

The background of the cover is a close-up photograph of water droplets of various sizes, some in sharp focus and others blurred, against a dark blue background. A clear glass tube or pipette is visible, extending diagonally from the bottom left towards the center, with several droplets clinging to its surface.

Water, Food and Environment

**dialogue on the implementation of the EU
Water Framework Directive in agricultural
water management in the CEE region**

Second Phase Report, March 2004

**Water, Food and Environment:
Dialogue on the Implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive
in Agricultural Water Management in the CEE region**

Second Phase Report, March 2004

Edited by Istvan Ijjas, coordinator of the CEE WFE Dialogue

The dialogues for this Final Report have been undertaken during the period September 2003 – February 2004. The Final Report was completed in February-March 2004. The views set out and analysis presented are those of the authors of the national report, the editor of this report and the participants of the national dialogues and do not necessarily represent the views of the GWP, ICID and WWF in general or of the national CWPs or of the Council of GWP CEE.

1. Introduction

This Dialogue could be considered as a combined international, national, regional and local PP process. The Dialogue is organised in the framework of the Global WFE Dialogue (Dialogue on Water for Food and Environment) that means a Dialogue on the Implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive in Agricultural Water Management in the Central and East European EU Candidate Countries.

The Water Framework Directive strongly emphasises the need for protection of water resources and requires the achievement of good ecological status of waters. The idea of the Dialogue, on the other hand, under the title “Water – Food – Environment” aims at providing sustainable development of rural areas.

The target of the Dialogue is to discuss problems associated with implementation of the WFD, to indicate possibilities and measures of its dissemination in rural areas, to combat organisational obstacles and particularly to stimulate contacts and cooperation between specialists of water management, agriculture and environmental protection.

Members of the consortium for the organisation of the CEE WFE Dialogue:

GWP CEE - Global Water Partnership, Central and Eastern Europe

The CEE Region considered by the GWP CEE: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia.

ICID ERWG - International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage, European Regional Working Group

Countries represented in ICID ERWG: Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Macedonia, The Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Serbia-Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom.

WWF DCP - World Wide Fund for Nature - Danube-Carpathian Programme: projects throughout the Danube River Basin and Carpathian eco-regions.

Staff in Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Ukraine.

Authors of the national CEE WFE reports:

Bulgaria

Dr. Galia Bardarska
Milena Dimitrova
Dr. Violina Hadjieva
Dr. Snejana Moncheva
Prof. Ivan Raev

Czech Republic

Evzen Polenka
Prof.Dr.Petr Dolejs

Estonia

Maret Merisar
Dr.Enn Loigu
Dr.Arvo Lital
Ülo Sults

Hungary

Ferenc Fehér
Gábor Kolossváry
Márta Konkoly
Prof. Istvan Ijjas

Latvia

Sandra Krivmane

Lithuania

Paukstys Bernardas
Dr.Antanas.Maziliauskas
Lithuanian Water Partnership

Poland

Prof. Waldemar Mioduszewski
Prof. Janusz Kindler

Romania

Liviu N.Popescu
Danut Maria
Teodor Lucian Constantinescu

Slovakia

Boris Minarik,
Katarina Hajtasova,
Prof. Anton Blazej
Dr.Alexandra Vancova

Slovenia

Martina Zupan
Dr. Marina Pintar
Dr. Branka Bracic Zeleznik
Andreja Susnik
Marjeta Krajnc
Prof.Brane Maticic

1.1 Objectives and scope of the Second Phase of the Dialogue

The CEE Dialogue is a decentralised, multi-year process, with milestones at the 3rd and 4th World Water Forum. The overall organisation and timing of the CEE Dialogue is co-ordinated with the Global Dialogue activities as well as with the overall work programme of the Common Implementation Strategy of the EU Water Framework Directive. The CEE Dialogue is co-ordinated also with other relevant activities of the GWP CEE, ERWG ICID, WWF Danube-Carpathian Programme and WWF Europe.

The key issues, principles and tools of Dialogue processes were agreed on the global and CEE WFE meetings on “How to organise Dialogue processes”.

The EU Working Document on CAP and WFD was considered as the most important EU document developed by the European Commission in 2003 for the implementation of the WFD in the field of Water, Agriculture and Environment. It was agreed to continue the cooperation between ICID, GWP and WWF in 2003 with the Dialogue on this document.

The Dialogue was continued in 2003 on three topics:

- (1) Dialogue on the conclusions and proposals of the reports of the First Phase of the Dialogue (National Dialogue Reports and the CEE WFE Dialogue Report);
- (2) Reporting on the Dialogue process;
- (3) Dialogue on the EC Working Document “The WFD and tools within the CAP to support its implementation”.

1.2 Results of the Second Phase of the Dialogue

The main results of the second phase of the CEE WFE Dialogue were the ten National Dialogue Reports including also the Dialogue Process Reports. The participating countries were Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia. A CEE WFE Report is also prepared under the title “CEE WFE Dialogue - Dialogue on the Implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive in Agricultural Water Management in Central and Eastern European EU Candidate Countries, *Final Report on the second phase of the Dialogue*”. This report was presented and distributed first in Bratislava on 27 March 2004.

The National Dialogue Reports were focused on the two types of conclusions and proposals

1. Conclusions and proposals on the National Dialogue Reports and the CEE WFE Dialogue Report
2. Conclusions and proposals on the EC Working Document “The WFD and tools within the CAP to support its implementation”

The key questions discussed by the Dialogue Process Reports were as follows:

- 1) Who was the Dialogue convener?
- 2) Which external agencies were supporting the Dialogue?
- 3) How the governmental agencies were involved in the process?
- 4) How the Dialogue was linked to the political process and institutions?
- 5) How was the dialogue linked to the other programs/actions for the implementation of the WFD?
- 6) What are the key issues being addressed?
- 7) What are the major obstacles/constraints that need to be overcome?
- 8) How was the dialogue process organized/planned?
- 9) Who were the key stakeholders in the dialogue process and what procedures have been applied to assure full stakeholder participation?
- 10) What Dialogue support tools have been used?

- 11) Is there sufficient research/knowledge backing to support the issue under discussion/consideration or there is a need for more background studies/research?
- 12) What outputs do you see emerging from this dialogue? How do you plan to document the learning, experiences and processes?
- 13) Do you require external support to conduct the future steps of the Dialogue? If so what type of support are you looking for?

1.3 Plans for the Third Phase of the Dialogue

It is proposed to focus the third phase of the dialogue on the actual activities of the implementation of the WFD with specific regard to the agricultural and rural sector and water management:

- Characterisation of the River Basin districts (and Water Bodies)
- Analyses of pressures and impacts (e.g. designation of the likely heavily modified water bodies)
- Economic analyses of water uses

2. Dialogue on the EC Working Document “The WFD and tools within the CAP to support its implementation”.

Bulgaria

The major conclusion of the Dialogue is that the national and SAPARD supporting system is not sufficient for covering the requirements of agriculture in the transition period.

The main proposals for integration of WFD and CAP:

- implementation of the integrated approach for the protection of groundwaters,
- establishment of financial mechanisms to stimulate the polluters for pollution reduction,
- organisation of WFD/CAP training courses,
- better communication between stakeholders,
- free access to the primary water quality information.

The final version of the EC Working Document on WFD/CAP has been adopted without any comments.

Estonia

The Estonian Dialogue group supports all the main points in the “Quick Hungarian Response” to the CAP/WFD document, but due to the Estonian climatic differences some of the Hungarian concerns are of less importance to them. For example, Estonia does not have so many irrigation related problems, however in some years the excess rainfall may cause harm to the crop yield. In recent years, due to the climate change, the weather has been behaving strangely and there have been draughts as well. Flooding of rivers is not a characteristic event in Estonia either, but last year there was a similar big and unexpected disaster after a heavy rainfall in NE Estonia.

In Estonia the manure handling and spreading practices need updating, especially in the Nitrate sensitive areas and may be this subsidy should not affect the summary subsidy per one enterprise.

In Estonia the cooperation of smaller agricultural enterprises (private farms) is not popular. Smaller units are more environmentally friendly and must be maintained, but for their survival joint project application and reporting or consultant help is necessary. While in Lithuania, Poland or Hungary the state is favouring cooperation very much, in Estonia, it is not done as the farmers do not want it. May be there could be some central mechanisms founded, to ensure a good and fair system.

Good examples for printed educational materials on water management and good practices are welcome as well as financial support for printing them.

Comments on the Draft Estonian Rural Development Plan (2003-2006) were formulated by the Dialogue meeting.

Hungary

The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development sent the Hungarian translation of the Working Document to over 150 interested organisations, including statutory partners, Non Government Organisations, Government Offices for the Regions, local authorities and Water Management Associations, requesting initial comments on the Commission's proposal. The covering letter specifically stated that any further consultation rounds would be sent to those who either commented on the original consultation or who registered an interest in the proposals.

The Hungarian and English version of the Working Document was also available on the website of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and on the website of the Union of Water Management Associations.

There were four written responses and five Dialogue meetings were held on the WFD/CAP document. Four regional meetings were organised in April and one national meeting on 10 July. The total number of the participants was over 100. There were a number of issues raised, which were outside the scope of the Working Document. Relevant comments and suggestions were considered.

The document on Hungarian responses summarises the written and oral responses received by the Ministry and reviewed, discussed and edited together with the representatives of the consortium established by the GWP Hungary, WWF Hungary, ICID Hungarian National Committee and the Hungarian Hydrological Society for the "Hungarian National Dialogue on the Implementation of the WFD in Agricultural Water Management".

The major Hungarian proposals for the corrections/amendments in the WFD/CAP document were as follows:

It was suggested to insert a new paragraph "According to the Commission enlargement proposals on agriculture, the starting level at which direct payments would be granted in CEECs for 2004, would be set at a rate equivalent to 25% of the present EU system. The progressive introduction of direct payments will proceed over a period of 10 years, i.e. the level then applicable in the current member states would be reached in 2013. The low rate of direct payments should be considered in CEECs in the application process of the supporting tools within the CAP.

It was suggested to consider buffer zones as protected zones within the list of "specific measures".

It was suggested to provide support:

- ≠ for active flood plains, former, present and reactivated floodplains, flood protection reservoirs, emergency reservoirs, low lands (as Environmentally Sensitive Areas), grassland instead of arable crops, extensive pasture and meadow on floodplains, extensive vegetable and fruit production, reedbed, wooded grasslands with native tree species, extensive fish ponds,
- ≠ for reparaCelling to re-install the hydromorphological status of surface waters,
- ≠ for general protection of wetlands and surface waters,
- ≠ for drought sensitive areas to increase preparedness and mitigation activities,
- ≠ for transformation of agricultural infrastructure (road-network, irrigation and drainage systems, agricultural facilities etc.) in Candidate Countries according to the new conditions caused by the privatisation, the market economy, the small and medium farms instead of the large farms etc. with regard to the obligations of the WFD and the relevant other EU directives,
- ≠ for implementation of programmes of measures making the agriculture of the candidate countries competitive on the European Market with regard to the obligations of the WFD and the relevant other EU directives.

It was suggested to insert two new paragraphs:

- 1) "Coordination of River Basin Management Planning under the WFD and the planning for programmes of measures to achieve the social and economic objectives (including the Rural Development, flood prevention and protection, drought management, public access, recreation, amenity of waterways etc.)"
- 2) "Common understanding of WFD and the supporting tools within CAP in case of specific artificial catchment areas (e.g. the Hungarian Great Plain, which is drained artificially by canals and pump-stations, the polders in Holland etc.)".

Lithuania

The Lithuanian Dialogue on the EC Working Document “The Water Framework Directive (WFD) and tools within the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) to support its implementation” (further WFD/CAP) has been started by the Lithuanian ICID in 2003. The WFD/CAP document was disseminated among the European National Committees of ICID with the request to comment it. The ICID ERWG has expressed its strong interest to edit comments and submit them to the responsible EU bodies.

The Chairman of the Lithuanian ICID provided comments to the Working Document (*Box 1*). It has been mentioned that the Working document (WD) is too restrictive and unclear in its form and content. “The Working Document is expected to be more optimistic in terms of highlighting challenges arising from implementation of the objectives of WFD and clear enough when describing the support opportunities coming from existing and/or future rural development practices” (*Maziliauskas, 2003*).

