



WORKSHOP REPORT

Subject: Technical Information Workshop between MD, RO and UA: First comparison of the MD and UA Prut River Basin Management Plans with the RO Prut RBMP
Date: 21 July 2016
Venue: Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, Vienna (Austria)

Agenda

Agenda of the Workshop is attached to the report ([Annex 1](#)).

Participants

The Workshop has been attended by representatives from MD, RO and UA; EPIRB Project team representatives; representatives from the AT Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management as well as the AT Environment Agency.

A detailed List of Participants of the workshop is attached to the report ([Annex 2](#)).

Objectives of the Workshops:

The technical information workshop between the countries sharing the Prut River Basin aimed to

- **Bring together relevant experts and representatives** from Moldova, Ukraine and Romania, the EPIRB Project to provide an update on the work regarding a first comparison of the MD and UA Prut RBMPs with the RO RBMP since November 2016;
- **Share and inform on preliminary results** of the first comparison of the MD and UA Prut RBMPs with the RO RBMP outlining identified overlaps, similarities and differences regarding the key issues on
 - (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.
- **Discuss eventual reasons for the identified differences in results and assessments** between the MD/UA Prut RBMPs and the RO RBMP;
- **Discuss if and how the identified differences could be tackled** towards future bi- and multilateral harmonization between the involved countries;

- **Discuss the next steps to finalize the internal reports**, which compare the MD/UA RBMP and the RO RBMP;
- **In the above context**, collect views of the participating representatives and outline practical cooperation steps that would be needed for harmonization of the three RBMPs;
- **Discuss relevance, next steps, challenges and options towards a consolidated RBMP** between MD, UA and RO including the discussion on options for an eventual mechanism that could support the development of a composite RBMP;

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 a further workshop in 2016 in which (i) the approach to compare the Plans will be discussed and decided (1st Workshop) as well as (ii) the comparative results will be presented and discussed (2nd 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).

Further, two Mini Workshops were held in Chisinau (MD, 11 April 2016) and in Kiev (UA, 12 April 2016) to develop an approach for a first overview regarding the planned comparison of the RBMPs, to agree on an approach regarding the upcoming comparison and to decide upon next steps.

Based on the above workshops and their outcomes, this *Technical Information Workshop between MD, RO and UA* was organised on 21 July 2016 in Vienna. Up-front the workshop a draft report presenting an internal discussion document including a *first comparison of the MD and UA Prut River Basin Management Plans with the RO Prut RBMP* has been provided to the workshop participants. MD and UA contractors with support of the CWMEs and the EPIRB Project WFD expert have developed this internal discussion document.

Mr. Karl Schwaiger - the Austrian Water Director – opened the meeting and welcomed all participants. Mr. Schwaiger emphasised the important role of the activity that also have potential to contribute to transboundary activities within the frame of the ICPDR. He mentioned that the comparison of the three

RBMPs will support a better understanding of any related differences and similarities. The comparison can provide the basis to further discuss if the development of a consolidated international RBMP for the Prut River Basin will be feasible.

Tim Turner – EPIRB Project Team Leader – also welcomed the participant attending the workshop and gave a short introduction on the development of RBMPs in the frame of the project as well as activities that took place since the Mini Workshops in April.

In follow-up, Birgit Vogel provided a short introduction regarding the scope and aims of this workshop and the comparison of 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. Before the technical presentations, the representatives from RO, MD and UA expressed their **expectations towards this technical workshop**, which are summarised as follows:

Irina Tutunaro from Romania thanked the experts for all efforts that have been undertaken so far to develop the comparison between the three RBMPs. The activity and related support from the EPIRB Project is being much appreciated. The overall expectation is the establishment of a basis to move towards a composite Prut RBMP. In this context, it will be necessary to compare all features of the three Plans.

Victor Bujac from Moldova (EPIRB Project CWME) emphasised that it will be important to understand any challenges that may come up when developing a composite Prut RBMP. As Moldova shares a long reach of the Prut mainstream with Romania, the understanding of any differences is seen as important as a basis to develop joint approaches and a composite RBMP for the Prut River Basin. In addition, Mr. Bujac emphasised that the WFD methodologies that have been developed and applied by Romania are important for Moldova as these feed into the development of national approaches.

Nataliia Zakorchevna from Ukraine (EPIRB Project CWME) also highlighted the importance to compare the three Prut RBMPs of MD, RO and UA. Many of the UA river basins are in fact transboundary and harmonised approaches will be important for all of them. This exercise on the Prut Basin, which is hoped for continuation in the follow-up EUWI+ project, contributes to this harmonisation that is also the overall expectation in relation to this activity.

