



## WORKSHOP REPORT

**Subject:** River Prut Mini Workshops to compare the MD and UA Prut RBMPs with the Romanian RBMP  
**Date:** Mini Workshop 1 in Chisinau (MD): 11 April 2016 (Venue: Institute of Labour in Chisinau)  
Mini Workshop 2 in Kiev (UA): 12 April 2016 (EPIRB Project Office in Kiev)

### Agenda

Agenda of the two Prut River Mini Workshops are attached to the report ([Annex 1 and Annex 2](#)).

### Participants

List of Participants of the meeting in Chisinau is attached to the report ([Annex 3](#)).

The Mini Workshop in Kiev on 12 April 2016 was attended by Nataliia Zakorchevna (EPIRB Project, CWME), Anna Tsvietkova (Contractor, Mama 86), Marta Korchemlyuk (Carpathian National Nature Park), Roman Sizo (UA GIS Expert), Timothy Turner (EPIRB Project, Team Leader), Birgit Vogel (EPIRB Project, WFD Expert).

### Structure of this workshop report

This workshop report holds introductory parts that refer to both Mini Workshops in MD and UA (Objectives; Workshop Summary and Overview).

Subsequently, two parts follow:

- **Part 1 is exclusively relevant for MD** as it is dedicated to MD workshop findings, conclusions and next steps regarding the comparison of the MD and RO Prut RBMPs.
- **Part 2 is exclusively relevant for UA** as it is dedicated to UA workshop findings, conclusions and next steps regarding the comparison of the UA and RO Prut RBMPs (and the UA and MD RBMPs).

### Objectives of the Mini Workshops:

The two Mini Workshop in MD and UA aimed to

- **Bring together technical experts** from Moldova and Ukraine in a small frame to **identify overlaps, similarities and also differences** between the two national Prut RBMPs and the Romanian Prut RBMP;
- In the above context, it was an aim **to present and discuss in detail water body delineation based on typology and pressures** in the MD/UA and RO RBMPs.

- As basis of follow-up activity, **other issues in the MD/UA and RO RBMPs were also addressed to achieve a first, general overview on related overlaps and differences.** These issues included:
  - (i) Significant pressures and their identification;
  - (ii) Sources of pollution and hydromorphological alterations;
  - (iii) Designation of Artificial and Heavily Modified Water Bodies;
  - (iv) Location of joint monitoring sites and implementation of joint monitoring programmes;
  - (v) Status assessment results.
- Based on the outcomes of the above, **needed and feasible technical improvements in the MD and UA RBMPs** were discussed towards alignment to the RO Prut RBMP;
- **Further, next steps** in the frame of the Prut Working Group and towards the harmonization between the MD, RO and UA RBMPs were addressed;

---

## Background and Workshop Summary – Brief Overview

---

On 26 November 2015 a *Technical Information Workshop regarding the national Prut River Basin Management Plans of MD, UA and RO* took place in Chisinau (Moldova). The participants of the meeting concluded that **a comparison of the MD/UA/RO RBMPs should be initiated by organising two further workshop in 2016 in which (i) the approach to compare the Plans will be discussed and decided (1<sup>st</sup> Workshop) as well as (ii) the comparative results will be presented and discussed (2<sup>nd</sup> Workshop).** The outcomes of these workshops should provide the basis to better understand (i) similarities, differences and overlaps between the three RBMPs, (ii) to determine key aims towards improvements of the MD and UA Prut RBMP as well as (iii) to discuss cooperation steps that can be undertaken between the three countries to harmonize the three Plans with each other towards a composite RBMP.

The participants of the Technical Information Workshop also concluded that upcoming activities within the comparative exercise should primarily focus on selected key issues of the RBMPs. This includes a first screening and checking of water body delineation in order to identify potential differences and to see if and how a harmonisation approach of the three RBMPs could be achieved. In follow-up, other approaches and results within the three RBMPs should be compared (e.g. significant pressures and their identification; inventory of sources of pollution and related pressures; Artificial and Heavily Modified Water Bodies; Programme and Measures, overlaps and possibilities towards harmonisation towards joint measures).

