event type, organiser and venue. There is no information available on the overall costs of the PP events. Some events received in kind contributions from the organisations that hosted the events. For a few of the events, participation fees were charged.

V Public participation activities

Several PP events were organised:

- 104 forums for members of the public, including settlement forums and village assemblies
- 10 regional water management council meetings
- 7 county assembly sessions
- 8 county assembly expert committee meetings
- 17 professional and scientific conferences, large events
- 6 parliamentary committee meetings
- 14 NGOs, events and forums
- 17 other events, negotiating forums.

Events were organised by different groups besides the three lead organisations (Ministry of Rural Development, VKKI and VIZITERV Consult Zrt.), including the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, regional organisations, the Environment Committee of the National Parliament, the World Wide Fund For Nature (in one case) and others. Based on the very wide range of PP events the planners organised, no important stakeholders were excluded from the PP process.

VI Governance

Different working groups were set up during the planning phases.

- Intergovernmental committee: coordinated information and interest exchange among the ministries.
- VTT committee: coordinated the elaboration of the detailed concepts and organisation of the PP events from the governmental side. Some members of the VTT committee represented groups with high numbers of stakeholders, such as the National Association of Water Management Societies (Vízgazdálkodási Társulatok Országos Szövetsége) or associations of local authorities, etc.
- Scientific committee: was responsible for supervising research work.

Besides the representatives of professional organisations and official nature conservationists, a delegate of civil society organisations was involved in the consultation process with a full legal mandate. This delegated representative actively participated in the planning and strongly influenced decisions like where flood retention basins would be located and which floodplains would be rehabilitated. The different interests put forward by participants were subsequently translated into sets of options by VKKI and VIZITERV, and then taken into account in later forums. So the main decisions regarding the location of flood retention basins and the compensation were made through a consensus-building process.

VII Participants

- Water regulator.
 - WFD-competent authority.
 - Central government department(s) or ministry.
 - Regional or local government(s).
 - Private sector (individual company, business association, etc.).
 - NGOs.
-

VIII Providing information and gathering knowledge

Cooperation between several ministries, academic research groups and technical designers was needed for the preparation of the VTT. Discussions were organised at different forums to reach compromises between environmental considerations and a variety of vested interests. Various interest groups were invited to these events and had the opportunity to participate in debates after becoming acquainted with the VTT concept. Designers discussed where to build flood retention basins with village residents and reached agreements with local residents and farmers. The technical content of the VTT has repeatedly been modified and approved by the stakeholders. Both sides (designers and stakeholders/members of the public) learnt from one another.

The concept plan was presented through maps by the designers and water professionals to stakeholders and the public. This way detailed information about the planned locations of the flood retention basins was given.

The final locations of the flood retention basins were selected through consultations and debates.

In the VTT planning phase, the compensation principles for land owners/farmers were part of the VTT plan document, and the principles were made available for consultation. Some elements of the compensation principles were changed as a result of the consultations.

Most of the PP events were advertised via electronic media (websites, newsletters of respective professional organisations, internal and external bulletin boards (e.g. at local authorities). Other media used were reports, brochures, pamphlets, flyers, direct invitations and newspapers.

Five public calls for tender were initiated prior to the approval of the VTT by the government of Hungary:

- 1) elaboration of the scientific basis of VTT;
- 2) investigation of flood mitigation, including solutions for excess drainage waters;
- 3) rehabilitation of the floodplains;
- 4) SEA;
- 5) public relations and communication.

Each one was supervised and reviewed by the intergovernmental committee and the professional and civil society organisations. The main task of the public relations and communication project was to produce informative documents about the VTT plan and the outcomes of PP events for both a technically skilled and a non-specialist audience. An external communication company handled this aspect.

Experts of the 'Public relations and communication' project of the VTT planning process collected information and opinions from the forums, events and electronic media (e.g. internet sites were useful for submitting comments, suggestions, and emails). Their work helped planners acquire processed, summarised information quickly and effectively. However, stakeholders and member of the public insisted on discussing issues directly with the planners.

IX Outcomes

In the first version of the VTT plan, 30 possible locations for flood retention basins were presented. During the revision process, points raised by participants were translated into options by the VKKI and the consultants, and then taken to forums later for further discussion and agreement. Only the supported locations were presented in these discussions. Some proposed water retention basins were dropped and others added. Finally six basins were identified for the first phase of construction.

One final outcome of the planning process was reached by consensus after many consultations. The original VTT plan intended to end farming in the flood retention basins after the first flood event, and turn the flooded areas into wetlands. Environmental groups favoured the wetland option but it was not accepted by farmers. It was agreed that an enhanced water management structure within the water retention basins would be developed to promote land and landscape management.