Aligned to the agenda and to support the technical discussion, the MD and UA representatives provided detailed presentations on the results regarding the draft comparison of the draft MD RBMP with the RO Prut RBMP. The presentations addressed the following aspects:

- Results including all key aspects of the EU WFD including WB delineation, monitoring, significant pressures, water status assessments and POM;
- Outline of existing overlaps and similarities;
- Outline of differences;
- Outline of information gaps to undertake the comparison and need of clarification from RO side;
- Outline of planned improvements in the MD Prut RBMP;

The technical presentations are provided as **Electronic Annexes 3, 4 and 5** to this workshop report as well as related details can be found in the draft comparative report of the three RBMPs.

Further, Irinia Tutunaru reflected on the results of the draft comparison. The related presentation is attached as **Electronic Annex 5**.

The remaining workshop day has then been used to discuss the draft internal discussion document including the comparison of the RBMPs, related issues and challenges. In addition, next steps and a possible way towards a composite Prut RBMP have been discussed. The outcomes are summarised in the next section of this report.

Workshop findings and conclusions regarding the comparison of the MD, RO and UA Prut RBMPs

As mentioned above MD and UA presented on the differences and similarities between their national RBMPs and the Romanian RBMPs. While related technical details can be found in the internal discussion document on the comparison of the three RBMPs, the following conclusions can be summarised:

General:

- Being an EU Member State, Romania already reported its second RBMP to the European Union. As Non EU Member States, UA and MD do not have legally binding reporting obligations towards the EU. However, both countries have signed Association Agreements with the EU, which holds the provision to approximate national law and its implementation to the EU Directives. This includes the Water Framework Directive;
- Based on the above, the three RBMPs are – to a certain extent - different in status regarding development and implementation;
- Therefore, all participants agreed that it is important to set-up a mechanism how to move forward towards a joint Prut RBMP and Programme of Measures between the three countries;
- In order to approach harmonised approaches and implementation regarding the technical aspects of the RBMPs, the participants highlighted that a stepwise approach should be followed; A Road Map that outlines these steps should be developed in future;

Typology:

- MD and UA applied the WFD System A for the typology, while RO used System B, which is more detailed;
- In consequence, it has been discussed that MD and UA shall aim towards an upgrade to System B as soon as possible;
- MD and UA shall investigate the outcomes of the intercalibration results of the Eastern Continental GIG and aim towards adaptation of the related status class boundaries. In addition, joint sampling between the three countries can further support the achievement of class boundaries that are intercalibrated between the three countries in order to meet the WFD requirements and to have a common basis for water status assessment;
- In the above context, close cooperation with RO shall be aimed for;
- To support the above, the planning and organisation of a workshop on typology and intercalibration was discussed;

Water Body Delineation

- Several differences in WB delineation became obvious during the comparison of the three RBMPs;

- While RO has rather delineated large water bodies, MD and UA have delineated small water bodies, which results in differences (number and length);
- Those differences require harmonisation along the Prut River (mainstream) to ensure a coherent basis for any following steps in WFD implementation. This harmonisation was highlighted as essential – if not undertaken consecutive steps can become complicated;

Pressures and Impact:

- The outcomes of the Pressure/Impact Analysis in the MD and UA water bodies are different compared to RO, which also requires harmonisation regarding approaches and assessments.
- In the above context, joint water status assessments should be taken into account in future in order to jointly assess impacts in shared water bodies;
- It has been raised that assessments should consider any impact that may result from tributaries regarding flows and related pollution pressures;
- As a starting point, a joint pressure/impact analysis and risk assessment should be undertaken supporting a harmonisation of approaches;

HMWB

- So far, assessment approaches on hydromorphological alterations in MD and UA are different from those in RO – a comparison of the approaches and harmonisation is considered as necessary in order to achieve coordinated results;
- The countries agreed that one data base regarding morphological pressures would be useful in order to increase a common understanding on these;
- The development of a joint approach regarding HMWB designation in the Prut mainstream has been addressed. A similar approach has been applied between the Danube countries for the Danube mainstream and could serve an example;

Monitoring an water status assessment

- As mentioned above, joint monitoring could be useful towards the harmonisation of sampling approaches, pressure/impact identification and water status assessment;
- Joint monitoring sites and a related programme for sampling and assessment could be planned, identified and implemented in future in order to support joint approaches, assessments and related harmonisation activities;
- An extended intercalibration that is aligned to the Eastern Continental GIG could be undertaken to support any harmonisation regarding water status assessment;
- Joint surveys would also support capacity development in MD and UA (technical and equipment);
- The possible development of joint monitoring reports have been mentioned;

Programme of Measures

- Harmonisation activities shall also address a joint PoM specifically regarding the transboundary Prut River. Related steps should be highlighted in the Road Map.

