

**Annex II**

**Inspiring examples of Public Participation in water  
management projects**

August 2002

## List of inspiring examples by country (29/6/02)

- Belgium: 1. River Basin Management plans Flanders page
- Denmark: 2. Regional planning system  
Denmark: 3. Tubaek Stream  
Denmark: 4. Reducing water consumption in Graphics Corporate Sector
- England: 5. Westcountry River Trust  
England: 6. DEFRA stakeholder Sounding Board, England  
England: 7. The Wise Use of Floodplains Project in Somerset, UK  
England: 8. The Fens Floodplain project East of England
- France: 9. National Water Council  
France: 10. SDAGE  
France: 11. The SAGE projects  
France: 12. The Drome river Sage  
France: 13. National Commission for Public Debate
- Germany: 14. Information Letters on the implementation of WFD in Thuringia  
Germany: 15. River Basin Management Plan Maas/sub basin Niers/consultation fora
- Ireland: 16. Erne Sustainable Wetlands cross border Ireland and N-Ireland
- Netherlands: 17. Integrated Reconnaissance of the river Rhine, Waal and IJssel Rivers  
Netherlands: 18. IVR Integrated Planning of Veluwe Lakes  
Netherlands: 19. Municipal Water Plan Hilversum
- Scotland: 20. The Scottish Water Bill
- Spain: 21. Global flood defence plan in river Jucar  
Spain: 22. Alcobendas – city of water for the 21th century  
Spain: **-under discussion-**. Formal standing mechanisms for public participation on water issues in Spain  
Spain: 23 Helcom, Baleoric Sea Region
- Sweden: 24. River Em  
Sweden: 25. Water Management plan of municipality of Orebro  
Sweden : 26. The River commission of Frysian water association  
Sweden: 27. River Tyreså (Tyresåproject)
- Eastern Europe:  
28. Helcom MLW, Baltic Sea Region  
29. Danube River Commission/ Environment Forum  
30. Lithuania and Russia: Nemunas Delta



**Matrix indicating the scale of inspiring examples and the degree of public participation**

<b>Level\PP</b>	<b>Active involvement</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Information</b>
<b>Inter-national</b>	<i>Danube River Commission, NGOs participating in ICDPR working groups, preparing draft WFD documents</i>	Danube River Commission, <i>NGOs consulted using the Danube Environment Forum as a platform,</i>	Danube River Commission; <i>Web-site and regular magazine providing information</i>
<b>National</b>	<p>DEFRA Stakeholder Sounding Board, UK <i>Involving national stakeholders in development of national WFD concept - regular meetings of the board.</i></p> <p>National commission for Public Debate (Fr)</p> <p>Niers (Germany) <i>Regional fora</i></p> <p>Formal standing mechanisms for public participation on water issues in Spain. <i>Legally binding mechanisms for public participation in the planning process and in day by day water resources management</i></p> <p>River Em</p>	<p>DEFRA Stakeholder Sounding Board, UK <i>Involving national stakeholders in development of national WFD concept - public meetings.</i></p> <p>National Commission for Public Debate (Fr)</p> <p>National Water Council</p> <p>Niers (Germany) <i>Regional fora</i></p> <p>River Em</p> <p>The water association of river Fyrisan</p>	<p>Thuringia , Germany Newsletter</p> <p>National commission for Public Debate (Fr)</p> <p>River Em</p>

<b>Level\PP</b>	<b>Active involvement</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Information</b>
<b>Local</b>	<p><b>Lower Danube Green Corridor</b> <i>Implementation activities designed in close co-operation with local and regional stakeholders</i></p> <p><b>Helcom MLW</b> <i>Co-operation at Baltic Sea region level, involving local and national stakeholders. demonstration activities - stakeholder advisory groups set up in all project sites</i></p> <p><b>The Tubaek Stream, DK</b> <i>All land-owners in this local catchment involved through visits paid at each farm</i></p> <p><b>Reducing water consumption in Graphics Corporate Sector, DK</b> <i>Demonstration project involving selected companies in implementation of new technologies, feed-back to the sector as such through its own structures</i></p> <p><b>Alcobendas - city of water for the 21<sup>st</sup> cent.</b> <i>Water saving achievements through active mobilisation of citizens and companies</i></p> <p><b>Fens Floodplain project, East of England</b> <i>Active Involvement in sample villages</i></p> <p><b>Wise Use Project, Somerset</b> <i>Active involvement with Parish Councils and local people on local flood and water level management issues within the catchment and its sub-catchments.</i></p>	<p><b>Helcom MLW</b> <i>Co-operation at Baltic Sea region level, involving local and national stakeholders, - all local stakeholders consulted on the plans</i></p> <p><b>Alcobendas - city of water for the 21<sup>st</sup> cent.</b> <i>Water saving achievements through public meetings and selected stakeholder seminars</i></p> <p><b>SAGE projects (Fr)</b></p> <p><b>Drome river, SAGE (Fr)</b></p>	<p><b>Helcom MLW</b> <i>all information available during the process, information for this integrated, holistic approach in a coastal watershed provided by the local and regional stakeholders</i></p> <p><b>Alcobendas - city of water for the 21<sup>st</sup> cent.</b> <i>Water saving achievements through a variety of communications channels, including media and household distribution of pamphlets</i></p>

