



4th RBMP Workshop on Production of Draft RBM Plans

8 December 2014
Kyiv, Ukraine

Venue: Hotel Rus, Conference-hall Venetia
4 Hospitalna Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
Tel.: +38 044 256 40 00
Fax: +38 044 289 43 96
<http://www.hotelrus.kiev.ua>

Meeting Report

The 4th River Basin Management Planning (RBMP) workshop was held on December 08, 2014 in Kiev, Ukraine. The main objective of the workshop was to review elements of RBMPs and highlighting planning process, including Water body delineation, Pressure-Impact Analysis and Risk Assessment, Environmental Quality Objectives, Programme of Measures and Economic Analyses. The workshop was also aimed to present monitoring programmes of the project pilot basins, agree procedures and timetable for compilation of draft RBMPs, review and agree on the public consultation and adoption procedures in 2015

The workshop agenda, list of participants and presentations are attached to the document as Annexes.

Session 1: Opening of the Workshop and Setting the Scene

Mr Mykhailo Tomakhin, Head of Natural Resources Protection Department of the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources, who at the same time is Head of NCC and representative of Ukraine in the Regional Steering Committee for the Project, made opening remarks on behalf of the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine. Mr Timothy Turner, EPIRB Team Leader also welcomed the participants on behalf of the EPIRB project. After introduction of participants, the workshop approved the draft Agenda with no changes and appointed Mr Tomakhin as the chairperson.

After the opening remarks, Mr Turner presented the objectives of the meeting, setting the scene before the specific presentations and outlining the achievements towards the development of RBMPs after the last workshop in Minsk.

Session 2: RBMP elements and outstanding issues

In her first presentation, the EPIRB Senior Non-Key Basin Management Expert Ms Birgit Vogel reviewed RBMP elements and List of Contents for the plans (Annex 3, pg. 1-22). She summarised the steps the RBMP contractors and beneficiaries have been following during the planning cycle: methodologies developed and used, delineated WBs in accordance of typology classes, identified significant pressures & impacts and programme of measures to respond to those pressures, etc. Ms Vogel then once again overviewed the table of contents of the draft RBMP documents that the teams are required to follow in accordance to the WFD Annex 7, discussing composition of each chapter in detail. Ms Vogel highlighted importance to focus to the precise summary of the analyses (Pressure-Impact, Risk Assessment) and results of the study (PoMs and Cost Estimation), rather than including lengthy descriptions and methodology parts that should go as annexes in

the final document. Finally the following issues, related to the draft RBMP composition, were presented for the breakout group discussions: open issues, shortcomings and key concerns towards development of the draft RBMPs.

Presentation of Ms Vogel raised some technical questions regarding ways of doing cost estimation (cost benefit analysis) of PoMs, effects that the updated risk assessment and 'gap filling' survey will have on the final delineation results, special measures to be applied for the protected areas, etc. Debates on these questions continued in the following breakout group discussions, eventually resulting in short presentations by each group.

Group A, composed of Chorokhi-Adjaristkali, Akhurian and Prut Moldova representatives came up with the following findings:

- Integration of data on economic analysis of water use remains to be an *Open Issue* in the RBMPs;
- *Shortcomings* not addressed in the RBM Plans would be: consequences of climate change and flooding on water resources management; Ecological and chemical status of transitional and coastal waters (related to Georgian pilot basin); Ecological flow; Future development/infrastructure projects affecting final status of WBs;
- *Key Concerns* include: lack of data on transboundary sections of the pilot basins (Chorokhi, Akhuryan, Prut) to be provided by neighbouring countries; link of the draft RBMPs to other important EU directives and national strategy documents.

Group B, composed of beneficiaries and contractors of Ukraine (both the Prut and Upper Dnieper) and Moldova focused on the following issues:

- Missing of relevant results from regular monitoring was identified as an *Open Issue*. It was mentioned that the data is mostly raw, lacking any analysis, while all the reference data is missing ;
- Data on Protected Areas and incomplete GIS Database were identified as main *Shortcomings*;
- Economic analysis and legislation inconsistency with the EU WFD were qualified as the *Key Concerns*. The presenter also raised apprehension regarding inconsistency of the current monitoring standards, specifically highlighting lack of regulation while identifying different classes of surface and groundwater protection zones.