Future Infrastructure Project (FIP)

- FIPs have the potential to cause additional pressures and impacts on water status;
- The participants raised the need to exchange on planned FIPs that may also have transboundary implications on the Prut River Basin. In this context, the theme of WFD exemptions under WFD Article 4.7 could be addressed.

How to approach a possible joint RBMP between MD, RO and UA?

- The participants discussed possible options for a mechanisms to develop a joint RBMP between the three basin sharing countries could be approached in future;
- One option was preferred between the participants, which is the establishment of a group (Prut Working Group) between the countries sharing the Prut basin within the cooperation framework of the ICPDR. The approach under which the RBMP for the international Tisza RBMP could serve as a role model.
- Related next steps and the feasibility of such an approach shall be discussed soon with the ICPDR Secretariat and certainly with the MD/RO/UA Heads of Delegations to the ICPDR.

Next Steps

- Thorough revision of the internal discussion document regarding the comparison of the MD/RO/UA RBMPs by the MD and UA contractors based on the discussion points during the workshop. Special attention need to focus on an improved and concise presentation of results;
- Circulation of the internal discussion document to the RO colleagues for comments;
- Inform the ICPDR Secretariat (the Executive Secretary) on the outcomes of the trilateral workshop and discuss these, specifically a possible mechanism towards a joint Prut RBMP (see proposal above);
- The UA/RO/MD workshop participants shall inform their national ICPDR Heads of Delegation on the Prut activities and workshop outcomes in order to discuss next steps;
- One option could be an agenda item regarding the joint Prut activities within the ICPDR's Ordinary Meeting in December that could support the development of next steps. All related steps need to be undertaken in close exchange with the ICPDR Secretariat;
- As the EPIRB Project will terminate in 2016, future technical support shall be addressed including the option of facilitation through the upcoming EUWI+ project. The support should support the three countries sharing the Prut Basin in developing a composite/umbrella Prut RBMP.

Annex 1: Workshop Agenda

Thursday, 21 July 2016

Morning Session

Time	Thematic Item	Presenter
9:00-9:15	Registration	
9:15-9:30	Welcome address by the host and the EPIRB Project	Kar Schwaiger <i>(Austrian Water Director)</i> Tim Turner <i>(EPIRB Project Team Leader)</i>
9:30 – 9:35	Adoption of the Agenda	
9:35 – 9:40	Tour de Table: Introduction of all participants	All
9:40 – 9:50	Short summary of activities regarding the Prut activity since November 2015 including the outcomes of the MD/UA Mini-Workshops	Tim Turner <i>(EPIRB Project Team Leader)</i>
9:50 – 10:05	Scope and aims of the EPIRB Project Activity to analyse and compare the 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>
10:05 – 10:20	Expectations of (i) RO, (ii) MD and (iii) UA regarding the outcomes of this meeting Each country representative to present 5 minutes	Irina Tutunatru <i>(Prut-Birlad RBM Authority, Agency, Apele Române)</i> Victor Bujac <i>(CWME EPIRB Project)</i> Zakorchevna Nataliia <i>(RBME EPIRB Project)</i>
10:20 – 11:05	Detailed presentation of results regarding the comparison of the draft MD RBMP with the RO Prut RBMP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of results including all key aspects of the EU WFD including WB delineation, monitoring, significant pressures, water status assessments and POM; • Outline of existing overlaps and similarities; • Outline of differences; • Outline of information gaps to undertake the comparison and need of clarification from RO side; • Outline of planned improvements in the MD Prut RBMP; 	Victor Bujac <i>(CWME EPIRB Project)</i> Iurie Bejan <i>(Institute of Ecology and Geography, MD)</i>
11:05 - 11:15	<i>Initial questions, answer and discussion</i>	
11:15 – 11:45	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
11:45 – 12:30	Detailed presentation of results regarding the comparison of the draft UA RBMP with the RO Prut RBMP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of results including all key aspects of the EU WFD including typology, WB delineation, significant pressures, monitoring sites/networks, water status assessments and PoM; • Outline of existing overlaps and similarities; • Outline of differences; • Outline of information gaps to undertake the comparison and need of clarification from RO side; • Outline of planned improvements in the UA Prut RBMP; 	Zakorchevna Nataliia <i>(RBME EPIRB Project)</i> Marta Korchemlyuk <i>(MAMA 86, UA)</i>
12:30 – 13:30	<i>Lunch Break</i>	