In the above context the two Mini Workshops in Chisinau (MD, 11 April 2016) and in Kiev (UA, 12 April 2016) have been organised to develop a first overview regarding the panned comparison of the RBMPs, to agree on an approach regarding the upcoming comparison and to decide upon next steps.

During the morning session of both Mini Workshops in UA and MD, Birgit Vogel provided as short introduction regarding the scope and aims to analyse and compare the final draft MD and UA Prut River Basin Management Plans with the RO Prut RBMP Plan as basis towards a composite Prut RBMP between Moldova, Romania and Ukraine. In follow-up the MD and UA representatives provided presentations on key features of their national RBMPs that shall be compared with the RO RBMP. The presented topics included:

- Water Body delineation in the Prut River Basin (MD respectively UA Prut Basin share),
- Heavily Modifies and Artificial Water Bodies in the Prut River Basin (MD/UA Prut Basin share),
- Water Status assessments in the Prut in the Prut River Basin (MD/UA Prut Basin share), and
- Monitoring programmes and networks in the Prut River Basin.

These presentations provided the basis to discuss any similarities and differences to the Romanian Prut RBMP that has been provided before the meeting. RO as a EU Member State has already developed the 2<sup>nd</sup> RBMP according to the requirements of the EU WFD – this 2<sup>nd</sup> RBMP has just recently been reported to the European Commission. This RO RBMP will be compared regarding the above elements with the MD and UA RBMPs that have been developed in the frame of the EPIRB Project.

The remaining workshop day have then been used in both countries to discuss with local experts and the RBMP contractors on the comparison of the RBMPs and the development of a first understanding of overlaps, similarities and differences. The outcomes are presented in the next section of this report.

---

## **PART 1:**

### **Workshop Findings, Conclusions and Next Steps regarding the comparison of the MD and RO Prut RBMPs**

---

MD and RO share a long reach of the Prut River that will be compared as part of the planned exercise. In the frame of the workshop the following findings have been achieved, which need more detailed investigation in follow-up:

#### **Typology:**

MD applied the WFD System A for the typology, while RO used System B, which is more detailed.

#### **Follow-Up Action Typology:**

- Describe the differences/similarities in typology for MD as well for RO;
- Describe the differences/similarities in typology **approach** for MD as well for RO;
- List the ecoregions and types and highlight differences and/or similarities;
- List issues that may be an issue for harmonisation.

#### **Water body delineation:**

Based on the typology and identified significant pressures, MD delineated 16 water bodies along the River Prut, while RO delineated only 5 water bodies.

Therefore, it can be said that this quite significant difference between the numbers of delineated surface water bodies need further investigation. Specifically the reason why this difference occurs needs to be investigated and clearly explained. E.g. it seems that MD set a water body delineation point in the Prut River for each confluence of a significant Prut tributary. A lower number of tributaries are located in the RO side of the Prut. All water bodies in the MD Prut share are assessed as 'at risk', while this seems not to be the case for the RO share. Reasons for these differences need to be investigated.

MD based the surface water body delineation on two criteria (i) hydrology and (ii) geomorphology, plus pressures and impacts. The technical implementation of the above-described activities was based on the

WFD requirements and the related CIS documents, particularly the CIS Guidance Document #2 "Identification of Water Bodies" and the CIS Guidance Document #4: "Identification and Designation of Heavily Modified and Artificial Water Bodies". In addition, the delineation followed the draft regulation for the new MD Water Law on the 'Methodology for Identification, Delineation and Classification of Surface Water Bodies'. The background of the RO delineation shall be investigated to enable the comparison.