One example, which demonstrates how participants influenced decision-making, is that of the Bereg region. After becoming acquainted with the VTT concept, several mayors suggested (on behalf of the population) that a flood retention basin be built within their region to avoid repeated flooding risks. This was requested despite the fact that some settlements in the region would see 60 % to 80 % of their land become part of the flood retention basin. Indeed, some settlements would lose all their farming land to the flood retention basin area.

One of the main outcomes of the PP process was the decision to compensate stakeholders for land value losses owing to the establishment of flood retention basins. Farmers who follow a new type of organic farming were offered advanced support. If there is a flood, the owners receive compensation for the loss of the yields, even if they made use of their land. Those who did not wish to select this option were offered the chance to purchase their land at market prices, or were offered replacement options by the National Land Fund.

The VTT specified that those settlements influenced by the interventions would be given priority in infrastructure development and services such as drainage of the excess surface water and wastewater treatment. Unfortunately, this has not been fulfilled, because local city officials were not able to raise their own contributions of 15 % to 20 % of the project budgets, and neither could the national government. However, it should be noted that most of Phase I of the VTT plan has been completed.

Dialogue between those involved in PP during the planning phase continued. For instance, water management societies negotiated with government organisations in taking over water management duties and field actions from the regional water directorates, thus ensuring consistency of agricultural water management actions inside and outside the flood retention basins.

X/XI Impacts and analysis

One effect of the VTT implementation is that stakeholders like farmers or local authorities are now better informed about flood risks and flood management. Full support that was provided by stakeholders and members of the public on the construction of flood retention basins and the development of enhanced water management within these water retention basins.

The VTT supports ecological nature conservation, and rejects flood management practices like the clearing of foreshores, as this practice kills foreshore vegetation and reduces the wildlife living space. The VTT plan will allow the creation of a so-called foreshore flood channel. Furthermore, in collaboration with the Cigánd flood retention basin, the VTT designed a water governance promoting land-management approach. This approach provides the opportunity for farmers to engage in environmentally friendly landscape management rather than in intensive arable farming.

Each investment element of the VTT which was put out to tender needed to have a PP element. Consequently, stakeholders and members of the public had to be involved in decision-making.

XI Sources of information

Interviews

- Mr Benedek Göncz, head of Department of Protection against Water Damage, National Water Authority.
- Dr Lajos Szlávik: currently president of Hungarian Hydrological Society. At the time of VTT planning, he was the head of the Scientific Committee of the preparation of VTT.
- Joint interview with Prof. Ferenc Ligetvári, currently president of the Vízgazdálkodási Társulatok Országos Szövetsége (National Association of Water Management Societies) and Mr Ferenc Fehér, executive president of the Vízgazdálkodási Társulatok Országos Szövetsége (National Association of Water Management Societies). Both were members of the VTT committee.
- Mr Miklós Vinnai, director of Bodrod Valley Water Management and Soil Conservation Society.

Annex 2 Criteria to evaluate public participation in the context of WFD implementation

I. Process of participation			
General Principles	Criteria	Sub-criteria	Relevant questions (or indicators)
Openness	Information systems and tools/ methods I	Communication & consultation tools and structures	<p>What kind of communication tools and structures were set up? How many different ones? Distinguish between passive and active tools</p> <p>Were any innovative consultation approaches and tools employed?</p> <p>What was the number of meetings organised?</p> <p>Were working groups set up?</p> <p>What kind of information systems were used and proved useful in the process?</p>
	Information systems and tools/ methods II	Information systems	
	Information systems and tools/ methods III	Documents	What type of documents were published for consultation?
	Information systems and tools/ methods IV	Mobilisation of media to support PP (TV, radio)	-
	Legitimacy I	Access to information and meetings	<p>What scientific and technical resources were provided to participants?</p> <p>Were information and meetings accessible?</p>
	Legitimacy II	Timing of involvement	<p>Did involvement start early in the planning process?</p> <p>Were any pre-consultation phases organised?</p> <p>Is involvement continuous?</p>
Protection of core values	Dialogue	-	<p>Preferences and values of all participants are made explicit and open to the critique of others.</p> <p>A 'space of exchange' is created where people feel comfortable sharing their needs, concerns, and values</p>
	Legitimate decision-making	-	Decision-making based on evidence rather than political motivations; structured and clearly displayed
Speed	Deadlines and milestones	-	The process includes a detailed agenda with deadlines
	Ground rules and task definition	-	<p>Clear ground rules for interactions are set at the start of the process</p> <p>Tasks are clearly defined</p>