	<p>Erne Sustainable Wetlands Project <i>Workshops and mapping at a sub – catchment level.</i></p> <p>SAGE projects (Fr)</p> <p>Drome river, SAGE (Fr)</p> <p>River Em (Sw)</p> <p>The Water Association of river Fyrisan (Sw)</p> <p>Municipal Water plan Hilversum</p>	<p>River Em (Sw)</p> <p>Municipal Water Plan of Orebro (Sw)</p>	<p>The water association of river Fyrisan</p> <p>Municipal Water Plan of Orebro</p>
--	---	---	---

# 1. River basin management plans in Flanders, Belgium

## **Inspiration points;**

Integral water management, planning at river basin level, participation in different phases of the process, stakeholders, participatory working groups, interviews, surveys,...

## **Aim/objective of the project;**

In Flanders, the water system is managed by several local (a.o. provinces, communities) and regional (Flemish) authorities. Because of different concerns and interests of these authorities on the one hand, and because of the role that stakeholders play in using the watersystem on the other hand, 11 river basin management plans will be made in a participatory manner. These management plans will include:

- A description of the water system and its surroundings;
- A description of the needs of the stakeholders;
- An analysis of these descriptions, the bottlenecks and expectations;
- A vision on the development of the water system (including goals);
- Programme of measures

## **Scale/unit of planning;**

11 river basins in Flanders

## **Period:**

2001-2006

## **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

- To involve all authorities and come to an agreement on the development of the water system;
- To involve all stakeholders and public in general;
- To inform the public in order to develop sustainable water management

## **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

- A description of the water system and its surroundings: consultation of all authorities, universities and (some) stakeholders in a working group;
- A description of the needs of the stakeholders: active involvement of the stakeholders;
- An analysis of these descriptions, the bottlenecks and expectations: active involvement of authorities and stakeholders;
- A vision on the development of the water system (including goals): active involvement of authorities and stakeholders;
- Programme of measures : active involvement of authorities and stakeholders;

## **2. Regional Planning System, Denmark**

### **Inspiration points;**

Integration of land-use and water use; public consultation procedures

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

Regional planning in Denmark integrates land-use and water management and provides the framework for agriculture, forestry, assignment of areas sensitive to groundwater, areas assigned for nature corridors, location of large infrastructure and urban development

The system is linked closely with the EIA requirements as well as all activities related to wastewater treatment planning, drinking water supply and nature restoration

Thus, the strength of the system is its high degree of integration between land-use and water management

### **Scale/unit of planning;**

Regional planning system, Denmark, up to 5.000 km<sup>2</sup>

### **Period:**

Since 1970ies

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

PP is provided at consultation level through public hearing procedures.

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

The number of people attending public meetings, though, is not very high. Stakeholders – organisations, industry, farmers etc. – provide their opinion through letters as well as bi-lateral meetings with the County

### **Methods and tools applied;**

Formal public hearing rounds via electronic media, local and regional press, publications available in public buildings etc.

### **Major input of stakeholders**

Knowledge. Support or disagreement communicated.

### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

Opportunity provided for the broad public as well as key stakeholders to influence the process. Acceptance of the regional planning system as the most feasible approach for linking water use and land use.

### **Lessons learnt:**

Lessons learned: integration of coastal waters in the regional planning has to take place across watershed boundaries; this is organised through county co-operation structures, but measures may vary from county to county; the Danish Water Action Plan is implemented through the counties, but has still difficulties in addressing non-point sources

### **Formal Procedures for PP**

Described in the Law on Regional Planning.