Group C, composed of beneficiaries of the Central Kura, Azerbaijan and Upper Dnieper, Belarus came up with the following findings:

- *Open issue* under the draft RBMPs is a relationship between the identified Basin Management Competent Authorities and the General Public - it is not defined clearly what would be the role of central government;
- Financing of specific activities under the Programme of Measures is a *Shortcoming* of the draft RBMPs;
- Possible inconsistency between national legislation and setting WFD compliant Environmental Objectives under the draft RBMPs was identified as the *Key Concern* by this group; Lack of information on government spending on water related issues in the pilot basins was identified as another *Concern*.

The break-out group discussions were summarised by Ms Birgit Vogel. She responded to the concern regarding the possible difference between national legislation and transboundary RBMPs, advising that any such inconsistency could be resolved either by negotiation bilaterally between the countries, or is a subject of international agreement, such as the Danube (ICPDR), or the Black Sea Convention. Regarding the ownership of the basin plans – it is clear that the national governments and basin authorities should carry full ownership, inevitably leading to the financing of identified PoMs by national, and/or local budgets. Therefore, it is important that the draft RBMPs and identified PoMs are as realistic as possible to enable them to go through the adoption process smoothly. Ms Vogel also touched the issue with the connection of the RBMPs and other national strategy documents, advising that this should be decided based on the national objectives by taking into account strategic plans of other sectors of economy, . However, at the first planning cycle it is



advised that the majority of measures should be 'Soft' measures, focusing on prioritised and most cost-effective activities.

Mr Bill Parr, the EPIRB Ecology and Biology NKE, responded on the question outlined by the Group-A on the transitional and coastal waters in the Chorokhi-Adjaristkali RBMP. He outlined procedures necessary for monitoring of coastal waters, suggesting to keep these activities within the 1 km zone, as required by the WFD, and perhaps include two additional biological elements other than benthic invertebrates: macrophytes and phytobenthos.

After the Plenary Session, the workshop resumed with the presentations of pilot basin monitoring plans.

Ms Romina Alvarez Troncoso, Key Biological Monitoring Expert, and Mr Peter Rončák, Senior Non-Key Monitoring Expert, presented Guidelines for Surface Water Monitoring in the Pilot Basins (Annex 3, pg. 23-45). In the beginning, the presenters highlighted WFD principles that guarantee proper procedures for monitoring: i) integration of the water bodies categories; ii) integration of the quality elements; iii) ecological status/potential assessment. The presenters mentioned that the design of monitoring programmes for the EPIRB pilots will be based on the **impact/pressure and risk analysis** of the surface water bodies. At least one typology class should be included in the monitoring programme. In addition, WBs 'at risk', or 'possibly at risk', as well as some long-term regular monitoring points will be included to validate the results. The presenters also proposed the following sub-networks for the Surveillance (SM) and Operational (OM) Monitoring Programmes:

- SM1: To be representative of the overall surface water status;
- SM2: Detection of long-term trends (the assessment of long-term changes in natural conditions and the assessment of long-term changes resulting from the anthropogenic activities);
- SM3: Supplementing and validating risk assessments;
- SM4: Large rivers and significant cross-border river and lake water bodies.

- OM1: To assess the effect of measures that have been aimed at improving the impact of individual and combined point sources (organic pollution, eutrophication impacts and priority substances);
- OM2: To assess the effectiveness of the measures related to diffuse pollution sources;
- OM3: To assess the effectiveness of measures to reduce hydromorphological alterations;
- OM4: To monitor high and good status sites currently not categorized to be at risk in order to assess the effectiveness of POMs aimed at maintaining high and good status water bodies;
- OM5: To monitor protected areas that are 'at risk', or 'possibly at risk'.