Beside that the consultation process with all agricultural stakeholders has been arranged during the preparation of measures laid down in the Single Programming Document. It was concluded after these consultations, that the farming community is not always able to participate adequately in the consultation process. The farmers comment very often on the problems only when they face them practically. That’s why this dialogue should be continued during the process of implementation of both documents: the WFD and CAP.

Box 1. Comments of the Lithuanian NICID to the EU Working Document on WFD/CAP

- The WD (p.4.1.5.) refers to the WFD derogations in respect of time of achieving the WFD objectives by the agricultural sector and providing for lower environmental objectives. This is crucial for the agricultural holdings undertaking restructuring and at the same time having the obligation to generate a lot of investments which are considered as “non-benefit investments” for meeting the requirements of the Nitrate Directive 91:676:EEC, the Plant Protection Directive 91/414/EEC, etc. It would be reasonable to suggest for the WD to refer clearly to those possible derogations, especially under p. 5.1 and p.5.3.
- The recommendation under the p.5.2.2 should be much better accepted by the farming community if it would contain the derogation regarding the right of the young farmers to apply for a transition period up to three years in order to comply with the minimum standards, as provided by the Council Regulation (EC) 1257/1999. This derogation is of special importance for the setting up young farmers of the new member states, where the initial investments in meeting the standards are rather high, and should be retained in the above regulation for the next financing period and, consequently, referred to in the WD.
- The WD under the p.5.2.7 is stating that the RD measure “Improving the processing and marketing of agricultural products” is currently not used for water protection. In fact, this statement should be reconsidered as, in reality, this measure is quite extensively used for water protection. All investment projects related to improving processing industry are specifically targeting water use efficiency (e.g. recycled water use) and waste water handling and treatment. The projects are undergoing the EIA procedures that are quite a significant contribution to water resources protection. It might be suggested that in the next financing period projects targeting the processing of agricultural products in a “water friendly way” should be given the priority elsewhere with no reference to the specific protected zones only (as stated in p. 5.2.7. of the WD).
- The WD in the p.5.2.8. should avoid referring to the afforestation of agricultural lands only (actually financed under the Guarantee section of EAGGF) as the recommendation for the contribution to the implementation of WFD in the next financing period. The afforestation of non-agricultural land (supported under the Guidance section of EAGGF) should also be considered as a contribution to the WFD objectives. Both should be giving the priority for targeting, among others, the prevention and control of degradation of lands (e.g. water erosion) in sensible areas.
- The statement of the WD in the p. 7 under (1) is misleading and has the opposing effect on farming community. It should refer to the existing compensation of investment costs (considering that the investments in meeting new standards make a part of the larger investment project) under the “Investment in agricultural holdings” measure provided by the Council Regulation (EC) 1257/1999. This kind of existing support by the expectations of the farming community should be

retained for the next financing period. The p.7 (1) should also refer to the support underlined in the paragraph (2). This would give the view of the wider range of opportunities for implementing new standards.

- The concluding statement under p.8.2.(3) regarding the harmonisation of appropriate support measures among the member states sharing the same river basin should have a more clear definition of what is the harmonisation meant about. The member states which are programming their support measures (e.g. for the use of structural funds) under the Single Programming Document for the country as a single region, might face serious problems in harmonising their support for a specific river basin shared by several member states. It might be suggested that this harmonisation of support measures should be limited to the harmonisation of support objectives and minimum standards prerequisite for providing the support for rural inhabitants (including farmers).
- The issue related to the Code of Good Farming Practice (CGFP- requested for the support within the measures under the Guarantee section of EAGGF) and the Code of Good Practice (CGP- for river basin management plan) should be reflected and explained adequately in the WD to avoid the conflicts which might occur due to the different interpretation of standard requirements by two different codes or to the different target area (region/ country based in CGFP but basin based in CGP).

Poland

One of the most difficult tasks arising from recommendations of the WFD is to implement adequate methods of management of the draining/irrigation systems and to obtain a good ecological status of streams and ditches used for agricultural purposes.

Having in mind the specifics of Polish agriculture and the existing water infrastructure it is thought that WFD/CAP Working Document should consider the following issues:

- financing of agriculture should mainly involve the development of infrastructure including water infrastructure (actions to improve exploitation of reclamation systems) even at a cost of direct subsidies;
- it is necessary to support the development of irrigation in grasslands situated in river valleys on peat soils mainly through the regulated outflow and maintaining high water tables in ditches. It is a standard method to restrict unfavourable processes like mineralization of organic soils;
- supporting the development of water-saving technologies for irrigation of field crops, orchards and vegetable crops. It is estimated that at least 3-4% of agricultural lands require irrigation (now irrigation covers 0.03%), at the same time it is necessary to limit the uptake of ground waters from deeper aquifers;
- supporting the reconstruction of small streams and ditches to improve their ecological status. It is not possible to achieve such a status in over 350 thousand km of rivers and channels in a short period of time. It is necessary to deal with small streams in the WFD in a separate way.
- CAP and plans for rural development should consider to a larger extent the development of agricultural landscape, construction/reconstruction of small water reservoirs including those for the extensive fish farming;
- plans for afforestation of post-agricultural lands should consider protection of water resources. Afforestation should be carried out in a way not to diminish the recharge of aquifers;
- land use in areas important for water management needs to be strictly determined. This refers to the use of infiltration areas (to the recharge of aquifers), to flooded terrains in river valleys intended for the retention of flood waters, to wetlands important for their natural values and to depressions like Żuławy or the Vistula delta.

Intensively discussed within the Dialogue were the remarks and proposals of Hungarian partners to the EU Working Document. Polish participants fully support postulates of Hungarian colleagues. Here we present only the remarks that extend beyond the document prepared by participants of the Dialogue in Hungary.

Romania

The Dialogue on Water for Food and Environment in Romania continued in the period April–December 2003 on the following topics:

- ⌘ The report on the National Dialogue on Water for Food and Environment in Romania (results of the First Phase of the national dialogue produced during 2002 and used by WFE –Task Force in the preparation of the Regional Dialogue Report in 2003,
- ⌘ CEE WFE Regional Dialogue report plus the discussions of parallel and common issues envisaged by the EU Water Framework Directive under Implementation with main focus on the agricultural pressures either points or diffuse sources, *Final Report on the first phase of the Dialogue 2001-2003*,
- ⌘ The EU Working Document on Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and Water Framework Directive (WFD).

Slovakia

The major conclusion of the Dialogue is that the national and SAPARD supporting system is not sufficient for covering the requirements of agriculture in the transition period in Slovakia.

The aim of the Dialogue was to explain the interaction between the agriculture and water and their overlaying policies (Common Agricultural Policy and Water Framework Directive) in specific conditions in Slovakia.

The objective of the program of the dialogue in 2003 was to discuss the following problems:

- ⌘ How does agriculture influence water bodies and related ecosystems ?
- ⌘ The main interactions between agriculture (as regulated by the CAP) and water (as regulated by the WFD).

Preparation of working documents for the reporting obligations in the year 2004 was discussed. The content and outline of “roof” report on the Danube river basin level and the national report on sub-basin level was analyzed and commented. It was concluded that the co-operation of the water management and agriculture sectors in the implementation of WFD and CAP has high importance.

Slovenia

The participants to the WFE dialogue did not have any objection to neither to the WFD and tools within the CAP to support its implementation nor to Hungarian response on the document. A lot of comments and discussion we have had regarding implementation. The time schedule for such enormous project, in which in some respect the thinking of the people has to turn, is relatively short. The opinion of the participants was, that the co-operation between competent authorities responsible for Rural Development programs and water management plans should be much more close. The dialogue process has shown that the experts working on the ground have been much more interested to the dialogue than decision makers level. The participants expressed a hope that all the written programs would be implemented. If so, we do not have to worry about the future of Slovenian agriculture and water management. The legal basis of the SAEP is the Agricultural Act (Official Gazette of RS, No. 54/00) with corresponding secondary legislation, while indirectly the program refers to several other regulations on environment protection, healthcare and veterinary medicine. Through SAEP the Slovene legal system is being adjusted to the legal system of EU regarding agricultural issues, especially agricultural structural measures and allocation of grants (Council Regulation (EC) No. 1257/1999 on support for rural development from European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund). Unfortunately in spite of this we could expect some difficulties in financial part of programs implementation.

The participants accented again the importance of the education process on all levels and to start immediately with public participation process and promotion of the ideas, presented in the documents and programs. The legislation, programs, knowledge are in place, however without strong support of the population the success would be put under question mark.

3. The Dialogue Process Reports

3.1 Who were the Dialogue conveners?

Bulgaria

Dr. Violina Hadjieva (national coordinator) - Institute for Economics of Agriculture
Dr. Galia Bardarska – Institute of Water Problems at Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Prof. Ivan Raev – Scientific-Coordination Centre for Global Changes at Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Dr. Snejana Moncheva – Institute of Oceanology at Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Milena Dimitrova – NGO “Centre for Environmental Information and Education”
Mrs Savka Shishkova – AWP Varna
Tinko Tinchev – AWP Ruse

Czech Republic

Evzen Polenka – Water Research Institute, Brno
Prof.Dr.Petr Dolejs – Water and Environmental Technology Team, Ceske Budejovice

Estonia

Maret Merisar, GWP Estonia
Dr.Enn Loigu, Environmental Engineering Institute of Tallin Technical University
Dr.Arvo Lital, Environmental Engineering Institute of Tallin Technical University

Hungary

Members of the WFE Dialogue Team:

Ferenc Fehér – National Union of the Water Management Associations
Gábor Kolossváry, Ministry of Agriculture and Regional Development,
Márta Konkoly, Ministry of Agriculture and Regional Development,
Istvan Ijjas, ICID/GWP

Members of the consortium for the organisation of the WFE Dialogue in Hungary:

Global Water Partnership Hungary,
Ministry of Agriculture and Regional Development,
Ministry of Environment and Water,
WWF – World Wide Fund for Nature, Hungary,
ICID Hungarian National Committee,
National Union of the Water Management Associations.

The Dialogue was supported by the

Hungarian Hydrological Society and the
Budapest University of Technology and Economics.

Sharing of the direct financial support

	per cent
Global Water Partnership Hungary	10
Ministry of Agriculture and Regional Development	50
National Union of the Water Management Associations	40

The preparation of the written documents as a knowledge base for the Dialogue was financed by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

Latvia

Sandra Krivmane – GWP-Latvia

Litvania

Lithuanian Water Partnership

Poland

Prof. Waldemar Mioduszewski, President, National Committee of ICID
Prof. Janusz Kindler, Global Water Partnership

Romania

Liviu N.Popescu

Head of Department in the National Institute for Research and Development for Environment Protection, ICIM Bucuresti
President of Country Water Partnership of GWP: “Asociatia Parteneriatul Global al Apei din Romania”

Danut Maria

Institute for Research and Design for Irrigation and Drainage - ISPIF Bucuresti – partner of GWP and of Romanian CWP

Teodor Lucian Constantinescu

National Administration "Romanian Waters" - A.N. “Apele Romane”
partner of GWP and of Romanian CWP

Slovakia

Conveners:

- Slovak Water Management Enterprise, Company for Water Management
- Union of Land Engineers, NGO
- Slovak Committee for Irrigation and Drainage
- Slovak Hydrometeorological Institute
- Slovak Centrum for Sustainable Development

Contact persons:

Boris Minarik,
Katarina Hajtasova,
Prof.Anton Blazej
Dr.Alexandra Vancova

The supporting organizations were:

- Slovak Hydrometeorological Institute
- Research Institute of Irrigation
- Institute of Hydrology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences
- Soil Fertility Research Institute
- Non-governmental organizations:
- Union of Landscape Engineers of Slovakia
- Slovak Centrum for Sustainable Development
- National representatives of ICID ERWG
- Slovak Agricultural University, Nitra
- Trenčín University of Alexander Dubček, Trenčín

Slovenia

GWP Slovenia was the main convener of the dialogue (analyzing the comments to the background

documents, organizing the dialogue and national consultation meeting, drawing up the final version of the report).