Differences have been discussed regarding groundwater body delineation in MD and RO. The process of identification of bodies of groundwater in the MD share of the Prut Basin in started with the development of a conceptual hydrogeological model of the area. At the onset of the EPIRB Project, t no digital hydrogeological map of the Prut basins was available. Instead hard copy hydrogeological maps were used for the preliminary hydrogeological analysis of the pilot basins. In addition, to these maps an important source for the characterization of hydrogeological units (aquifers). While the RO RBMP considers 1 GWB as transboundary, MD considers 7 GWBs as transboundary. The MD groundwater experts concluded to formulate a proposal how the comparison can be done regarding groundwater delineation and how the related outcomes can be presented in the report. The RO colleagues will be proactively involved during the exercise.

**Follow-Up Action Water Body Delineation:**

- Compare the MD and RO water body delineation, water body by water body (for the mainstream);

**Comparison of surface WB delineation and explain why borders have been set:**

- Describe the water body delineation approach that has been applied (i) in MD and (ii) in RO and outline any respective similarities and differences in detail;

**Comparison of pressure types that led to surface water body delineation on (i) MD and (ii) RO side of the Prut River (using tables, figures and maps)**

- List the significant pressures/impacts for each water body that were reason for setting water body delineation border. This needs to be done for the MD and RO share of the Prut River. Develop a comparative table (MD – RO) listing the pressures and making differences/similarities clear. In addition, develop figures to illustrate the differences/similarities regarding pressures and delineated water bodies.

**Comparison of water status classes that led to water body delineation on (i) MD and (ii) RO side of the Prut River (using tables, figures and maps)**

- List the water status classifications for each water body that were reason for setting water body delineation border. This needs to be done for the MD and RO share of the Prut River. Develop a comparative table (MD – RO) listing water status and making differences/similarities clear. In addition, develop figures to illustrate the differences/similarities regarding water status and delineated water bodies.
- Illustrate the water bodies for MD and RO in **one** single map regarding the respective topics developing left and right bank illustrations.
- To enable this comparison make use of RO and MD background documents a available as well as seek the active exchange with the RO colleagues that have been involved in the Prut activity so far;

**Comparison of ground water body delineation in the (i) MD and (ii) RO share of the Prut River (using tables, figures and maps)**

- The MD groundwater experts will formulate a proposal how the comparison can be done regarding groundwater delineation and how the related outcomes can be presented in the report.
- RO counterparts will be proactively involved.

### **Heavily Modified and Artificial Water Bodies**

It is obvious that the designation of HMWBs along the shared part of the Prut River differs. RO designated 2/3 of the Prut River as HMWB. MD identified 6 water bodies of the Prut River as HMWB ( MD0201/01, 04, 08, 11, 13, 15, totally 128 km long) due to significant hydromorphological changes by the number of reservoirs along the river, including the Costesti-Stinca Reservoir. Only the Costesti-Stinca Reservoir is used for production of energy by both countries Moldova and Romania. All other water reservoirs are used for irrigation and flood protection and have complex destination (fishery, rest of population etc.). The only artificial water body identified in the basin is the group of 4 ponds of the Cahul fish farm (MDL020102) in the Prut River downstream, which are considered as a separate single AWB. The reasons of these differences regarding the designation of HMWB need to be described and clarified.

### **Follow-Up Action HMWB:**

- Compare HMWB/AWB designation for the (i) MD and (ii) RO share of the Prut River (using tables, figures and maps);
- Describe any differences in HMWB/AWB designation methods and outline possibilities of harmonisation and the application of a joint HMWB approach for the Prut River.
- Identify issues for possible harmonisation.

### **Monitoring and status assessment**

In MD 20 monitoring sites are located in the entire Prut River Basin. 68% are operational monitoring sites and 32 % used for surveillance monitoring. 7 sampling sites are shared with RO and one with UA.

The MD status assessment in the shared/transboundary Prut River reach is *moderate* in the upper part and water status class 4 in the lower half. For the RO share of the Prut good status has been assessed for the upper part and the remaining two thirds of the lower part in moderate ecological potential. These differences need clarification and investigation of reasons behind.