Finally, Ms Alvarez Troncoso and Mr Rončák presented locations and proposals to establish WFD compliant Surveillance and Operational Monitoring network for the Ecological Status Assessment in all seven pilot basins of the project (Annex 3, pg. 30-43). It was suggested all Quality Elements (except fish fauna) will be monitored for both SM and OM. These draft proposals will be discussed with the beneficiary institution and will be finalised after receiving feedbacks by the beginning of 2015.

Presentation on Design of Chemical Status Monitoring, prepared by Mr Paul Buijs, EPIRB Senior Non-Key Chemical Expert, was presented by Peter Rončák, since Mr Buijs could not attend the workshop due to other commitments (Annex 3, pg. 46-53). The presentation reminded the participants about obligatory 'priority substances and certain other pollutants', as well as the EU Directive 2013/39/EC amending Directives 2000/60/EC and 2008/105/EC about Priority substances in the field of water policy. The limiting factors complicating the design of Chemical Status Monitoring Programmes in the pilot basins were also highlighted,

namely: lack of routine monitoring data, methodological issues while laboratory analysis of the JFS I and II samplings, etc. Mr. Buijs suggested the following sub-networks for Surveillance Monitoring (SM):

- SM1 (overall water status)
- SM2 (long-term trends)
- SM4 (large rivers, lakes, reservoirs, plus cross-border)

It was also suggested that there is insufficient basis for assigning surface water bodies 'at risk', or 'possibly at risk' of failing to achieve good chemical status to set the Operational Monitoring Programme (OM). As to the Investigative Monitoring (IM), Mr Buijs proposed to set this programme only in two pilot basins where some hazardous substances were detected while laboratory testing, namely: DDT and other pesticides in Prut tributaries of Moldova and cadmium and lead in Central Kura tributaries of Azerbaijan.

Guidelines for Groundwater Monitoring in the Pilot Basins were presented by Mr Bernardas Paukstys, EPIRB Key Expert (Annex 3, pg. 54-68). Mr Paukstys highlighted the progress towards the development of GW monitoring programmes in all the seven EPIRB pilot basins and suggested to establish additional, or new monitoring stations for Surveillance Monitoring (SM) for each pilot basin. Operational (OM) Monitoring network were proposed to establish in Armenia (x2 stations), Georgia (x2) and Belarus (x16). Investigative Monitoring (IM) stations were proposed in those basins where specific problems have been detected: in Akhuryan (AM) to investigate arsenic problems and in Upper Dnieper, Belarus to analyse nitrate pollution in Novinki well field (Annex 3, pg. 58-64). For the existing data gaps and lack of GW monitoring infrastructure Mr Paukstys suggested to use water supply companies, involve the industries with polluting activities in the Prevent & limit monitoring, oblige economic entities to organise operational monitoring.

Session 3: RBMP Production and Adoption

Second half of the workshop was dedicated to the production of draft planning documents in terms of additional contents and other technical details, as well as public consultations and the adoption of the draft RBMPs.

Ms Birgit Vogel and Mr Zurab Jincharadze in their joint presentation discussed Additional Issues that could become parts of the pilot RBMPs (Annex 3, pg. 69-85). For drafting the final RBMP documents Ms Vogel suggested following clear structure in accordance to the WFD Annex VII, but depending on the local conditions in each pilot basin, maybe also reflect some cross-cutting questions. She specifically outlined the issues that are relevant for most of the pilot basins, namely: Climate Change, Flood Risk Management and Protection, Future (additional) Significant Water Management Issues, Sediment Balance Alteration and Management and Future Infrastructure Projects (FIPs). Mr Jincharadze added two important cross-cutting issues that some pilot RBMPs are advised to consider: Assessment of Eutrophication, and monitoring and risk assessment in Transitional and Coastal Waters.