Martina Zupan was the responsible person, GWP Slovenija;

Co-operating institutions and individual experts:

Dr. Marina Pintar presented and wrote the report on the drainage and new irrigation technologies, which enable sustainable agricultural practice in Slovenia; University of Ljubljana, Biotechnical Faculty, Center for Agricultural Land Management and Agro Hydrology,

Dr. Branka Bracic Zeleznik, presented the water supply company measures taken to eliminate the consequences of no sustainable agricultural practice; Water Supply Company of Ljubljana;

Andreja Susnik, agro meteorologist, presented and wrote the report on climate variability and water deficit of agricultural plants; Ministry of Environment, Spatial Planning and Energy (MESPE), Environmental Agency of the Republic of Slovenia;

Marjeta Krajnc, presented the groundwater quality in Slovenia; Ministry of Environment, Spatial Planning and Energy (MESPE), Environmental Agency of the Republic of Slovenia;

Prof. Brane Maticic, President of the Slovenian National Committee of ICID, prepared an annex to the National Report.

3.2 Which external agencies were supporting the Dialogue?

Bulgaria

The Wetland Seminar was supported by DEF, GEF, UNDP and CEIE.

The local and national WFE dialogues were supported by the GWP partner organisations.

Czech Republic

Some events organised by different professional organisations (Czech Scientific and Technical Water Association, Czech Union of Civil Engineers, Czech House of Chartered Engineers and Technicians, Ministry of Environment etc.) contributed to the Dialogue.

Estonia

Technical support was provided by Estonian Water Association, Estonian Institute of Ecology, the Consulting Agency Maves and several local municipalities. One speaker, Mr. Indrikis was invited from Latvia, from the River Daugava Project.

Financial support was provided by GWP CEE; Baltic American Partnership Programme and Mantra East project.

Hungary

Supporting organisations:

Hungarian Association for Agro-Sciences, Session of Water Management,
Hungarian Hydrological Society,
Hungarian National Committee of International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage.

Poland

The Dialogue is supported by NGO's like WWF-Poland and IUCN-Poland. Actively participated the Polish Association of Water and Reclamation Engineers and Technicians and Polish Ecological Club.

Many institutions dealing with water and agricultural problems contributed actively to the Dialogue. Particularly important merit contribution was provided by the following institutions and universities:

- ☞ Institute of Meteorology and Water Management,
- ☞ Institute of Land Reclamation and Grassland Farming,
- ☞ Institute of Crops, Fertilisation and Soil Sciences,
- ☞ Institute of Building, Mechanisation and Electrification of Agriculture,
- ☞ Institute of Agrophysics, Polish Academy of Sciences,
- ☞ Warsaw Agricultural University (Department of Landscape and Environmental Engineering),
- ☞ Warsaw University of Technology (Department of Environmental Engineering).

Romania

- ☞ The International Association of Water Users (IAWA) was represented by Prodan Emil – Chairman, and Goldenber Vaida Victoria -Executive Secretary of National Water Association (ARA), members of European Council of IAWA.
- ☞ The Ministry of Environment and Water Management
- ☞ Water Director
- ☞ Research Institute for Irrigation and Drainage
- ☞ National Water Administration “Apele Romane”

Slovakia

The supporting organizations were:

- ☞ Slovak Hydrometeorological Institute
- ☞ Research Institute of Irrigation
- ☞ Institute of Hydrology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences
- ☞ Soil Fertility Research Institute
- ☞ Non-governmental organizations
- ☞ Union of Landscape Engineers of Slovakia
- ☞ Slovak Centrum for Sustainable Development
- ☞ National representatives of ICID ERWG
- ☞ Slovak Agricultural University, Nitra
- ☞ Trenčín University of Alexander Dubček, Trenčín

Slovenia

National ICID coordinator, Prof. Dr. Brane Maticic, President of SINCID-Slovenian National Committee on Irrigation and Drainage, co-operated in the preparation phase of the dialogue process. He has prepared a separate – independent contribution on drainage and irrigation in Slovenia.

3.3 How the governmental agencies were involved in the process?

Bulgaria

The Ministry of Environment and Water (MoEW) and the Executive Agency of Environment at the MoEW have been co-organisers of the WFE dialogue conferences. Reports on monitoring of nitrate and pesticides pollution were presented by the Executive Agency of Environment at the GWP WFE national conference. The guidelines on good agricultural practice drafted for the Ministry of Environment and Water was disseminated for the participants of the national WFE events. The main issues of the gap analysis of the implementation of the Nitrate Directive (Protection of waters against pollution caused by Nitrates from agricultural sources) and the recommendations of the analysis were presented.

Hungary

At the very beginning of the process it was clear that for a successful country dialogue more partners were needed. GWP-Hungary therefore was looking for organizations sharing the above objectives and found very soon interested parties, like the Ministry of Agriculture and Regional Development, Ministry of Environment and Water, WWF – World Wide Fund, Hungary, ICID Hungarian National Committee, two universities and the National Union of Water Management Associations.

Water Management Associations (WMAs) are independent organizations playing important role in solving rural water management tasks. Members are individuals or agricultural companies having land or other properties within the area of interest of a WMA, and therefore being locally interested in the protection against water induced damages including excess water as well. Presently there are 72 WMAs in Hungary covering almost the whole territory of the country. Members contribute financially according to the value of their property. The Ministries proved to be committed partners showing not only political will, but also providing financial support to the local level dialogues organized in the countryside, as well as delegating high level officers to help facilitate the meetings and draw conclusions. WWF-Hungary, the ministries and ICID National Committee were instrumental supporters by providing keynote lecturers at the meetings and giving professional expertise. The consortium was based on mutual interest and created a constructive atmosphere for the whole process. GWP-Hungary played a catalytic role which was appreciated by the other members.

Poland

Water management is within the responsibility of two ministries. Ministry of Environment is responsible for the whole of water management, development strategies and protection of water resources and for the maintenance of large rivers together with their technical facilities. Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development is responsible for the construction and management of irrigation and draining systems, for the maintenance of small rivers and water reservoirs important for agriculture and for the maintenance and exploitation of flood embankments.

The Dialogue is supported and advanced by both ministries and by their subjected agencies.

Ministry of Environment is represented by the Department of Water Resources, while the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development is represented by the Department of European Integration and Department of Land Management.

The Dialogue involved also the following governmental agencies:

- Regional Boards of Water Management subjected to Minister of Environment and responsible for the whole of water management in selected catchment basins. Poland is divided into 7 regions administered by the Regional Boards of Water Management.
- Provincial Boards of Reclamation and Water Facilities subjected to provincial governor and also to Minister of Agriculture. They are responsible for water management for agricultural purposes.
- Provincial Agricultural Advisory Centres subjected to Minister of Agriculture.

Slovakia

Different bodies and representatives, mainly Slovak Water Management Authorities, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, Slovak Hydrometeorological Institute, Water Research Institute, Slovak Agriculture University, Hydromelioration Authority and other governmental organizations working in the field of water and agriculture policy supported the Dialogue.

Romania

Global Water Partnership is present in Romania from 1998. Since then a number of activities and events have been organised. The IWRM principles, examples, technical books, GWP documents were presented in a number of events. The major partners, participants and also beneficiaries were the National Water Authorities, the Ministry of Water and Environmental Protection, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Health, the water and wastewater enterprises.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Forests, Waters and Environment sent the Romanian translation of the EU Working Document on Common Agricultural Practices to over 60 organisations, including statutory partners, NGOs, Regional Government Offices and local authorities. Shortened versions of the CAP codes will be done and sent to the Chambers of Agriculture. The Romanian and English version of the Working Document will be also available soon on the web-site of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forests, Waters and Environment and on the web-site of the Union of Water Management Associations.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Forests, Waters and Environment was represented at the dialogue by George Constantin, Romanian Water Director, Head of the Water Department. He is involved in the negotiation process with the European Union regarding the implementation of the EU Directives in the field of waters.

Other agencies involved:

- ICITID (Ioanițoaia Horațiu),
- Academy for Agricultural and Forestry Science - ASAS (Gheorghe Mihai),
- I.N.I.D. (Virgil Dobre),
- Ecorural (Silvian V.),
- Romanian Society for History and Retrology of Agriculture S.I.R.A.R. – (Nițu Ion),
- Engineering Association for Construction and Development of Irrigation, Drainage and Rural Communities- AIFCDR- (Mateiu Codreanu),
- Faculty of Irrigation, Drainage and Environment Engineering - USAMV- (Mărăcineanu Florin) and
- ISPIF (Dănuț Maria).

Slovenia

At the very beginning of the national consultation process GWP Slovenia has contacted the Ministry of Environment, Spatial Planning and Energy, Ministry of Agriculture, Chamber for Agriculture and Forestry of the Republic of Slovenia and Chamber of Economy of the Republic of Slovenia, asking them to involve appropriate groups and stakeholders into the dialogue process. The group of experts from the regional Agricultural Advisory Services (Chamber for Agriculture and Forestry) contributed substantial comments and proposals.

Marjeta Krajnc (MESPE) presented the water quality problems and measures taken by MESPE to protect the groundwater quality endangered by intensive agriculture. Andreja Susnik reported on impact of climatic variability on agricultural production.

3.4 How the Dialogue was linked to the political process and institutions?

Bulgaria

Politicians and decision makers attended the national GWP events and the WFE Dialogue meetings. Hristina Petrova- the head of the Scientific-Technical Union of Water Affairs in Bulgaria – attended the GWP WFE workshop in Sofia, on 3 October 2003. Prof. Ibrahim Kassimov - the agriculture advisor of the President of Bulgaria - attended the National GWP WFE Conference on 28 November 2003. Dr. Borislav Velikov - the deputy president of the Commission of Environment and Water at the Parliament attended the IWRM discussion in Sofia on 17 – 18 December 2003. This is the way that has been used by GWP-Bulgaria to make a bridge between WFE stakeholders and politicians.

Czech Republic

The major achievements of the Twinning Project on “Implementation of WFD to the Czech Republic Water Politics” were discussed by the GWP WFE platform:

- characterisation of river basins and assessment of the status of waters for river basin management planning;
- approaches for public participation in the planning process; and
- relationship between river basin management planning and rural development and regional planning.

Estonia

Several participants of the dialogue are also members of the working group issuing the official Water Management Plan for Lake Peipsi Watershed. All useful comments and ideas were recorded and will be used in the final official policy paper (Sub Basin Water Management Plan). Estonian Water

Association is taking care of passing any relevant information to the other public discussions, for example to the process of drafting the Rural Development Plan for the year 2003-2006.

Hungary

The EU accession is an unprecedented political step and as the likely date of joining the EU (2004) is approaching it is becoming the issue number one in the candidate countries. Although by the end of 2001 the accession negotiations on the environment chapter were provisionally concluded with nine countries, the implications of becoming EU member is still unclear for many professionals of the water and the agri-food sector. On the other hand a study confirms that all candidate countries will reap significant benefits from EU environmental directives (Wallstrom, 2002).

Luckily this situation (definite support to join, uncertainties related to implication and clear signs of positive impact on the environment) helps to call the attention of senior decision makers and governmental officers to the Dialogue process in the CEE countries. The efforts of the Country Water Partnerships (CWPs) preparing the national consultations were generally acknowledged and supported by relevant ministries and the meetings were attended by their representatives. They considered the meetings as a contribution to the ministries' public awareness campaign and usually gained good impressions. The top-down and bottom-up approaches complemented each other and resulted in trust building.

Dialogue results were well communicated to competent ministries. Information for decision makers on practical obstacles encountered in the field and on local preferences are prerequisites of implementing the Dialogue results. This process however is time consuming and as envisaged the Dialogue will last until 2006.

Regarding the CEE countries located in the Danube River Basin, both GWP-CEE and WWF are observers with the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR), which includes governmental delegates of the countries sharing the basin (the most complex one in the world in terms of number of countries involved). ICPDR provides the multilateral setting of the implementation of Water Framework Directive. Observers are not idle parties at the meetings; they bring expertise and from time to time volunteer or are requested to contribute with issue papers, like the recent one on public participation in connection with the implementation of WFD. They are active partners in the lasting political process of joining the EU and able to influence the decisions of this international body including EU members states and associated countries as well. The CEE Dialogue consortium (GWP, WWF and ICID) therefore can put through the ideas, recommendations and results of country and regional meetings directly by its observers and indirectly through country delegates. This is the case in the Danube basin, where six out of the ten CEE countries can be found.