### **Follow-Up Action Water Status Assessment:**

- Compare the MD and RO monitoring programmes and networks and identify joint sampling sites as well as what is samples/assessed jointly
- Compare water status and potential results for the (i) MD and (ii) RO share of the Prut River (using tables, figures and maps);
- Describe any differences in assessment methods and quality elements that are being assessed;
- Highlight issues that need harmonisation in future;

---

## Next Steps regarding the comparison of the MD and RO RBMPs

---

- Focus of the comparative analysis will be on the Prut River itself that is shared by MD and RO;
- Both surface water and ground waters will be addressed;
- The EPIRB Project team leader and/or WFD expert will inform the RO experts that this activity is taking place and what will be done; In addition they will inform the ICPDR Secretariat on the activity;
- The MD EPIRB project experts and the contractors will find a way how to exchange with the RO expert (National Agency 'Apele Romane') during the upcoming activity;
- The MD EPIRB project experts and the contractors will initiate the activity right after the Mini Workshop in order to develop a **respective report that will be available end June 2016 and presented at a Prut Workshop end July 2016**;
- The EPIRB Project WFD expert will provide a Table of Contents to MD that shall be used as basis to develop the report on the comparison of the MD and RO Prut RBMP;
- The report on the comparison of the MD and RO Prut RBMP shall (i) present overlaps, differences and similarities between the Plans, as well as (ii) be concise and **not exceed 20 pages**.
- All actions that are outlined above will be tackled plus the activities that are part of the ToR for the assignment; the contractors will ensure best possible presentation of results making use of text, tables, figures and maps. GIS experts shall, hence, support the work.
- The MD contractors will also add a chapter on the activity in the current national Prut RBMP highlighting next steps towards eventual harmonisation.
- To support the work the RO RBMP annexes on (i) water body delineation and (ii) pressures/impact identification shall be translated into English.

---

## PART 2:

### Workshop Findings, Conclusions and Next Steps regarding the comparison of the UA and RO Prut RBMPs (as well as the UA and MD RBMPs)

---

The situation in the shared UA and RO Prut basin is different that the one between MD and RO. UA and RO share only a short river reach of the Prut River, which has a length of about 40 km. In addition, transboundary issues occur along Prut tributaries that are shared between UA and MD: UA shares the upper parts of these transboundary tributaries. Therefore, it has been decided that the comparison towards a composite RBMP will address:

- The shared Prut River reach shared between UA and RO,
- The Prut tributaries shared between UA and MD.

### **Typology:**

UA holds 2 ecoregions (16; 10) in the Prut River Basin (16, 10) and RO three (11, 12, 16).

UA applied the WFD System A for the typology, while RO used System B, which is more detailed. 12 river types have been identified in the UA Prut share and 7 in the RO one.

### **Follow-Up Action Typology:**

- Describe the differences/similarities in typology for UA as well for RO;
- Describe the differences/similarities in typology approach for UA as well for RO and for UA/MD;
- List the ecoregions and types and highlight differences and/or similarities;
- List issues than may be an issue for harmonisation.

### **Water body delineation:**

For the surface water bodies on the Prut River shared between UA and RO: Ukraine delineated four water bodies and as RO delineated only 2 WBs. Differences in delineation may occur due to typology and a change in the geological characterisation. The reason why this difference occurs needs to be investigated and clearly explained as basis for a possible harmonisation.

All 4 surface water bodies in UA have been assessed as 'at risk' due to hydromorphological alterations (pressure: gravel abstraction). The risk assessment result for the RO WBs need to be investigated. Indications shall be given if the risk assessment of WBs directly connected to the border between UA and MD is the same.

Water status has not been assessed for the 4 UA WBs, while the 2 RO WBs are assessed with good water status. Related investigations for this difference shall be outlined as well as possibilities for harmonisation. UA shall also compare water status assessment results in those water bodies in the tributaries shared between UA and MD. Indications shall be given if the water status assessment of WBs directly connected to the border between UA and MD is the same.