Substance	Cost-effectiveness	-	Costs of implementing the programme are balanced by the importance of the issue being addressed
	Knowledge inclusion	-	A variety of knowledge is included to help reach informed decisions
	Representation	-	Participants represent a broad and cross-cutting section of society and interest groups Number of stakeholders involved? Percentage of relevant stakeholders involved? Size of target population (e.g. if tools like questionnaires were used) Interactions take place across administrative levels and geographic scales Key meta-players are present to ensure that agreements reached are implemented
All	Facilitation	-	Is facilitation impartial? Dynamic? Is facilitator experienced in the issues addressed? Has ability to build trust and establish alliances? Is highly skilled? Does process strive to find common interests?
II. Outcomes			
General Principles	Criteria	Sub-criteria	Relevant questions (or indicators)
Openness	Interaction and network development I	Process leads to greater interaction and awareness to other's activities	-
	Interaction and network development II	Relationships are developed which support continued dialogue	-
	Shared knowledge and information	Data, information, and terminology are developed which are accepted and trusted by all participants	-
Protection of core values	Trust between participants	-	-
Speed	Process enhancement	Capacity to manage knowledge and information to undertake collective action is enhanced	-

II. Outcomes			
General Principles	Criteria	Sub-criteria	Relevant questions (or indicators)
Substance	Agreements	Agreements are reached between participants and plans are developed	Were new visions or options raised by the stakeholders? Did proven reframing of issues take place? How were critical comments of stakeholders taken up in the further process? Were consultation outcomes made public?
	End to a stalemate	The process leads to discussion between participants who had previously refused to discuss issues	-
	Innovation	Policies and practices are developed which are more creative and context dependent	How did the active involvement and PP influence the development of the RBMP and PoM?
	Institutional change I	Institutional functions, roles or structures are modified to reflect participants' ideas, values, or requirements	-
	Institutional change II	New organisations are created or developed	-
	Knowledge generation	The process generates information that would not have been available otherwise	-
III. Impacts			
General Principles	Criteria	Sub-criteria	Relevant questions (or indicators)
Substance	Ecological improvement Economical improvement	A measurable improvement in ecological conditions More cost-effective solutions are identified Implementation is achieved at a lower cost	
	Reduction in conflict/increased harmony	Benefits of participation exceed costs to participants Consensus is achieved Increase of integration (of problem perception, objectives or measures) with relevant sectors	Was any conflict detected and resolved during the RBMP process?
	Implementation of an accepted plan	Decisions are not appealed against or contended through legal channels Plans are implemented (properly) (due to proven support by stakeholders, proven shared need for their implementation and demonstrated, e.g. by shared financing from several stakeholders, continued interactions after the PP process, robustness of plans in the present economic crisis)	How is active involvement and public participation expected to help the achievements of the objectives for the river basin?

Note: Criteria in table are based to large degree on the summary of evaluation criteria reviewed by Carr et al. (2012).

Annex 3 Case study working template

Section I General information
a. Name of participation initiative
b. Location
c. Scale [<i>Trans-boundary; national; RBD; sub-RBD; local</i>]
d. Start date/end date
e. Lead organisation(s)
Section II Context
a. Background [<i>Short description of area; water management issues and relationship with WFD or other planning process; what caused the public participation</i>]
b. Target audience for participation [<i>stakeholders; members of the public; both</i>]
c. Short description of project activities
Section III Purpose and objectives
a. Purpose of participation initiative or process
b. Objectives of participation
c. Intended outcomes of participation

Section IV Resources

a. Monetary contributions [*amount and source of significant contributions*]

b. Resources in kind: expertise, staff, equipment, venues, etc. [*amount and source of significant contributions*]

Section V Public participation activities

Summary of participation activities

Name and description of activity:

Duration of activity:

Number of activities:

Total number of participants:

[Repeat for each different type of activity]

Stakeholders (tick all that participated)

Water regulator

WFD-competent authority

Central government department(s) or ministry

Regional or local government(s)

Private sector (individual company, business association, etc.)

NGO(s)

Other – *please specify:* _____

Did any stakeholders have interests that particularly affected the engagement? If so, which were the stakeholder(s) and how did this affect the engagement?

Were there any particularly important stakeholders who did not participate? If so, who were they and why did they not participate?

Openness ⁽²¹⁾

What working groups were set up, if any? What was their role? How did they contribute to communications, consultation and participation? Did they contribute to the openness of the process?

What methods or tools were used for communications and consultation? Were different methods and tools used for different purposes? If so, which and how? To what extent did the mix of methods and tools contribute to openness of the process?

⁽²¹⁾ 'Openness implies that the initiator adopts an open attitude and does not take unilateral decisions. Other stakeholders must have the opportunity to influence the agenda and the decisions, otherwise the process cannot benefit from their cooperation.' (Ridder, D., Mostert, E. and Wolters, H. A., 2005, *Learning together to manage together — improving participation in water management, Harmonising Collaborative Planning*, University of Osnabrück. p. 5).