Poland

Since the Dialogue is targeted on implementation of the Water Framework Directive and the Common Agricultural Policy which are the official EU documents transposed into Polish legislation, the Dialogue by necessity has some linkages to the political processes. Implementation of the WFD is an obligation undertaken by Polish Government within the adaptation of Polish regulations to the directives of the EU.

There is no close connection between the Dialogue and political activity, however, postulates and conclusions formulated within the Dialogue are used in works of Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment.

Romania

The ANAR and ICIM have been organised ten workshops in 2003 at the river basin authorities. The representatives of the RO-CWP were involved and the relationships between the IWRM and WFD were discussed.

Slovakia

Politicians and decision makers attended the national GWP events and the WFE Dialogue meetings. Since the Dialogue is targeted on implementation of the Water Framework Directive and the Common Agricultural Policy as official EU documents are transposed step by step into Slovak legislation.

Implementation of the WFD is an obligation undertaken by Slovak Government within the acquis process with the aim to transpose the directives of the EU into Slovak legislation.

Slovenia

Some participants in the dialogue process and WFE meeting are the members of WFD working groups and the experts preparing pilot water management plans. The political level and institutions have been informed and they gave us some positive response in sense of some directions for future agricultural practices in Slovenia given in Slovene agri-environmental program, 2001.

The political will to solve the problems is obvious, however as far as the opinion of agricultural sector concerned, the measures should be taken more harmonized with other sectors (environment, health) and vice versa.

3.5 How was the dialogue linked to the other programs/actions for the implementation of the WFD?

Bulgaria

GWP-Bulgaria and Bulgarian GWP partners (more than 54 organizations) have a good collaboration not only with governmental organizations but also with NGOs. They played an active role at the National Conference on IWRM organized by TIME Foundation in Sofia on 17 – 18 December 2003. The results of the investigation of the people knowledge on the necessary EC pre-accession changes in the field of water management were reported at the Conference (1013 persons were interviewed within the investigation).

Poland

The linkage was provided mostly through the representatives of main organisations responsible for the implementation of WFD, i.e. Regional Boards of Water Management that actively participate in the Dialogue.

Romania

The linkage was assured mostly through the meetings. The key issues of IWRM, the WFD/CAP and implementation of the WFD were discussed by the representatives of the public administration, the NGOs, the water users, the RO-CWP, the local communities and other stakeholders.

Slovakia

The linkage was assured mostly through the co-operation with working groups established on the level of the ICPDR (Danube and national scale).

Slovenia

The organisres of the Dialogue co-operate with the members of the EU and ICPDR WFD working groups, however the formal links are not established yet. GWP Slovenija was invited to participate in GEF activity on public participation in Danubian countries.

3.6 What key issues being addressed?

Bulgaria

Important proposals were formulated in three groups of issues:

- institutional framework for the implementation of the WFD;
- legal transposition of WFD;
- protection of the status of waters.

Czech Republic

Two major issues were in the focus of the Dialogue in 2003:

- establishment of the institutional framework for the implementation of the WFD;
- evaluation of the catastrophic flood in August 2002.

“Commissions for Water Planning” were established in 2003. These commissions will function as consultative bodies for the public authorities according to the provisions of the WFD. Such commission was also established by the Ministry of Agriculture. The members of the Commission are:

- central water authorities;
- central authority for rural development planning;
- Ministry of Interior;
- river basin authorities;
- water research and development institutions;
- water users;
- NGOs.

Commissions for Water Planning were also established by the eight river basin authorities. These commissions are considered as very promising bodies for the development of the WFE/WFD Dialogue.

Estonia

The roundtable seminar was organised by Peipsi Water Club and Peipsi Center for Transboundary Cooperation at 26th of August 2002 in Rāpina. Over 30 participants from different counties of the Lake Peipsi River Basin District took part in this seminar. After the plenary session, where the ideas of GWP, integrated water management and main tasks of the Water Management Plans were explained, three working groups discussed the key issues of water management, agriculture, food and changes in climatic conditions:

- reliability of the official statistics;
- main sources of nitrogen pollution;
- main risks to the human health;
- priorities in food consumption;
- the use of bottled water instead of tap-water;
- water quality in small rivers and brooks;
- investments for environmental protection;
- possibilities for improvement of public participation in water management.

The major conclusions relevant to the Dialogue:

- more investments are needed in the water management sector, mainly in rural areas and in agriculture;
- the investments for BAT and manure storages had been estimated as the most efficient.

Latvia

The Action Program against nitrate pollution from agricultural sources was the key issue of the Latvian Dialogue in 2003. The Action Programme has been elaborated to comply with the requirements of the Latvian national legislation, the EU Nitrate Directive (Council Directive 91/676/EEC), the EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) and the HELCOM recommendations.

Since 1994 Latvia is partner in the Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (Helsinki, 1992). In addition, as a contracting party to the Helsinki Convention, Latvia is obliged to make measures to control pollution to the Baltic Sea from land-based and other sources.

In the Action Programme there are also recommendations included from the Code of Good Agriculture Practice for Latvia that is already prepared and approved in 1999.

The Action Programme was prepared by the Ministry of Agriculture in cooperation with the Ministry of Environment. The Latvian University of Agriculture, experts of research institutions, advisory services and other organizations were involved in the elaboration of the Action Programme. It is planned to adopt this Programme in the beginning of 2004.

The measures for financing of the Nitrate Pollution Control Action Programme are presented in the Latvian National Dialogue Report.

Poland

Basic results, conclusions and proposals arising from the Dialogue are as follows:

- it is necessary to implement integrated water management in rural areas not only to satisfy agricultural needs but also to consider the requirements of other users including the natural environment since drainage and irrigation systems are parts of the total water management;
- it is necessary to reorient water management systems. It seems reasonable to enlarge the scope of activity of Provincial Boards of Reclamation and Water Facilities which should manage water resources in agricultural areas and not only in irrigation-drainage systems;
- water protection issues should be better represented in the works of Provincial Agricultural Advisory Centres. It is necessary to consider pro-ecological methods of water management in rural areas in the next issue of the Code of Good Agricultural Practises;
- presently implemented agro-environmental programmes should consider financial needs of activities associated with the protection of water resources.

Romania

The Dialogue was focused on the implementation of the WFD in the field of agriculture. The pressures and impacts from agricultural activities and the main sources were discussed with specific attention to the diffuse pollution. It was concluded that the cooperation between the authorities competent for water resources management and agricultural activities should be improved.

Slovakia

The objective of the program of the Dialogue was to discuss the following problems:

- How does agriculture influence water bodies and related ecosystems ?
- The main interactions between agriculture (as regulated by the CAP) and water (as regulated by the WFD)
 1. Interaction on administrative level (timing of planning under WFD and the CAP, Co-ordination in programming of measures, synergies from CAP and WFD regarding the identification of environmental issues, competition for land, derogations)
 2. Interaction on farm level (measures under the WFD, standards, the polluter pays principle, competition issues for farmers in different river basins, broadened objective of the WFD compared to earlier water legislation)
- Policy measures of the current Common Agricultural Policy to support and implement the WFD
 1. The common market organizations
 2. Rural Development (investment in agriculture holdings, setting up of young farmers, training, early retirement, less favoured areas, agri-environment, improving processing and marketing, forestry, promoting the adaptation and development of rural areas)
 3. Good farming practice and minimum standards
 4. Consultation process
 5. LEADER+ as part of Structural Funds

- Further development of policy tools of the CAP to support and implement the WFD

Discussions concerning integration of agriculture in the WFD process were interesting and valuable. The suggestion for straightening of the implementation process in this direction was called mainly by agriculture partners.

The further problems discussed during workshops and meetings were the Rural Development plan of Slovakia 2004-2006 that the Government of Slovakia finally approved.

Slovenia

The key issues addressed were as follows:

- the impact of water to agriculture and the impact of agriculture to water (drainage, soil erosion, irrigation);
- climate variability and limited possibilities for irrigation in most drought affected areas of Slovenia;
- education of farmers.

3.7 What are the major obstacles/constraints that need to be overcome?

Bulgaria

The major obstacles and constraints that need to be overcome are institutional and economic ones. The WFE dialogue of the responsible institutions should be developed.

Estonia

The main obstacles mentioned in the dialogue were

- the insufficient statistical data and
- insufficient environmental information on local and regional level.

The nature of this problem is related to the insufficient local level administrative capacities and central level data collection and monitoring system.

Hungary

There were some obstacles of the Dialogue processes:

- the guidance documents were still under development,
- a large amount of information is covered by the guidance documents,
- the difficulties of the common understanding of the provisions of the WFD with regard to the rural water management aspects,
- the difficulties of the simplification of the professional terms and provisions under the WFD making them understandable for the non-professional participants of the Dialogue process,

Most of the WFD documents are not understandable for the general public and also not for the professionals who are not familiar with the WFD. The WFD is focussed on the planning for programmes of measures to achieve the environmental objectives. It should be explained for the public, how this planning will be integrated with the planning of measures to achieve the social and economic objectives (e.g. integration with the plans called “sector plans” in WFD).

The further discussion on the best approaches and tools for country dialogue processes would be very useful. The dialogue has not been finished, many problems remained unsolved, yet some actions are undertaken at various levels to improve environmental quality in rural areas.

The key elements of the knowledge-base for the CEE WFE Dialogue in the next phase of the Dialogue will be the guidance documents completed by the EU CIS Working Groups. It should be considered a key issue how to adopt these guidance documents – the main knowledge base for the implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive - in the agricultural areas in the CEE region with regard to the specific CEE conditions. The international exchange on the practical application and

adoption of the guidance documents would be also useful (e.g. tool-box/approaches for integrated river basin management planning).

Poland

Not all specialists are aware that food production must not be the basic task of agriculture. Most agricultural specialists are of the opinion that a farm must maximise production while, on the other hand, some ecologists think agricultural activity poses a great threat to natural environment.

Lacking possibility of direct contacts with farmers was a problem often encountered during the Dialogue. It is a result of farm dispersion (a great number of farmers) and a lack of an organisation that would represent the farms.

A need is being felt of closer co-operation between Regional Boards of Water Management and institutions responsible for agriculture like Provincial Agricultural Advisory Centres.

Romania

The lack of appropriate technologies and machineries are the major obstacles in the implementation process of the good, environmentally friendly agricultural practices. Also the financial resources in order to apply the environmentally friendly procedures are another major issues which are breaking the sustainable agricultural practices application .

Slovakia

The major obstacles and constrains that need to be overcome are institutional and economic ones. From the point of view of the public participation it is difficult to disseminate information and documents concerning very complex policy. Most of the WFD documents are not understandable for the general public and also not for the professionals who are not familiar with the WFD.

Slovenia

The major constraint is the time needed to change the farmers attitude. A lot of effort in education and promotion will be needed to persuade the farmers that they could manage a farm more efficient by using less water, fertilizers and chemicals and by that to impact the environment much less.

The promising mechanism are in the agri-environmental programme foreseen possibilities, eligibility and obligations for accession of direct payments for implementing organic farming.

3.8 How was the dialogue process organized/planned?

Bulgaria

The Dialogue meetings in the second phase were organised in Sofia (national conference on 28 November 2003), in Ruse (Wetlands Seminar on 4-6 April 2003) and in Varna (Black Sea Conference on 13 – 18 October 2003). The National Conference on IWRM was also an important relevant event (organized by TIME Foundation and Ministry of Environment and Water on 17 – 18 December 2003 in Sofia).

The virtual and direct discussions of the stakeholders were the main approach of the WFE dialogue. Dissemination of the translated WFE dialogue reports and the East-to-East information exchange is very useful for Bulgaria. The national conferences, seminars, round-tables, home pages (www.gwpbg.org; www.gwp.hit.bg), the Water Newsletter etc. are considered as efficient approaches for the dialogue.