No exemptions have been applied by UA in the transboundary water bodies. The RO situation has to be respectively investigates and reflected. Same for the transboundary water bodies shared between UA and MD in the Prut tributaries.

Regarding groundwater, Ukraine delineated 4 GWBs and RO 7. Some of the GWBs are shared with RO but not designated like this. As of today, or is unclear which GWBs are transboundary and this seems an issue for future harmonisation. No GWBs are shared with MD.

### **Follow-Up Action Water Body Delineation:**

- Compare the UA and RO water body delineation, water body by water body;
- Compare the UA and MD water body delineation;

### **Comparison of surface WB delineation and explain why borders have been set:**

- Describe the water body delineation approach that has been applied (i) in UA and (ii) in RO and outline any respective similarities and differences in detail;
- Describe the water body delineation approach that has been applied (i) in UA and (ii) in MD and outline any respective similarities and differences in detail;

### **Comparison of pressure types that led to surface water body delineation on (i) UA and (ii) RO side of the Prut River (using tables, figures and maps)**

- List the significant pressures/impacts for each water body that were reason for setting water body delineation border. This needs to be done for the UA and RO share of the Prut River. Develop a comparative table (UA – RO) listing the pressures and making differences/similarities clear. In addition, develop figures to illustrate the differences/similarities regarding pressures and delineated water bodies.
- List pressures in the UA parts of the tributaries shared with MD and indicate if they may be of transboundary importance;

**Comparison of water status classes that led to water body delineation on (i) UA and (ii) RO side of the Prut River (using tables, figures and maps)**

- List the water status classifications for each water body that were reason for setting water body delineation border. This needs to be done for the UA and RO share of the Prut River. Develop a comparative table (UA – RO) listing water status and making differences/similarities clear. In addition, develop figures to illustrate the differences/similarities regarding water status and delineated water bodies.
- Illustrate the water bodies for UA and RO in **one** single map developing left and right bank illustrations.
- Compare the status assessments of those water bodies shared in the UA/MD tributaries when crossing the border and indicate if the assessment results are the same or different;
- To enable this comparison make use of RO and UA background document as well as seek the active exchange with the RO colleagues that have been involved in the Prut activity so far;

**Comparison of ground water body delineation in the (i) UA and (ii) RO share of the Prut River (using tables, figures and maps)**

- Compare the GWB delineation approaches of UA and RO as well as UA and MD and outline differences.
- RO counterparts will be proactively involved.

**Heavily Modified and Artificial Water Bodies**

No HMWBs have been designated in the Prut River reach shared between UA and RO.

It shall be investigated if the HMWBs/AWBS have been designated in the tributaries shared between UA and MD. Specifically it shall be indicated if eventual HMWB designations of WBs directly connected to the border between UA and MD are the same.

**Follow-Up Action HMWBs:**

- Compare HMWB/AWB designation for the (i) UA and (ii) RO share of the Prut River (using tables, figures and maps);
- Compare the HMWB/AWB designation in the transboundary water bodies shared between UA and MD in the Prut tributaries;
- Describe any differences in HMWB/AWB designation methods and outline possibilities of harmonisation and the application of a joint HMWB approach for the Prut River.
- Identify issues for possible harmonisation.



### **Monitoring and status assessment**

No UA monitoring site is located in the shared Prut River reach and it is unclear if RO operates any monitoring in this transboundary river reach. This needs to be investigated and reflected. Water status has not been assessed for the 4 UA WBs, while the 2 RO WBs are assessed with good water status. Related investigations for this difference shall be outlined as well as possibilities for harmonisation.

In addition, it needs to be reflected if any monitoring sites are located in the water bodies of the Prut tributaries shared between UA and MD. UA shall also compare water status assessment results in those water bodies in the tributaries shared between UA and MD. Indications shall be given if the water status assessment of WBs directly connected to the border between UA and MD has been coordinated and is the same or different.