What types of documents were published for consultation?

How were media like the press, TV, radio and social media mobilised to support PP?

Were clear ground rules for interaction set out at the start of the public participation? If so, how and by whom were they defined? If not, why not?

How easy did stakeholders and/or the public find it to access information and to access the consultation and participation activities? How understandable and relevant did stakeholders and/or the public find the information and activities?

Protection of core values ⁽²²⁾

Were the preferences and values of all participants made explicit and open to the critique of others? If so, how? Did people feel comfortable sharing their needs, concerns, and values?

How were decisions made? How was evidence used in decision-making? Were participants clear about how decisions were made?

Speed ⁽²³⁾

How early and at what stages of the process were stakeholders and the public involved? Did the process have an agenda with deadlines that was clear to all participants? Were the deadlines changed over the course of the process? If so, why?

Substance ⁽²⁴⁾

How was the knowledge provided by different stakeholders used to make informed decisions? Were some sources used more than others? If so, why?

Facilitation ⁽²⁵⁾

Were facilitators used? If so, what was their role? What level of training did they have?

Were any scientific or technical resources or support provided to participants? If so, what were these resources or support? To what extent and how were these resources used by stakeholders and members of the public?

⁽²²⁾ 'All stakeholders must feel confident that their core values will not be harmed, regardless of the outcome. This will create a safe environment for discussion.' (Ridder et al., op. cit., p. 6).
⁽²³⁾ 'Sufficient speed and progress is required. Proper methods and procedures combined with clear and realistic deadlines will make people progress.' (Ridder, D. et al., op. cit., p. 6).
⁽²⁴⁾ 'All stakeholders should get sufficient protection and the guarantee of progress and not be sent home with agreements that are not technically feasible, do not deliver the expected benefits or are disproportionately expensive.' (Ridder, D. et al., op. cit., p 7).
⁽²⁵⁾ A process in which a person who is acceptable to all those involved, substantively neutral and has no decision-making authority intervenes to help a group improve the way it identifies and solves problems in order to increase effectiveness.

Section VI Outcomes**Speed**

Were the deadlines met for achieving the intended outcomes? How did public participation affect the ability to meet deadlines?

Openness

To what extent were the numbers and types of participants representative of the wider population? What factors facilitated or prevented more representative participation?

Did any groups or interests participate that had not previously been involved? If so, which? What made them participate?

How, if at all, did the participation process change interactions between stakeholders and members of the public?

Protection of core values

Were spaces of exchange created where participants felt comfortable sharing their needs, concerns and values? If so, in which activities did this occur and how were these spaces created?

Is there any evidence of increased trust or understanding between the lead organisation, stakeholders and members of the public?

What evidence is there that the process has led to discussion between participants who had previously refused to discuss together? How was this achieved?

Is there any evidence of continued dialogue between those involved in the public participation?

Substance

To what extent did the participation of stakeholders or members of the public change decisions on planning or implementation? Please give any evidence of these changes.

Were any new plans developed? Have new agreements been reached between participants? If so, which and why were they reached?

Is there any evidence that the agreements reached have been implemented? If not, why not?

Did participants bring in any new sources of knowledge or evidence to influence decision-making? If so, which sources or kinds of knowledge?

Is there evidence of the development of new data, information or terminology that is accepted and trusted by all participants?

Have any new policies and practices been developed as a result of the process? What evidence is there that these new policies and practices are more creative and context relevant?

Have any institutional functions, roles or structures been modified to reflect participants' ideas, values, or requirements? If so, how has the process contributed to produce this change?

Facilitation

If facilitators were used, to what extent and in what way did their involvement make public participation more effective, help to build trust or overcome conflict?

Section VII Impacts

Is any information available about the impact of participation on ecological conditions?

Is any information available about the cost-effectiveness of the participation?

Have any decisions been appealed against or legal objections raised?

Have stakeholders or members of the public have been involved in implementation of decisions coming out of the participation? Yes No X

If Yes, describe how they have been involved.

Section VIII Analysis

Costs and benefits: to what extent did the costs of the participation reflect the importance of the issues being addressed?

Information to inform public participation

What were the main innovations introduced by the project?

Section IX Sources of information

Please list all sources of information drawn on to complete this template, including interviews, journal articles, reports, books, etc., using Harvard citation style.



European Environment Agency
Kongens Nytorv 6
1050 Copenhagen K
Denmark

Tel.: +45 33 36 71 00
Fax: +45 33 36 71 99

Web: eea.europa.eu
Enquiries: eea.europa.eu/enquiries

European Environment Agency