Estonia

The GWP Dialogue on Water for Food and Environment was held in SE Estonia, R pina on 26 August 2002 as one part of a longer seminar. The main event was called “Informing the inhabitants of the Lake Peipsi Watershed about integrated water management problems”. The Dialogue in R pina was covering the issues of Lake Peipsi Watershed, and as Estonia is said to be one waterbasin with 8 sub basins, it means that the scope of the dialogue was a sub basin.

The seminar was organized by GWP Estonia (Estonian Water Association) from an NGO called Peipsi CTC or Peipsi Centre for Transboundary Cooperation. The facilitator of the dialogue was Mr. Ülo Sults.

The 2nd WFE Dialogue event in Estonia, held on 26 November 2003 to discuss the WRD/CAP document, was different from the Rāpina Dialogue. The location was a seminar room in Tallinn, in Rāvala Boulevard 8, where a lot of environmental lectures and trainings are held.

Hungary

The countryside events were organized in a form of a “road show” in various spots of the country starting with general presentations on the problems, prevailing trends and objectives of the Dialogue. Since the main driving force in the CEE countries is the joining to the EU and the implementation of the Water Framework Directive is a major task also for the candidate countries, the EU water policy as well as its agricultural policy was presented. Other important regulation, which was referred to in many countries (Lithuania, Romania, Estonia, Latvia) is the Nitrate directive with the objective of reducing water pollution caused or induced by nitrates used in agriculture and preventing further such pollution.

The wetland restoration programme of WWF-Hungary was reported and its relation to the WFD was highlighted. This was followed by questions and answers in plenary. Key questions have been then formulated, which were discussed in small working groups of six to eight participants. While the facilitators were the lecturers of the plenary session, the reporter was a volunteer from the participants in order to receive feedback from those whose opinion is the most important for decision makers and encourage real dialogue.

The attendees of the Dialogue meetings were members of the local WMAs, farmers, representatives of agricultural companies, municipalities, professionals from district water authorities, environmental inspectorates, local governments, ministries, universities, NGOs (WWF and ICID) and GWP, presenting real grass root interest in the discussions.

The Dialogue meetings were prepared by the organisation team. The most important elements of the Knowledge Base of the CEE WFE Dialogue are the series of the guidance documents drafted by the EU CIS Working Groups for the implementation of the WFD. The summaries and synthesis of the drafts of the guidance documents with regard to the WFE Dialogue have been prepared by the key-note speakers of the Dialogue meetings and distributed through the information system of the WMAs.

Geographical spread of the Dialogue:

- national - the Hungarian part of the Danube River Basin District;
- regional - the sub-basins covered by the regional groups of the Water Management Associations (four regional groups);
- local - the sub-basins covered by the Water Management Associations (76 Water Management Associations in Hungary).

The countryside events were organized in a form of a “road show” in various spots of the country in four regions. List of Dialogue meetings and venues in 2003:

- First round: April 2003
 - Celldömök
 - Lengyeltóti
 - Kiskunmajsa
 - Sárospatak
- Second round: July 2003
 - Mosonmagyaróvár
 - Debrecen
 - Szolnok
 - Szarvas
- Plenary meeting, July 2003
 - Budapest
- Third round: October 2003
 - Mezőkövesd
 - Szeged

- €# Tamási
- €# Tapolca
- Plenary meeting, October 2003
 - €# Budapest
- Plenary meeting, December 2003
 - €# Budapest

Latvia

Seminars were organised within the framework of the Daugava River Basin Project for the Regional Environmental Boards and local municipalities on the river basin management to reduce water pollution caused by agricultural sources. The representative of Global Water Partnership (GWP) – Latvia participated in these seminars. GWP – Latvia is promoting the public participation in the implementation process of the EU WFD requirements.

Lithuania

The overall purpose of the 2nd phase national dialogue on Water, Food and Environment in Lithuania was to discuss the possibility of an agreement between the agricultural production and environmental security through sustainable water management in agriculture. Two main EC documents: Water Framework Directive (WFD) and Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) have served as a basis for discussion during the dialogue process. The idea of the dialogue was the exchange of views and concerns between the parties directly responsible for the implementation of the WFD (national environmental authorities) and the farmer community, who will be directly affected by the Water Framework Directive. The national dialogue report has been drafted following the guidelines prepared by the GWP-CEE Task Force leader.

The 1st phase dialogue on Water, Food and Environment in Lithuania has been organised in 2002. The draft national report has been prepared by the purposefully established Working Group, distributed to a wide circle of stakeholders, their comments processed and reflected in the final report which has been submitted to the GWP-CEE. The procedure has worked quite well and it was decided to use the same course for the 2nd phase dialogue.

The LWP has established a Working Group (WG) for drafting the national report. The organisations represented by the members of the WG were as follows:

1. Ministry of Environment
2. Ministry of Agriculture
3. Ministry of Health
4. Geological Survey
5. European delegation in Lithuania
6. Environmental Protection Agency
7. ICID - Lithuania
8. WWF – Lithuania
9. Institute of Agriculture
10. Lithuanian Water Partnership

Lithuanian Water Partnership has acted as a convener of the dialogue process. Draft report was prepared at the end of 2003 and distributed to LWP members. The possibilities of the consensus among the WFD and CAP have been discussed at the national LWP meeting held on 11th December, 2003.

Requirements and status of implementation of the relevant EU directives (particularly the Nitrate directive) have been taken into consideration during the dialogue.

The Action Programme for implementation of EU Nitrate Directive (approved by the Government of Lithuania on the 26th of August 2003) emphasise the requirement to implement the following measures:

1. Livestock density should be not more than 1,7 LU/ha of agricultural land;
2. Amount of nitrogen applied (both organic and mineral) should not be more than 170 kg/N/ha;
3. Winter crop coverage should be minimum 50 %;
4. All farms having more than 300 LU must establish manure/slurry storages and spray manure/slurry with a special equipment

Implementation of the of Nitrate directive has been organised in two phase projects assisted by the Danish government in 2001 and 2003.

Article 5 of the Nitrates Directive states that Member States shall draw up and implement suitable monitoring programmes to assess the agricultural action programmes. The monitoring programme should make it possible to establish the extent of nitrate pollution in the waters from agricultural sources.

The monitoring in relation to the Nitrate Directive will be co-ordinated with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive and the Drinking Water Directive, as both of these Directives demands surface and groundwater monitoring.

The concluding remark is that implementation of all above mentioned directives should be closely co-ordinated with the implementation of the Common Agricultural Policy in order to achieve desired consensus between the formerly conflicting sectors of environment and agricultural production.

Poland

The dialogue was coordinated and organised by non-governmental organisations: Global Water Partnership, Poland (prof. Janusz Kindler) and the National Committee of ICID (prof. Waldemar Mioduszewski).

The dialogue carried out in Poland consists mainly in organisation of meetings and seminars and in publication of information associated with the topic "Water-Food-Environment". In the year 2003 earlier forms of activity were continued and involved:

1. co-organisation of the regional conference "The development of regional and local initiatives with the use of water infrastructure of Podlaskie Province" (Augustów, 26-27 September 2003). About 80 persons participated in the conference, 10 contributions were presented and conclusions were elaborated. Conference materials were published in a journal "Informacje Naukowe i Techniczne [Scientific and Technical Info]". The conference was devoted to regional problems and had to answer the question whether water management could be a stimulator of the economic development in the region where agriculture is dominating and river valleys have high natural values.
2. organisation of a seminar "Water Framework Directive and methods of supporting its implementation resulting from the Common Agricultural Policy", Warsaw, 5 December 2003. The idea of the seminar was to discuss in a broad team of stakeholders the possibilities and ways of effective implementation of Water Framework Directive in rural areas. Four introductory lectures were invited, which represented different viewpoints:
 - €# Code of Good Agricultural Practise as an element of implementation of the WFD;
 - €# The role of agro-environmental programmes in implementation of the WFD;
 - €# Adaptation of water management in agriculture to the requirements of the WFD;
 - €# Exploitation and maintenance of irrigation-draining systems from the standpoint of the requirements of the WFD.

Fifty participants of the seminar represented stakeholders from agriculture, water management and ecology sectors. Representatives of Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Ministry of Environment, Regional Boards of Water Management, Provincial Boards of Reclamation and Water Facilities, Provincial Agricultural Advisory Centres, scientific institutes and universities were also present.

Working EU document "The Water Framework Directive (WFD) and tools within the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) to support its implementation" was translated into Polish and edited in a form of a booklet. The document was a base for discussion during the seminar of 5 Decemebr 2003 and, moreover, was sent to institutions interested in these topics.

Romania

As it was pointed out also at the point 3.6 of this report, the need to move the discussions from the central administration and research levels to the great public, to the water users either they are institutions or private farmers, is a must for the success of the implementation of WFD and other EU directives, but also for IWRM and other GWP documents which are focused on the optimization of water use and ways of waters consumptions. In this respect it was mentioned during different

workshops and dialogue meetings, the need for discussion on different thematic and/or sectoral issues that have to be organised, the selection being made according with categories of users, but also some issues with general informative and educational character for the rest of auditorium

The main users that were mentioned during the discussions:

- ☞ The Association of Water Users for Irrigations
- ☞ The Farmers Associations which are in advance pressure to be created
- ☞ The agricultural products processors like food industry with different sectors
- ☞ Different water providers for population, industry, etc
- ☞ The Offices for the Protection of Consumers in the quality of protector of consumers interest
- ☞ The water consumers industries, like sugar factories, meat processing units, etc
- ☞ Te balneo-turistic industries

It is of vital important that in the dialogue and discussions to be invited together the big water polluters (industries, or other types) and the other parts which are affected by the respective pollution of the surface waters and groundwater. During the discussion and dialogues it is helpful if the size of pollution is presented also the lack of water which is created by these processes for the users and if possible the different solution for solving the problems are also identified and the support form the public is obtained. If this things are obtained the respective solutions ca be directed to the teams and/or institutions responsible with the policies and strategies elaboration and projects proposals preparation

As potential subjects for discussion which were exemplified can be mentioned:

- ☞ The results and effects of urbanization extension on the groundwater table
- ☞ Water and the ecological agriculture
- ☞ Water and the industries of the future
- ☞ Water and the eco-tourism
- ☞ Water and the energy

Slovakia

The National Dialogue in the frame of the CEE WFE in 2003 was supported by private companies, governmental institutions as well as by the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture, research institutions and universities.

Members of the National Steering Committee for the WFE Dialogue has been organized the workshops and seminars.

Slovenia

The national WFE dialogue process has been performed on country level and the meeting was held on November 28, 2003 in Ljubljana. With the invitation to the national WFE meeting, the following documents have been distributed to 170 experts:

- ☞ Slovenian National WFE Dialogue Report, 1st phase
- ☞ CEE WFE Dialogue Report, 1st. phase
- ☞ EC Working Document “The WFD and tools within the CAP to support its implementation” and
- ☞ Irrigation water demand in Europe: the impact of Agenda 2000 and the Water Framework Directive.

The experts were asked to comment the documents in view of the implementation process of the WFD.

3.9 Who were the key stakeholders in the dialogue process and what procedures have been applied to assure full stakeholder participation?

Bulgaria

The key stakeholders in the dialogue process were the water users associations, irrigation associations, water unions, associations for water quality, irrigation firms, insurance companies, institutes and universities, ministries, river basin directorates etc.

Estonia

The stakeholders of the Rapina dialogue were the representatives of about 25 local governments in Northern, Central and Southern region of the large Lake Peipsi Watershed. The keynote speakers were representing two water related NGOs, two Regional Environmental Services, two academic institutes and one private consulting enterprise.

The co-ordinators of the two official working groups for drafting the Water Management Plans (Lake Peipsi, Estonia and River Daugava, Latvia) were attending the Dialogue and holding keynote lectures too.

The participants of the Dialogue meeting in Tallinn were mainly members of Estonian Water Association or GWP Estonia (belonging to many different professions) but also representatives of the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, various Environmental NGOs, Agricultural Producers, Consumers etc. The GWP members represented Universities, private companies for consulting, building or sale of chemicals and water treatment equipment. There were participants from other regions of Estonia also present.

The dialogue and its background materials were introduced to the participants well in advance on the homepage and over the electronic discussion lists. The dialogue was also continued on the WEB after the real event.