### **Follow-Up Action Water Status Assessment:**

- Compare the UA and RO monitoring programmes and networks and identify joint sampling sites as well as what is samples/assessed jointly
- Compare water status and potential results for the (i) UA and (ii) RO share of the Prut River (using tables, figures and maps);
- Compare water status assessment results in the transboundary water bodies crossing the border between UA and MD.
- Describe any differences in assessment methods and quality elements that are being assessed;
- Highlight issues that need harmonisation in future;

---

### **Next Steps regarding the comparison of the UA and RO RBMPs as well as UA and MD RBMPs**

---

- Focus of the comparative analysis will be on the Prut River itself that is shared by UA and RO;
- In addition, transboundary issues that occur along Prut tributaries that are shared between UA and MD shall be investigated and compared.
- Both surface water and groundwater's will be addressed;
- The EPIRB Project team leader or WFD expert will inform the RO experts that this activity is taking place and what will be done;
- In addition they will inform the ICPDR Secretariat on the activity;
- The UA EPIRB project experts and the contractors will find a way how to exchange with the RO expert (National Agency „Apele Romane”) during the upcoming activity as well as with the MD experts;
- The UA EPIRB project experts and the contractors will initiate the activity right after the Mini Workshop in order to develop a respective report that will be **developed by end June 2016** and be presented at a **Prut Workshop end July 2016**;
- The EPIRB Project WFD expert will provide a Table of Contents to UA that shall be used as basis to develop the report on the comparison of the MD and RO Prut RBMP;

- The report on the comparison of the UA and RO Prut RBMPs as well as UA and MD RBMPs shall (i) present overlaps, differences and similarities between the Plans, as well as (ii) be concise and **not exceed 20 pages**.
- All actions that are outlined above will be tackled plus the activities that are part of the ToR for the assignment; the contractors will ensure best possible presentation of results making use of text, tables, figures and maps. GIS experts shall, hence, support the work.
- The MD contractors will also add a chapter on the activity in the current national Prut RBMP highlighting next steps towards eventual harmonisation.
- To support the work the RO RBMP annexes on (i) water body delineation and (ii) pressures/impact identification shall be translated into English.

## **Annex 1: Workshop Agenda in Chisinau (MD)**

**11 April 2016**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Thematic Item</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
<b>9:00-9:15</b>	Registration	
<b>9:15-9:25</b>	Welcome by the host and the EPIRB Project	(MD host) Birgit Vogel (Senior Expert EPIRB Project)
<b>9:25 – 9:30</b>	Introduction of all participants	All Participants
<b>9:30 – 9:45</b>	Introduction to the EPIRB Project Activity to analyse and compare the final draft MD and UA Prut River Basin Management Plans with the RO Prut RBMP Plan as basis towards a composite Prut RBMP between Moldova, Romania and Ukraine	Birgit Vogel (Senior Expert EPIRB Project)
<b>9:45 – 11:15</b>	<b>Water body delineation in the MD RBMP and Prut River</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation on surface water body delineation in the MD share of the Prut River based on typology and significant pressures/impacts and water status assessment;</li> <li>- Presentation on groundwater body delineation in the MD share of the Prut River based on typology and significant pressures/impacts;</li> <li>- Discussion and first identification of overlaps, similarities and differences with the RO RBMP.</li> </ul>	MD GIS Expert  Victor Bujac/Birgit Vogel All Participants
<b>11:15 – 11:45</b>	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
<b>11:45-12:30</b>	<b>Heavily Modified and Artificial Water Bodies in the MD RBMP and Prut River</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overview on HMWBs and AWBs in the MD share of the Prut River and comparison to the assessments in the RO RBMP.</li> <li>- Discussion and first identification of overlaps, similarities and differences with the RO RBMP.</li> </ul>	MD Technical Experts  Victor Bujac/Birgit Vogel All Participants
<b>12:30 – 13:15</b>	<b>National and joint monitoring with RO in the MD RBMP and Prut River</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation on national and joint monitoring sites and programmes;</li> <li>- Discussion</li> </ul>	MD Experts  All Participants
<b>13:15 – 14:30</b>	<i>Lunch Break</i>	
<b>14:30 – 15:15</b>	<b>Water status assessment in the MD RBMP and Prut River</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overview on water status assessment including ecological potential for AWBs/HMWBs in the MD share of the Prut River and comparison to the assessments in the RO RBMP.</li> <li>- Discussion and first identification of overlaps, similarities and differences with the RO RBMP.</li> </ul>	MD Technical Experts  Victor Bujac/Birgit Vogel All Participants
<b>15:30 – 17:00</b>	<b>Technical workshop session to identify similarities and differences between the MD and RO RBMP on a preliminary level</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Based on previous presentations and discussion identify similarities and differences with the RO RBMP and highlight these in maps;</li> <li>- Discussion on technical follow-up to assess the similarities and differences in more detail towards final conclusions and as part of a report;</li> <li>- Discussion possibilities to improve and adapt the MD RBMP aligned to the RO RBMP;</li> </ul>	All Participants (moderation: Birgit Vogel and Victor Bujac)
<b>17:00 – 17:30</b>	Next steps and wrap-up	Birgit Vogel (Senior Expert EPIRB Project)