Eutrophication is particularly important for pilot basins with numerous lakes and artificial reservoirs (Prut Moldova, Upper Dnieper Ukraine), as well as slow flowing lowland rivers (Upper Dnieper Belarus and Ukraine). Taking into account main anthropogenic sources of nutrient loads causing eutrophication, it was mentioned that linkage to the two major Directives dealing with the municipal waste waters (91/271/EEC Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive) and diffuse pollution of nitrogen from agriculture (91/676/EEC Nitrates Directive) is essential. As to considering Transitional and Coastal Waters, this is significant only for one pilot basin (Chorokhi-Adajristkali, Georgia). Although it was acknowledged that with the existing resources and time limits it is almost impossible to address this issue in the current RBMP draft, the contractor was advised to look for synergy with another EU-funded project (EMBLAS), who's main objective is the environmental monitoring of the Black Sea coastal and marine waters.

RBMP Formatting and Delivery Timeline were presented by Tim Turner and Zurab Jincharadze (Annex 3, pg. 86-93). Mr Turner proposed the latest possible delivery dates for submission of the first draft documents so there would be sufficient time for internal comment, translation to national languages and presentation



ahead of public consultation meetings in the pilot basins. March 15, 2015 was set as the expected date for publication of finalised documents, after addressing all comments and amendments. Mr Jincharadze highlighted the general editorial and structural requirements that each RBMP contractor are supposed to comply with, including the proper quotation, copyright policy for used sources, standard formatting of tables, figures, maps, composition of annexes and main document, etc. It was also suggested that the teams allow enough time for translation, correction and printing of posters and maps before going to Public Consultations.

Public participation and Adoption Procedures were presented by Ms Imola Koszta, EPIRB Public Participation NKE (Annex 3, pg. 94-115). In the beginning Ms Koszta overviewed basic requirements of public participation in the context of EU WFD, the overall goal of the activity and the expected outcome in general. Special attention was paid to the WFD Article 14 and Annex VII that outlines three stages of stakeholder consultations to be undertaken within a at least six months period. She then discussed experiences from the EU member countries on successful public consultation cases, as well as first phase activities carried out by the EPIRB project in this regard. For the next phase planning, Ms Koszta proposed to start preparation by providing necessary information to the general public and basin stakeholders well in advance via: i) online means: websites and targeted e-mails; ii) printed material: newsletters, brochures, magazines; iii) media coverage. Public consultation meetings should involve invited stakeholders, but also be open to the general public and be balanced by different sector stakeholders. The public consultations will result in written comments and verbal suggestions while face to face consultations should be addressed by the country teams.

The follow up country presentations discussed the legal basis and practices for public participation and adoption of the draft RBMPs in each project country (Annex 3, pg. 116-158). The CWMEs summarised conducted consultations in the pilot basins during the first PC phase and proposed timeline for the final consultations. In general, due to difference in the national legislation, customised approach will be applied to the RBMP adoption process, moreover it was noted that in some countries (UA, GE, AZ) these procedures in early stage of development. However, as a sum up the team were advised to start consultations with the key beneficiary institutions and basin authorities as early as possible.

Meeting summary and closure

Results of the workshop and suggestions made towards the drafting of the final RBMP document, as well as the Monitoring Programmes design for the pilot basins, were summarised by the project Team Leader, Tim Turner. The country teams were advised to accelerate with the final deliverables in order to meet the deadlines imposed by the Public Consultation and Adoption processes of the draft RBMPs.

The meeting was notified that some additional sources were re-allocated from the project budget for another round of Joint Field Surveys and Gap Filling exercise that will take place in June-July 2015, results of which should also be reflected in the final documents. It was also stated that additional funds would be made available for extension of the RBMP contracts so that the contractors may assist the beneficiaries in finalisation of the plans and steering through the adoption process. Therefore, Tim Turner stressed the necessity of following the agreed timeline as closely as possible.

Concluding remarks were also made by representative of the host institution - Mr Oleksandr Bonn, Head of the Water Ecosystems and Resources Division of the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine. He appreciated the results of the project and thanked the project for assistance in the approximation of Ukraine and other beneficiary countries with the EU WFD principles.