The main direct conclusions and recommendations from the discussion were forwarded to the Ministry of Agriculture, working group on Estonian Rural Development Plan, as both EU level CAP and national Rural Development Plans should include as much water protection measures as possible.

Contacts to various sub basin Water Management Planning Groups were established.

The 2nd Dialogue was held one day before the public discussion on the Rural Development Plan, so all the relevant ideas, concerning water protection were once more discussed over the next day. A positive impact to RDP was very evident.

A radio broadcast in the series “Hello, this is Europe” was also made after the seminar, including the main stakeholders in to a 40 minutes talking panel. The possibilities of environmentally friendly agriculture in the European Union as well as the current water management problems and solutions in Estonia were highlighted in a popular way.

Summarising it can be added, that there is a big variety of possibilities to develop the WFE discussion in Estonia in the future. The international component is almost missing so far and much more central institutions may be involved.

The importance and input from a more lower, local level discussion should not be underestimated as this is the level where the real problems and solutions occur.

Hungary

Organizations/stakeholders represented in the Dialogue process:

Union of the Water Management Associations,
Water Management Associations (76 WMAs)
Global Water Partnership Hungary,
WWF Hungary,
ICID Hungarian National Committee,
ICID ERWG,
ICID ERWG Drought Work Team,
ICID ERWG Water Framework Directive Work Team
Hungarian Hydrological Society,
Hungarian Association for Agro-Sciences, Session of Water Management,

Ministry for Agriculture and Rural Development,
 Ministry for Environment and Water,
 County Authorities of Ministry for Agriculture and Rural Development,

Lithuania

In the last quarter of 2003 the Lithuanian Water Partnership (LWP) was involved in the dialogue process organised by the GWP-CEE. Through the LWP a wide range of water stakeholders have got a possibility to be participants of the dialogue process: representatives of governmental institutions, NGOs, research organizations, private companies and society. The stakeholders who had an opportunity to comment the draft report on “Implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive in Agricultural Water Management in Lithuania” are presented in the *Table 1*.

Table 1. List of stakeholders involved in the dialogue process.

No	Type of institution	Number of representatives
1	Government: Ministries of Agriculture, Environment&Health	10
2	Agencies under the ministries: Hydrometeorological, Geological, Environmental Protection institutions	24
3	Research institutes: Ecology, Geography and Geology, Agriculture	11
4	Academia: Vilnius University, University of Agriculture	7
5	NGOs	12
6	Private companies	8
7	Municipalities	1
8	Society	2
	Total	75

Among the listed institutions members of the GWP-LWP, ICID-Lithuania and WWF- Lithuania should be mentioned.

Poland

Main institutions responsible for the status and development of agriculture and water management in rural areas are:

- Regional Boards of Water Management responsible for planning and protection of water resources
- Provincial Boards of Reclamation and Water Facilities responsible for the exploitation and maintenance of irrigation and draining systems
- Provincial Agricultural Advisory Centres.

All these organisations co-operate and participate in the Dialogue. Still open is the question of the way and extent of the involvement of direct users of water-reclamation systems in the agricultural areas. Due to the dispersion of farms in Poland the only way of contacting farmers is to prepare various educational materials. Selected groups of farmers from the regions with large irrigation systems or from the regions with conflicting interests of agriculture and environmental protection will be invited to participate in the Dialogue.

Romania

The major stakeholder groups were as follows:

- ministries and national authorities,
- research institutes,
- academic institutions,
- professional associations,
- NGOs,

- members of the Basin Committees,
- etc.

It was concluded that it is necessary to organise an intensive dialogue for the farmers associations, involving those lecturers who are able to present, explain and discuss the new approaches for the implementation of the WFD in the form understandable for the farmers.

Slovakia

The key stakeholders in the dialogue process were water and agriculture bodies, users associations, mainly Slovak Water Management Authorities, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, Slovak Hydrometeorological Institute, Water Research Institute, Slovak Agriculture University, Hydromelioration Authority, farmers bodies. Several methods for public participation (e.g. information dissemination, consultation and active involvement) were applied to assure full stakeholder participation.

Slovenia

The most active stakeholders in the dialogue have been till now those who are dealing:

- With water quality issues (Environmental Agency of the Republic of Slovenia),
- With researching and implementing the new methods in the agriculture (University institutes) and
- With education of farmers and promotion of the new agricultural methods (Chamber for Agriculture and Forestry of the Republic of Slovenia, the group of experts from the regional Agricultural Advisory Services).

The most efficient method to assure the participation of decision makers and other important stakeholders would be more intensive publicity on national, regional and global level on importance of WFE. The experience from the first two phases of WFE national consultation process was, that the participation is becoming larger by dissemination of information, involvement of more experts and reports.

3.10 What Dialogue support tools have been used?

Bulgaria

The members of the Dialogue-Team are well prepared for the coordination of the dialogue process. Dr.Hadjieva is one of the leaders of the project on Sustainable Agriculture in Bulgaria, Prof.Raev is member of the EU COST Technical Committee and Dimitrova and Bardarska are lecturers on WFD implementation. They made an interesting inquiry for the international training course, organised by DEF and UNDP on November 2003 in Obrenovac, Serbia.

Estonia

The Räpina Dialogue was held in the Ristipalo Forestry Management Centre lecture hall, that was equipped with all necessary technical facilities. It was also economically quite feasible place and close to many local stakeholders who cannot come to the capital Tallinn (NW Estonia) so easily. The dialogue was held in three working groups according to the geographical origin of the participants. All facilitators were having good professional skills. The list of questions was prepared earlier and was distributed to every dialogue participant during the event. All answers and proposals were carefully documented and are kept in the archive of Peipsi CTC.

Hungary

The overall aim of the Dialogue (the stakeholder/public engagement) was to support the successful implementation of the WFD in agricultural water management. The relative emphases within the

overall engagement process was the active public engagement and reporting and evaluation of the process.

The main techniques used:

- The social learning approach was extensively applied (“to learn together how to manage together”).
- The knowledge base was developed for the Dialogue (simplification of the WFD documents by experts) and the WFD information was disseminated on the WEB system of the Union of Water Management Associations and the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

Dialogue meetings were organised in four regions of Hungary including small group meetings and plenary sessions. Session facilitators and reporters were invited. National meeting on the synthesis reports of the regional meetings were held. Three meetings in each regions (12 meetings all together) and three national meetings were organised in 2003.

The knowledge base was developed and the reporting in English for the CEE WFE Dialogue was made by consultants and by the invited speakers.

The first outputs of the EU HARMONICOP FP6 project were also considered in the planning of the Hungarian Dialogue. It was learned that there are a lot of news on the implementation of the WFD that are not known by the public and also by the professionals. In these conditions the social-learning has a high importance. The organisers of the Dialogue process have learned together with the representatives of the farmers and the local water managers how to understand and implement the provisions of the WFD in agricultural water management.

Poland

The Dialogue is chiefly carried out by volunteers. The meetings arise much interest and many stakeholders are eager to actively participate in them.

Romania

The lecturers were well prepared, the reports were presented in ppt. format by projectors. The relevant documents were distributed in English and Romanian languages.

Slovakia

The members of the Dialogue-Team were prepared for the coordination of the dialogue process using CIRCA Guidance Documents and tools.

Slovenia

The skills of the team have been on high professional level, although GWP Slovenia might to improve the communication efficiency level in the future activities (communication with media, advertising the issue in more efficient mode etc.). However, the financial resources, which have been available, did not allowed the involvement of communication experts. Another possibility would be the better co-coordinated action on international level (EC, UN organizations).

3.11 Is there sufficient research/knowledge backing to support the issue under discussion/consideration or there is a need for more background studies/research?

Bulgaria

A WFD/CAP project would be necessary in the GWP CEE region.

Hungary

Some changes are likely to be required to implement public participation requirements associated with the WFD. In the next phase of the Dialogue local Dialogue meetings should be organised,

involving the local farmers. There are sometimes thousands of farms sharing the sub-basins covered by a Water Management Association. Currently the tools for Dialogue/PP in local scale are studied and evaluated by the Hungarian WFE Dialogue Consortium.

The agriculture is a critical sector of the EU. The sustainable agriculture requires the careful implementation of the WFD. The social and economic aspects and plans should be considered. A “Win-Win Solution” should be achieved and the Dialogue could provide a useful help.

Poland

There is no need to perform special studies to carry out the Dialogue. The knowledge is satisfactory. Many qualified specialists from universities and scientific institutes participate in the Dialogue.

Romania

It was concluded that there is a need for detailed studies in some of the key issues to support the implementation of the WFD in the field of agriculture.

Slovakia

It was concluded that there is a need to extract the most important parts from WFD and CAP guidance documents, to adapt them to the Slovak conditions and to translate into Slovak language. The research is necessary e.g. to define environmental goals, reference conditions and other very complex issues.

Slovenia

Before and during the preparation of Slovene Agri-Environmental Programme substantial number of preliminary studies has been performed. The pilot projects would be needed to approve the presumed theories and methods. In the environmental field more toxicological studies on chemicals used in agriculture would be needed as well as the research on more efficient methods for estimation of vulnerability and endangering of groundwater bodies by agriculture (disperse pollution).

There is a need to promote studies and applications of agro meteorological services to cope with improved understanding of natural climate variability. Current advances in the application of new technologies such as remote sensing constitute new sources of data for many applications. These complement ground observations. The role of early warning and weather monitoring for periods of favorable and especially adverse climatic variation should be emphasized. The application of weather and climate forecast information to improve the response activities is essential. Therefore dissemination of information and training of decision-makers, managers, state officers and public in general should be promoted.

3.12 What outputs do you see emerging from this dialogue? How do you plan to document the learning, experiences and processes?

Bulgaria

The proposals formulated by the Dialogue were submitted to the competent authorities and the results will be disseminated to more stakeholders. The information of the public on the relevant EU legislation is considered very important.

Czech Republic

The WFE Dialogue in Czech Republic was considerably enhanced in 2003 and good conditions were established for its further expansion in the future. The Dialogue processes and the CZ GWP Water Club could have an important role in the implementation of the WFD.

Estonia

The experiences of the Dialogue will be used in the Lake Peipsi Water Management Plan.

Hungary

The conclusions of the Dialogue were submitted to the EC by the Hungarian Water Director and most of the comments and proposals of the Hungarian Dialogue were considered in the final version of the EC Working Document “The WFD and tools within the CAP to support its implementation”.

Four Water Management Associations agreed with the WWF to start common pilot projects for the planning of measures to achieve the good status of wetlands and/or reactivate former flood plain areas in sub-basins covered by the Associations.

The organisers of the Dialogue have learned from the evaluation questionnaire that the Dialogue was successful, however on the basis of the responses it should be developed and continued. The social learning process seems to be very efficient. The understanding and common understanding of the agriculture water management aspects of the WFD and the tools of CAP for the implementation of the WFD are the main results of the second phase of the Dialogue.

The use of internet for the dissemination of the information and also for some parts of the consultation, the “social-learning like” discussions on the hot agricultural issues of WFD, the dialogue between the representatives of WWF and Water Management Associations, between the representatives of public administration, the farmers, the nature protectors, the water managers and the academics, the system of small group meetings, regional and national meetings could be considered as the most efficient elements of the Dialogue process.

In the next phase of the Dialogue the local farmers (thousands of land owners per Water Management Associations) should be involved. The Dialogue Consortium is working on the plans and approaches for the first pilot local Dialogue processes.

Immediate output – an agreement was launched between WWF and the Union of Water Management Associations in Hungary on four pilot studies (implementation of WFD in a large drainage system).

Lithuania

The consultation process with all stakeholders has taken place during the preparation of programming documents and measures. However, the farming community is not always able to participate adequately in the consultation process through the associative structures. They comment very often on the problem when they face it practically. That’s why this dialogue should be continued during the implementation of measures.

The draft Lithuanian report on WFD and CAP has been prepared by the working group consisting of the representatives of ministries, research institutions and NGOs and discussed at the national LWP meeting. The report has also been disseminated to 75 members of the Lithuanian Water Partnership, ICID, WWF for comments. The comments received have been analysed, processed and are included into the final report

Poland

The basic output of the Dialogue is better understanding and raised awareness of mutual relations between water, agriculture and environment. The meetings organized within the framework of the Dialogue attract more and more participants and publications distributed among the stakeholders contribute to the education of all concerned. The Dialogue can be seen also as a social support to activities carried out by state administration for implementation of the WFD.