**- End of Workshop -**

## **Annex 2: Workshop Agenda in Kiev (UA)**

12 April 2016

<b>Time</b>	<b>Thematic Item</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
<b>10:00-10:15</b>	Registration	
<b>10:15 – 10:30</b>	Welcome and Introduction of all participants	<i>All Participants</i>
<b>10:30 – 10:45</b>	Introduction to the EPIRB Project Activity to analyse and compare the final draft MD and UA Prut River Basin Management Plans with the RO Prut RBMP Plan as basis towards a composite Prut RBMP between Moldova, Romania and Ukraine	Birgit Vogel <i>(Senior Expert EPIRB Project)</i>
<b>10:45 – 12:15</b>	<p><b>Water body delineation in the UA RBMP and Prut River</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation on surface water body delineation in the UA share of the Prut River based on typology and significant pressures/impacts and water status assessment;</li> <li>- Presentation on groundwater body delineation in the UA share of the Prut River based on typology and significant pressures/impacts;</li> <li>- Discussion and first identification of overlaps, similarities and differences with the RO RBMP.</li> </ul>	UA Technical Expert  Natalia Zakorchevna /Birgit Vogel All Participants
<b>12:15 – 12:45</b>	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
<b>12:45-13:30</b>	<p><b>Heavily Modified and Artificial Water Bodies in the UA RBMP and Prut River</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overview on HMWBs and AWBs in the UA share of the Prut River and comparison to the assessments in the RO RBMP.</li> <li>- Discussion and first identification of overlaps, similarities and differences with the RO RBMP.</li> </ul>	UA Technical Experts  Natalia Zakorchevna /Birgit Vogel All Participants
<b>13:30 – 14:30</b>	<i>Lunch Break</i>	
<b>14:30 – 15:00</b>	<p><b>National and joint monitoring with RO in the UA RBMP and Prut River</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation on national and joint monitoring sites and programmes;</li> <li>- Discussion</li> </ul>	UA Technical Experts  All Participants
<b>15:00 – 16:00</b>	<p><b>Water status assessment in the UA RBMP and Prut River</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overview on water status assessment including ecological potential for AWBs/HMWBs in the UA share of the Prut River and comparison to the assessments in the RO RBMP.</li> <li>- Discussion and first identification of overlaps, similarities and differences with the RO RBMP.</li> </ul>	UA Technical Experts  Natalia Zakorchevna/Birgit Vogel All Participants
<b>16:00 – 17:30</b>	<p><b>Technical workshop session to identify similarities and differences between the UA and RO RBMP on a preliminary level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Based on previous presentations and discussion identify similarities and differences with the RO RBMP and highlight these in maps;</li> <li>- Discussion on technical follow-up to assess the similarities and differences in more detail towards final conclusions and as part of a report;</li> <li>- Discussion possibilities to improve and adapt the UA RBMP aligned to the RO RBMP;</li> </ul>	All Participants <i>(moderation: Birgit Vogel and Natalia Zakorchevna)</i>
<b>17:30 – 17:45</b>	Next steps and wrap-up	Birgit Vogel <i>(Senior Expert EPIRB Project)</i>