Afternoon Session

13:30 – 13:45	<p>Detailed presentation of results regarding the comparison between the draft UA and MD RBMP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of results including all key aspects of the EU WFD including typology, WB delineation, significant pressures, monitoring sites/networks, water status assessments and PoM; • Outline of existing overlaps, similarities and differences; 	<p>Zakorchevna Nataliia (RBME EPIRB Project) Marta Korchemlyuk (MAMA 86, UA) Victor Bujac (CWME EPIRB Project) Iurie Bejan (Institute of Ecology and Geography, MD)</p>
13:45 – 14:00	Questions, answer and discussion	
14:00 -14:15	<p>Brief reflection of RO regarding the results of the comparison based on the (i) reports that have been circulated before the meeting and (ii) the morning presentations</p>	<p>Irina Tutunatru (Prut-Birlad RBM Authority, Agency, Apele Române)</p>
14:15 – 15:30	<p>Technical Working Group Session: Discussion regarding each topic, existing differences between the MD/UA RBMP and the RO RBMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do differences occur? • Explanation of background information to understand differences • Can the differences be harmonised in future? • If so, how can these be harmonised? <p>Note: Key issues to be discussed will be outlined as well as this session will be moderated</p>	<p>All in plenary</p>
15:30 – 16:00	Coffee Break	
16:00-16:30	<p>Outline of next steps towards an eventual composite Prut RBMP between MD, RO and UA addressing:</p> <p>(i) Finalisation of the comparative report regarding the three RBMPs,</p> <p>(ii) Options of a supporting mechanism to develop a composite RBMP.</p>	<p>EPIRB Project Team; All</p>
16:30-17:00	<p>Wrap-up and closing of the meeting</p>	<p>Birgit Vogel (Senior Expert EPIRB Project)</p>

-- end --



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

ANNEX 3. List of Participants



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

**Technical Information Workshop between MD, RO and UA:
First comparison of the MD and UA Prut RBMPs with the RO Prut RBMP**
Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management
Marxergasse 2, 1030 Vienna, Austria

**21 July 2016
List of Participants**

#	Name	Organization	Position	E-mail	Signature
Representatives of the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management (AFEWM)					
1	Mr Karl Schwaiger	Federal Ministry of AFEWM	Water Director	Karl.SCHWAIGER@bmlfuw.gv.at	
2	<i>Philipp Hohenegger</i>	<i>Env. Agency Austria</i>	<i>Senior WWS</i>	<i>philipp.hohenegger@umweltbundesamt.at</i>	
Representatives of the Beneficiary Institutions of the Republic of Moldova					
3	Mr Andrei Ursache	Ministry of Environment	Head of Water, Soil and Subsoil Section	ursache@mediu.gov.md	
4	Mr Gherman Bejenaru	State Hydrometeorological Service	Head of Forecast Department, GIS Expert	gherman.bejenaru@meteo.gov.md	
5	Mr Iurii Bejan	Institute of Ecology and Geography	Vice-Director, RBMP contractor, GIS Expert	iurie.bejan@gmail.com	

Human Dynamics Consortium Page 1 of 3



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



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

#	Name	Organization	Position	E-mail	Signature
Representatives from RBMP Institutions of Romania					
6	Ms Irina Tutunaru	River Basin Management Plan Office, ABA Prut-Barlad	Engineer	irina.tutunaru@dap.rowater.ro	
Representatives of the Beneficiary Institutions of Ukraine					
7	Mr Oleksandr Bon	Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources	Head of Water Ecosystems and Resources Division, NCC Member	bon@menr.gov.ua	
8	Ms Marta Korchemlyuk	UNENGO "MAMA-86"	RBMP contractor	martakor@yahoo.com	
EPIRB Project/Human Dynamics Consortium					
9	Mr Timothy Turner	HD/EPIRB	Team Leader, KE1	trturner@btinternet.com	
10	Ms Birgit Vogel	HD/EPIRB	Senior Expert, NKE	bv@rbm-solutions.com	
11	Mr Victor Bujac	HD/EPIRB	CWME	victor.bujac@blacksea-riverbasins.net	
12	Ms Nataliia Zakorchevna	HD/EPIRB	RBME	nataliia.zakorchevna@blacksea-riverbasins.net	



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



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

#	Name	Organization	Position	E-mail	Signature
13	Michael Suttas	UMWELT BUNDESAMT	WAM Asia, Africa, Americas	michael.suttas@ umweltbundesamt.at	
14	Andreas SCHEIDLER	UMWELT- BUNDESAMT	Senior Expert Ground water	andreas.scheidler@ umweltbundesamt.at	