Romania

A number of priorities were identified for the future activities and proposals were formulated to enlarge the panels of experts involved in the elaboration and drafting of the future strategies and policies for land and water use and management.

Slovakia

The proposals formulated by the Dialogue were submitted to the competent authorities and other bodies. The organizers of the Dialogue have learned from the evaluation questionnaire that the Dialogue was successful and well prepared. The social learning process seems to be efficient. The understanding and common understanding of the agriculture and water management aspects of the WFD and the tools of CAP for the implementation of the WFD are the main results of the second phase of the Dialogue.

The cooperation and information exchange between the competent authorities, research institutions, higher educational institutions, NGOs, private organisations and professionals of the water relevant fields have been improved.

Three workshops and two seminars have been organised on the policy measures of the CAP to support the implementation of the WFD.

Work Plan for 2004:

- organisation of workshops and seminars;
- preparation of a brochure for small and medium farms on the EU document “The WFD and tools within the CAP to support its implementation”;
- evaluation of the present Water Management System.

Slovenia

The most important outcome of WFE dialogue was starting of information exchange between water and agricultural sector. The food production is a must and it is necessary to find the methods and administrative/financial mechanisms to protect the environment as much as needed and in feasible range. The so far existing research has shown that this goal would be attainable.

The CD with WFE documents, presentations, discussion and national report will be disseminated to all the institutions and experts, who have been invited to take part in the WFE dialogue and through public relation services to media. We would ask them for feedback information and opinion on proposed activities. In frame of GWP Slovenia activities in 2004 will publish the leaflet with information for farmers and municipalities on possibilities to protect water ecosystems from agricultural pollution.

3.13 Do you require external support to conduct the future steps of the Dialogue? If so what type of support are you looking for?

Bulgaria

External support would be necessary for

- printing of the translated version of the GWP CEE report on the second phase of the WFE Dialogue;
- making detailed studies on the implementation of the EU WFD/CAP document in the GWP CEE region.

Estonia

External support is always useful in some way, either in the form of financial input or as a visiting lecturer on some similar kind of event.

Lithuania

Requirements of the WFD in Lithuania have been transposed with assistance of the DANCEE financed project “Transposition of the EU Water Framework Directive and Elaboration of a National Strategy for the Management of Water Resources in Lithuania (WFD transposition project). The project was finished in 2003.

Another DANCEE supported project “Implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive, Lithuania, meeting 2006 deadlines” should be seen as a follow-up project building on experience and capacity developed by the WFD transposition project.

This project aims to assist Lithuania to implement provisions of the EU Water Framework Directive, in particular to meet the deadlines of 2004 and 2006, namely:

- analysis of characteristics of River Basin Districts (2004);
- review of impact of human activity on status of surface waters and on groundwaters in River Basin Districts (2004);
- economic analysis of water use in River Basin Districts (2004);
- programme for monitoring of water status (2006);
- timetable and work programme for public information and consultation (2006).

Poland

No external institutions supported the Dialogue. We expect, however, a financial revenue from Polish Government and from GWP, which would enable organisation of conferences and seminars and publication/dissemination of educational materials.

“It was a good experience to continue the Dialogue in 2003 and if funding is available, we would like very much to continue in 2004. In a small scale, corresponding to the funds available, we will continue the Dialogue anyway.”

The Dialogue in a similar form i.e. meetings, seminars and distribution and publication of materials is planned to continue in 2004. More attention will be paid to closer contacts with food producers (farmers) via Agricultural Advisory Centres, to introducing water issues into the Code of Good Agricultural Practise, to publishing educational materials, to undertaking closer co-operation between the institutions responsible for agriculture and Regional Boards of Water Management and to broader involvement of water protection into agro-environmental programmes.

Romania

It is proposed to organise an international GWP CEE meeting for the convenors, the facilitators and some of the most creative participants/stakeholders. The objective of the meeting would be to discuss how to improve the dialogue processes.

It was concluded that it would be necessary to get financial support from different sources to continue the Dialogue processes on the implementation of the WFD.

Slovakia

External support would be necessary for future cooperation in the dialogue. There are some promising activities to ensure this support. The financial support for NGO involved in the process is the most important. Active involvement of governmental bodies is expected.

Slovenia

The most efficient and useful external support for the future would be to support the knowledge and experience on WFD/CAP implementation by EU/EC experts and by financial input for education and dissemination of information among farmers through existing national institutions.

4. Conclusions and proposals on the National Dialogue Reports

Poland

The Dialogue is an important element stimulating the exchange of ideas between various groups interested in utilisation and protection of water resources. It is commonly understood that agriculture can not be restricted to food production. It also plays social and cultural functions.

Agriculture strongly affects the quality and quantity of water resources. *It is necessary to intensify activities to restrict the negative effect of agriculture on surface and ground waters.* The Code of Good Agricultural Practises plays a fundamental role. Basic agro-technical recommendations of the Code are aimed at protecting water quality. *One should consider a possibility and reasonability of supplementing the Code with rules adopted to the natural and economic conditions of particular river basins.*

Agro-environmental programmes of the EU are important elements affecting the status of the natural environment in rural areas. *They should become the basic tool of the State agricultural policy in regard to environmental (and thus water) protection.*

Having in mind that Poland is a country not abundant in water resources, more attention should be paid to the protection of water resources in rural areas. *Agriculture should utilise more rainfall waters* – thus one should aim at increasing the retention capacity of small catchments (rural areas) and at restricting surface runoffs and decreasing water losses from agriculture. These actions extend beyond the Code of Good Agricultural Practises and involve problems closely connected with spatial planning and sustainable development of rural areas as, for example:

- increasing water capacity of soils and decreasing useless evaporation from the soil surface,
- creating appropriate arrangement of arable fields, grasslands and forests,
- increasing afforestation in water basins, building buffer zones, furrows and terraces to decrease soil erosion,
- increasing the area of wetlands, peatlands, water potholes,
- proper design of communication tracts,
- implementing the principles of regulated outflow from draining systems.

Recommendations presented here are underrated by specialists of both agriculture and water management, and such activities might largely restrict local floods and counteract droughts without any negative impact on natural environment.

The Dialogue underlines the fact that *water management might be a stimulator of economic growth* particularly in areas of high natural values where agriculture is the basic economic activity. The regions need, however, financial support that would enable the development of water infrastructure and adaptation of farms to tourism.

It is necessary to analyse up-to-date system of management and maintenance of waters within the scope of agriculture. Changes of the system should be directed towards integrated water management in small agricultural catchments. Drainage and irrigation systems should be treated as only one of many elements of water management in rural areas.

The efficiency of actions aimed to improve water balance and water quality depends not only on systems of water management and on financing ecological activities but largely on dissemination of rational economic methods at a level of particular farms. The later is a difficult task because of farm dispersal, a lack of strong nation wide farmers organisations and in many cases because of poor economic conditions of agriculture. Creating an educational system is indispensable. The Dialogue might play an important role here as a forum for the exchange of views and ideas. In order to contact particular farmers, however, one needs to create a comprehensive educational system and to publish training materials. Accomplishment of these tasks would be possible in close co-operation with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and with the Ministry of Environment.

The Dialogue will be continued in 2004. Main aim is to undertake closer contacts with food producers and with services responsible for exploitation of the draining and irrigation systems. The extent and intensity of the Dialogue depends i.a. on a possibility of obtaining funds necessary to organise meetings, training courses and to publish training materials.

Slovakia

The Dialogue is an important element stimulating the exchange of ideas between various groups in the field of agriculture and water management.

The key issues discussed are as follows:

- The need for specification of environmental pressures and impacts of agriculture
- The implementation of CAP and WFD in integrated and harmonized way
- The coordination of rural development planning and the implementation of WFD and other water related directives, (mainly Nitrate and Habitat Directive)
- The need for better educational and training programs
- International exchange of information and practical application of guidance documents
- The further discussions in the field of WFD and CAP is necessary.

Slovenia

In principle the Slovene Agri-Environmental Programme (SAEP) contains many measures and requirements expressed by the participants in WFE dialogue process: more sustainable use of natural resources, preservation of biodiversity, characteristics of the Slovenian landscape and environment. SAEP was adopted by the government of the Republic of Slovenia in 2001 as the implementation component of the Programme of Agricultural policy Reform. The reform emphasizes the orientation towards agricultural practices friendly to the nature and environment, providing products and food safe to the consumers. Specific national agri-environmental programmes are also an important part of the EU Common Agricultural Policy, which envisaged the production of specific agricultural products as well, such as organic and integrated products and products with markings of traditional reputation, geographic brand names and higher quality labeling. SAEP was developed to facilitate a progressive transition to EU-compatible subsidies in agricultural sector. The Slovene agricultural policy undertakes the role of promoting socially important issues, such as preservation of population in the rural areas, cultural landscape, and agricultural practices friendly to the nature. Planned measures are not associated only with production, but consider environmental, social, spatial and demographic aspects of the countryside.

Additionally the following specific measures have been accented and supported by the national WFE dialogue participants:

- ⌘ Decreasing of negative impacts of agriculture on environment by reduction of livestock density, revitalization of agricultural land, protection against erosion in orchards and vineyards (grass cover will be subsidized), crop rotation, greening of arable land, integrated food production and organic farming.
- ⌘ Preservation of nature, biodiversity, soil fertility and traditional cultural landscape by mountain pastures, steep slopes and humpy meadows mowing, meadow orchards, rearing of traditional and rare domestic breeds and agricultural plants, sustainable animal breeding and extensive grassland maintenance.
- ⌘ Maintenance of protected and sensitive areas by maintenance of protected areas, preservation of habitats of endangered bird species, grassing and green fallow, permanent green cover in groundwater protected areas.
- ⌘ Education and promotion would contain: education of farmers, state administration and promotion by informing the public on the significance of the agri-environmental measures, informing of the customers of quality of agricultural products and foodstuffs obtained through sustainable agricultural practices.

Next to this the participants support following measures and methods:

- ⌘ Integrated and organic agriculture should have absolute preference. Very important part of implementation would be education of farmers, because the level of knowledge needed to perform this kind of farming is rather high
- ⌘ Drip irrigation systems should be used and if feasible fertigation incorporated
- ⌘ Restoration of wetlands (habitats and species) should be implemented wherever feasible and the buffer zones identified as protected zones
- ⌘ The ecoremediation methods (constructed wetlands or renaturated channels) should be used to clean the water from existing drainage systems
- ⌘ Strict consideration of natural conditions in agricultural practice
- ⌘ The related legislation is adequate, but more strict control (inspections), faster legal proceedings and higher punishments against violators should be executed
- ⌘ More linked co-operation between inspection services and agricultural advisory services should be established
- ⌘ The permits for the sale and use of new phytopharmaceutical chemicals should be based on comprehensive studies (toxicity, antagonism, synergy etc) performed in the independent research institutes.
- ⌘ Climatic studies, meteorological and agro meteorological prognosis should become a part of routine data used in agriculture.

5. General conclusions

The final deliverables of the second phase of the CEE WFE Dialogue were the ten National Dialogue Reports (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia). The key issues that have been discussed during the national dialogue processes and considered as most important are as follows:

- # environmental pressures and impacts caused by agriculture in the CEE region,
- # the provisions of the EU WFD, the Nitrate Directive, and the Habitat Directive,
- # elements of the Good Agricultural Practice,
- # loss of wetlands,
- # expected impacts of the climate change,
- # privatisation, land use changes,
- # financial difficulties of farmers,
- # competitiveness of CEE agriculture,
- # coordination of rural development planning and the WFD,
- # coordination of WFD and the new flood management policies and strategies,
- # integration of environmental, economic and social objectives and integrated planning to achieve those objectives,
- # possible EU funds to introduce the necessary agri-environment measures,
- # the need for new education and training programmes,
- # the need for improved information exchange,
- # the role of farmers and farmer's organisations in the implementation process of the WFD.