- End of Workshop -



**ANNEX 3. List of Participant; Mini Workshop Chisnau (MD)**

**Prut River RBMP Mini-Workshop**

Conference-hall "Protocol" (1<sup>st</sup> floor), Labor Institute, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova

**11 April 2016**

**List of Moldavian Participants**

#	Name	Organization	Position	E-mail
<b>Representatives of the Beneficiary Institutions of the Republic of Moldova</b>				
1.	Mr Gherman Bejenaru	State Hydrometeorological Service	Research and GIS Expert	<a href="mailto:gherman.bejenaru@meteo.gov.md">gherman.bejenaru@meteo.gov.md</a>
2.	Mr Boris Iurciuc	Agency of Geology and Mineral Resources	Head of Geological Fund, GIS expert	<a href="mailto:geofund@agrm.gov.md">geofund@agrm.gov.md</a>
3.	Mr Iurie Bejan	Institute of Ecology and Geography	Vice-Director, RBMP contractor, GIS Expert	<a href="mailto:iurie.bejan@gmail.com">iurie.bejan@gmail.com</a>
4.	Mr Nicolae Boboc	Institute of Ecology and Geography	Head of Landscape Section	<a href="mailto:nicboboc@gmail.com">nicboboc@gmail.com</a>
5.	Mr Ghenadii Syrodoev	Institute of Ecology and Geography	Head of Section, GIS Expert	<a href="mailto:syrodoev_g@rambler.ru">syrodoev_g@rambler.ru</a>



## Environmental Protection of International River Basins Project (EPIRBP)

Contract No. ENPI/2011/279-666



Funded by the European Union and Implemented by a Consortium led by Hulla & Co. Human Dynamics KG

6.	Mr Oleg Bogdevici	Institute of Chemistry of Academy of Sciences	Head of Geochemical Laboratory	<a href="mailto:bogdevicholeg@yahoo.com">bogdevicholeg@yahoo.com</a>
7.	Mr Alexandru Tabacaru	Basin Water Management Authority	Head of Project Management Section, GIS Expert	<a href="mailto:tabacaruaalex@yahoo.com">tabacaruaalex@yahoo.com</a>
8.	Ms Liuba Secareanu	Agency Apele Moldovei	Head of water cadaster section	<a href="mailto:liuba.secareanu@gmail.com">liuba.secareanu@gmail.com</a>
9.	Mr Cyrille Valett	ADA/SDC project	Water expert	<a href="mailto:cyrille.valet@mediu.gov.md">cyrille.valet@mediu.gov.md</a>
10.	Mr Dan Titov	SHS	GIS expert	<a href="mailto:titov.dan@gmail.com">titov.dan@gmail.com</a>
11.	Ms Natalia Zgircu	SHS, Water Quality Center	Deputy head of environmental monitoring department	<a href="mailto:nataliaracovet1901@yahoo.com">nataliaracovet1901@yahoo.com</a>
<b>EPIRB Project/Human Dynamics Consortium</b>				
12.	Ms Birgit Vogel	HD/EPIRB	WFD Expert, NKE	<a href="mailto:bv@rbm-solutions.com">bv@rbm-solutions.com</a>
13.	Mr Victor Bujac	HD/EPIRB	CWME, Moldova	<a href="mailto:victor.bujac@blacksea-riverbasins.net">victor.bujac@blacksea-riverbasins.net</a>