In order to conduct successful Dialogue committed partners are needed from both ends of the political palette. In CEE the unique political situation of historic reunification of the European continent helps to gain political support for the Dialogue process.

The discussions revealed that to meet WFD requirements is not enough. A delicate balance has to be reached by meeting EU water and common agricultural policies and by being competitive without increasing the burden on the environment under harsh conditions of limited subsidy (average 15% compared with 40-60% in EU). To raise the relatively low living standards typical in agriculture in all CEE countries reconsideration of subsidiary policy is needed. Compensation of people living in disadvantageous areas is also needed for achieving social justice and environment-friendly investments must be encouraged by adequate incentives. Concept of integrated water resources management (or the way to implement it) is different in the world, in the EU and in the local environment. The EU WFD stipulates the planning of action plans necessary for meeting the environmental objectives and do not deal with programmes related to social and economic objectives.

The Knowledge Base will be the scientific core of the Dialogue. An enhanced CEE knowledge base will feed the dialogue to establish credible and authoritative knowledge accepted by both agricultural and environmental constituencies. The knowledge base would focus on improving agricultural production and achieving environmental security and on impacts of past development as well as on evaluation of options for future development. The implementation process of the EU Water Framework Directive will create wealth of information, experience and knowledge.

The overall conclusions of the national reports on the implementation of the WFD in agricultural water management are as follows:

- 1) The implementation of the existing EU environmental directives (in particular, the nitrates directive, the habitats directive, the environmental impact assessment directive, and the WFD) will be an important factor in mitigating the negative environmental impacts of current and future agriculture.
- 2) There is a growing sense that it is necessary to involve local farmers more directly in the implementation process of WFD, without much knowledge of how this can be done in practice. Many organisations recognise a need to strengthen consultation and partnership but much CEE WFE Dialogue experience to date suggests that this has not yet translated into river basin management and planning.
- 3) All national reports show that the implementation of the WFD remains very complex. At the same time, the national reports have identified positive examples of structures, institutional

arrangements and policy approaches which suggest potential solutions to many of the problems of the implementation of the WFD in agriculture.

- 4) The form of implementation of the WFD in agricultural water management is influenced by the particular and highly diverse economic conditions, geographical circumstances, socio-cultural factors, government structures and traditions. Role of „national cultures” requires more attention. At the same time there are important similarities
- 5) All participating CEE countries pay considerable attention to maintaining their agricultural environment and rural heritage which has been neglected in the past.
- 6) To promote the implementation of the WFD in agricultural water management and to promote sustainable rural development in the CEE region, the conclusions of the Second Phase Dialogue suggest that implementation of the WFD in agriculture will need:
 - more effective, continues public participation;
 - more resources;
 - more recognition,
 - more use of innovative tools of the dialogues and Public Participation processes; and
 - more learning from examples across EU Member States and CEE countries.
- 7) More ambitious and flexible programmes to implement the WFD in agricultural water management, more tailored to national conditions as well as adaptation to the EU guidance documents should be considered.
- 8) The planners of the implementation activities of WFD in agriculture water management should recognise the links between environmental, social and economic processes and conditions, and sufficient consideration should be given to each. The integrated approach that is used for the implementation should be sensitive to issues of scale, from the local and regional through to the national and international , and ensure that solutions to problems are acceptable and beneficial to all stakeholders of the agriculture sector.
- 9) The principle of equity should be applied between environmental, social and economic interests, such that adequate consideration is given to each and as wide a possible consensus is reached.
- 10) Approaches to agriculture development should recognise that there are environmental limits to the development according to the WFD. It is not always clear where the implementation of WFD ends and planning of programmes of measures to harmonise different interests and to achieve the social and economic objectives begins.
- 11) Several CEE countries have developed the concept of Good Agricultural Practice (GAP) into a series of practical guidelines to help agricultural consultants and farmers minimise the risk of polluting soil and water, while allowing economically viable agriculture to continue.
- 12) A variety of measures is available for mitigating the negative impacts of agriculture and enhancing environmental benefits where these are achievable. Some of these are technical or site specific but many could be also applied to the implementation of the WFD in general at national, regional or local level.
- 13) The recently adopted EU CAP reform provides a considerable number of tools seeking to improve or maintain the environmental profile of agriculture, these should be implemented across agriculture sectors and countries.

Proposals for the future plans

The National Dialogue processes in the ten EU Candidate Countries were based on the outputs of the Setting up National Dialogues Design Workshop in Bonn and the CEE WFE Dialogue Kick-off Meeting in Bled. The further international discussions on the best approaches and tools for country dialogue processes could be very useful.

The key elements of the knowledge-base for the CEE WFE Dialogue in the next phase of the Dialogue will be the guidance documents completed by the EU CIS Working Groups (*Box 2*). It should be considered a key issue how to adopt these guidance documents in the CEE region in the agricultural and rural water management with regard to the specific conditions. The international exchange on the practical application and adoption of the guidance documents would be also useful (e.g. tool-box/approaches for integrated river basin management planning).

Box 2

Guidance Documents for the implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive

- IMPRESS** - Guidance for the analysis of Pressures and Impacts In accordance with the Water Framework Directive
- HMWB** - Guidance Document on identification and designation of Heavily Modified and Artificial Water Bodies
- REFCOND** - Guidance on establishing reference conditions and ecological status class boundaries for inland surface waters
- COAST** - Guidance on typology, reference conditions and classification systems for transitional and coastal waters
- INTERCALIBRATION** - Towards a guidance on establishment of the Intercalibration network and on the process of the Intercalibration exercise
- WATECO** - Economics and the Environment. The implementation challenge of the Water Framework Directive. A Guidance Document
- MONITORING** - Guidance on Monitoring for the Water Framework Directive
- GW** - The EU Water Framework Directive: Statistical aspects of the identification of groundwater pollution trends, and aggregation of monitoring results
- BPRBP** - WP1 Identification of RBDs – Identification of River Basin Districts in Member States.
WP2 Planning Process - Guidance on the planning process
WP3 Public Participation – Guidance on Public Participation in relation to the Water Framework Directive.
- GIS** - Guidance Document on Implementing the GIS Elements of the WFD
- PRB** - Summary of Proposals for Pilot River Basins submitted by Member States
- Water Bodies** - Horizontal guidance on the application of the term “water body” in the context of the Water Framework Directive

Networking for local and basin level action-oriented projects in CEE region will focus on testing and evaluating innovative approaches that enhance sustainable water services for agriculture and environment. This would essentially be a platform for information exchange - leading to identification of “best practices”. Within the framework of the CEE Dialogue Project pilot case studies and/or pilot river basins could be selected. The selection could be based on data availability, prior studies carried out at each test site, and system scale.

The CEE Dialogue Project is foreseen as a decentralised, multi-year process, with milestones at the 3rd and 4th World Water Forum in Kyoto and Montreal. The overall co-ordination and timing of the Project will be co-ordinated with the Global Dialogue activities as well as with the overall work programme of the Common Implementation Strategy of the EU Water Framework Directive. The CEE Dialogue Project will be co-ordinated also with other relevant activities of the GWP CEE, ERWG ICID, WWF Danube Carpathian Programme and WWF Europe.

References

Country WFE reports (2003) from Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia (see the list of authors in Chapter 2)

and

Choudhury, Keya, Tanja Draeger - Ruta Landgrebe - R. Andreas Kraemer (2003): EU - CAP and Enlargement - An Opportunity for Nature and Environment?, Background Paper, Ecologic, Institute for International and European Environmental Policy

Commission of the European Communities (2003): Proposal for a Council Regulation establishing common rules for direct support schemes under the common agricultural policy and support schemes for producers of certain crops, COM(2003) 23 final, Brussels, 21.1.2003

Commission of the European Communities (2002): Enlargement and Agriculture, Successfully integrating the new Member States into the CAP, Issue Paper, SEC(2002)95 final, 30.1.2002

CarlBro-EPC (2003): Transposition and implementation of the Nitrate Directive Phase II in Lithuania. Final report by Scanagri and CarlBro (Denmark) and Environmental Policy Center(Lithuania)

DHI-APINI (2003): Tools for groundwater and surface water analysis during implementation of the Water Framework Directive in Lithuania, DHI Water & Environment in co-operation with Public Establishment "Water House" and APINI-Institute of Environmental Engineering, Vilnius, WFD-Tools Project document

Ijjas, István – József Gayer, Janusz Kindler, Márta Konkoly (2002): Country dialogues in CEE and their link to the political process, International Water Conference, Dialogue on Water, Food and Environment, Hanoi, 14-16 October 2002

Ijjas, Istvan, ed. (2003) CEE WFE Dialogue - Dialogue on Water, Food and Environment in Central and Eastern Europe - Dialogue on the Implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive in Agricultural Water Management in Central and Eastern European EU Candidate Countries, Final Report on the first phase of the Dialogue 2001-2003, Kyoto, March 2003

Institute for European Environmental Policy (2000): The environmental impacts of irrigation in the European Union, A report to the Environment Directorate of the European Commission, March 2000

IUCN (1995) Interaction between Agriculture and Nature Conservation in the Czech and Slovak Republics. IUCN East European Programme, Cambridge, UK

Kolossvary, Gabor (2002): Dialogue on the Implementation of EU Water Framework Directive in the Field of Agricultural Water Management in Hungary, Meeting of the ICID ERWG, July 2002. Montreal, Canada

Konkoly, Marta (2002): Implementation of EU Water Framework Directive in the Field of Agricultural Water Management in Hungary, Dialogue on Water, Food and Environment, 10. November 2002. Prague

Lübbe, Eiko (2002): Latest news on the practical implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive, Pre-Workshop Meeting of Kick-off Meeting of CEE WFE Dialogue, European Work Team on EU Water Framework Directive – ICID ERWG, 23 April 2002

Maziliauskas, A. (2003): Comments on the Working Document (WD) The Water Framework Directive (WFD) and tools within the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) to support its implementation, Lithuanian NCID.

Mioduszewski, Waldemar (2002): The advantage of the Dialogue “Water, Food, Environment” undertekan in Poland, International Water Conference: Dialogue on Water, Food, Environment, Hanoi, Vietnam, 14-16 October 2002

Röling, Niels, Jim Woodhill From Paradigms To Practice (2001): Foundations, Principles and Elements for Dialogue on Water, Food and Environment, Background Document for National and Basin Dialogue Design Workshop, Draft for Discussion, Workshop on National and Basin Level Dialogue, Bonn December 1-2, 2001

Wallström Margot (2002) Will an Enlarged Europe Be Better for the Environment? Labour Party Conference, Blackpool, (UK) 30 September 2002

The GWP-CEE region



BG – Bulgaria
CZ – Czech Rep.
EE – Estonia
H – Hungary
LT – Lithuania

LV – Latvia
P – Poland
RO – Romania
SK – Slovakia
SL – Slovenia

ISBN 80-88907-46-2



9 788088 907466

The Global Water Partnership (GWP), established in 1996, is an international network open to all organizations involved in water resources management: developed and developing country government institutions, agencies of the United Nations, bi- and multilateral development banks, professional associations, research institutions, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector.

GWP was created to foster Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM), which aims to ensure the coordinated development and management of water, land, and related resources by maximizing economic and social welfare without compromising the sustainability of vital environmental systems. GWP promotes IWRM by creating fora at global, regional, and national levels designed to support stakeholders with their practical implementation of IWRM.

Currently, the GWP network consists of twelve regions: Central America, Central and Eastern Europe, Central Asia and Caucasus, China, Eastern Africa, Mediterranean, Pacific, South America, South Asia, Southeast Asia, Southern Africa and West Africa. The GWP Secretariat is located in Stockholm in Sweden and supported by the following resource centers: DHI Water & Environment in Denmark, HR Wallingford in the UK, and the International Water Management Institute (IWMI) in Sri Lanka. The mission of GWP is to "support countries in the sustainable management of their water resources."

GWP Central and Eastern Europe
c/o Slovak Hydrometeorological Institute
Jeseniova 17, 833 15 Bratislava, Slovakia
E-mail: gwpcee@shmu.sk

GWP Secretariat
Hantverkargatan 5
SE-112 21 Stockholm, Sweden
E-mail: gwp@gwpforum.org