### **For more information contact:**

Danish Ministry of Environment  
Henrik Dissing, WWF Denmark, [h.dissing@wwf.dk](mailto:h.dissing@wwf.dk)

### **Available reports**

[www.mem.dk](http://www.mem.dk)

### **3. Tubaek Stream, Denmark**

**Inspiration points;**

Involving farmers as partners in water management

**Aim/objective of the project;**

A 3-year project involving 1 person from the county and 1 from the farmers union aiming at involving all farmers (approx 50) in the 15 km Tubaek Stream in voluntary agreements regarding reducing excessive use of nutrients and pesticides. Through a carefully planned dialogue, a positive and constructive co-operation was established with the farmers, leading to substantial cuts in run-off of nitrogen, full cut of excessive use of phosphorous and pesticides. The basis for the voluntary agreements was the existing framework for supporting environmentally-friendly farming, which has its origin in the 2<sup>nd</sup> pillar of the CAP

**Scale/unit of planning;**

A 15 km stream and its catchment within the county of Storstroem

**Period:**

1998-2001

**Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

To establish a win-win situation, which involves farmers as partners in water management

**Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

Farmers in a local water catchment together with representatives from county and farmers advisory service

**Methods and tools applied;**

The key to the constructive dialogue was that public meetings were organised through the farmers union and that meetings took place at the farm – the “kitchen-table model”.

**Major input of stakeholders**

Knowledge on local issues, resources in terms of pro-active participation and commitment. Willingness to imply changes in their production practices to ensure environmental quality,

**Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

Local farmers accepting environmental objectives, contributing pro-actively in implementation of programs perceiving it as a win-win situation, establishment of relations between farmers and the county build on trust.

**Lessons learnt:**

Lessons learned: farmers can be mobilised for implementing environmentally-friendly practices, provided the dialogue chosen respects the farmer and it meets him at his premises

The approach is time-consuming, but prevents conflicts. The results are incorporated into the daily farming activities, hereby creating a win-win situation. The approach builds on existing co-operation structures within the farmers' community.

**For more information contact:**

Storstroems County, Annette Larsen, [ajl@npk.stam.dk](mailto:ajl@npk.stam.dk)

Henrik Dissing, WWF Denmark, [h.dissing@wwf.dk](mailto:h.dissing@wwf.dk)

**Available reports**

Forthcoming

## **4. Reducing Water Consumption in the Graphics Sector, Denmark**

### **Inspiration points;**

Cooperation with business companies. Knowledge on day-to-day business practices. Co-funding in terms of staff time allocated for the demonstration activities. Sharing knowledge with other companies from the sector, which in fact are also their competitors. Cleaner practices in Graphics Sector

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

Aim: to reduce water consumption and environmental impact from companies in the Graphics Corporate Sector through demonstration activities – the result was an impressive 70-90% reduction in the water consumption

### **Scale/unit of planning;**

Company / business sector

**Period:** 2000

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

For the corporate sector as such to engage in cleaner practices investments, several barriers must be dealt with: lack of information about their environmental problems and related improvement opportunities (knowledge on benefits), lack of interest / motivation (incentives), lack of access to financing.

Demonstration of concrete opportunities and providing of win-win examples allows for a new business paradigm to spread. Further, through this co-operation the Competent Authorities also gets input on how to establish a feasible planning and incentives framework.

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

Danish Environmental Protection Agency unit for cleaner production, consultancy company, selected companies from the Graphics Sector, Graphics Business Sector Association

PP: several companies as well as the Graphics Corporate Sector organisation was involved comprehensively throughout the entire process shaping the improvements within the daily activities of the companies and testing new equipment, supported economically by the project

### **Methods and tools applied;**

Direct involvement of selected companies in concrete activities, elaboration of main results in evaluation report, dissemination through Danish EPA and Graphics Business Sector networks

### **Major input of stakeholders**

Knowledge on day-to-day business practices. Co-funding in terms of staff time allocated for the demonstration activities. Sharing knowledge with other companies from the sector, which in fact are also their competitors.

### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

Significant environmental improvements, positive attitude from the Business Sector to implementation of Cleaner Practices, remarkably improved

### **Lessons learnt:**

With rather limited funding schemes, demonstration activities can successfully be conducted, with the results being extracted for later inclusion in revision of environmental regulation of the sector's environmental impact. Through this approach, the new regulation is fully in line with what is possible in the sector, while at the same time the organisation can communicate results as well as the future legislative changes in advance to their members. The investments made from the State budget are later saved in costs for wastewater treatment plants.

### **For more information contact:**

Danish EPA, +45 32660100, Danish Technological University, Christian Poll, [cp@ipu.dk](mailto:cp@ipu.dk)

Henrik Dissing, WWF Denmark, [h.dissing@wwf.dk](mailto:h.dissing@wwf.dk)

## 5. Westcountry Rivers Trust, UK

### **Inspiration points;**

Environmental charitable trust. Development of catchment management activities.

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

The Westcountry Rivers Trust (WRT) is an environmental charitable trust established in 1994/5 to conserve, maintain and improve the natural beauty and ecological integrity of rivers, streams and wetlands. The WRT regards appropriate land management and the restoration of sympathetic flow regimes as central to the recovery of biodiversity. The WRT works both as a leader and facilitator in the region to effect change through the development and delivery of catchment action.

WWF-UK identified the WRT as a partner in 2000. The partnership, still in its early stages, is intended to demonstrate WWF's key policy messages on the ground and to take some of the lessons from WRT's work to national and European level policy arenas. Work on focuses primarily on freshwater conservation, sustainable rural development and other key land use policy areas.

### **Scale/unit of planning;**

The Westcountry Rivers Trust focuses its activities in the south-west of England (the counties of Devon and Cornwall). Specific projects are largely focused at the catchment level (e.g. the Tamar 2000 project was focused on the River Tamar catchment).

### **Period:**

The Westcountry Rivers Trust has been in existence since 1995. Several projects have undertaken since its formation with varying durations. The Tamar 2000 project was funded by the EU under its Objective 5b scheme – it lasted three years.

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

- awareness raising
- to use the knowledge and experience of stakeholders for the sustainable development of river catchment areas
- improved water quality through comprehensive involvement of farmers

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

Participation has largely focused on farmers and key regional stakeholders (e.g. statutory environment agencies, the local water company, other NGOs).

The WRT works both as a leader and facilitator in the region to effect change through the development and delivery of action. For instance, WRT has recently used WWF-UK funding to bring together key regional stakeholders in a workshop to begin the process of agreeing a long term vision for the landscape of the south-west. The workshop has been followed by a questionnaire exercise which asks stakeholders to identify their priorities for rural land-use. Further follow-up activities are planned.

### **Major input of stakeholders**

Vision on the long term development of the landscape

Priorities for rural land use

Knowledge on local issues, resources in terms of pro-active participation and commitment. Willingness to imply changes in their production practices to ensure environmental quality,

### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

WRT projects have resulted in:

- Improved river water quality through reduced use of farm chemicals (fertilisers, pesticides etc.). In time this will contribute to enhanced aquatic ecosystems.

- Improved farm incomes: more efficient use of water, improved farming practices and reduced chemical use have resulted in net direct benefits of approximately £2,700 per farm per year in two catchments. Indirect benefits have yet to be measured.

The implementation of proposed activities with tangible results like: for example Salmon is back, being able to swim in the river , etc.

**Lessons learnt:**

One of the most important lessons learned is that farmers are the best people to communicate messages to other farmers. In addition, messages on how to improve rivers and the environment carry more weight if there are clear benefits for farmers.

**For more information please contact:**

WWF UK, Dave Tickner

Henrik Dissing, WWF Denmark, [h.dissing@wwf.dk](mailto:h.dissing@wwf.dk)

**Available reports**

[www.wwf.uk](http://www.wwf.uk)

## 6. DEFRA Stakeholder Sounding Board, England

### Key- words;

National stakeholder involvement

### Aim/objective of the project;

The terms of reference for the Stakeholder Sounding Board says that it is a forum for stakeholders to:

- provide input to DEFRA (Department for Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs) thinking on transposition, and related policy issues, of the Water Framework Directive (WFD)
- raise issues relating to the WFD of concern to the group
- provide input into development of a long-term strategy for the environmental quality of water - what it should cover, in what detail, risks and opportunities

### Scale/unit of planning;

National – the Stakeholder Sounding Board considers WFD-related issues for the whole of England. To date, no similar groups have been established in Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland.

### Period:

The Stakeholder Sounding Board was established in early 2001 after a request from a group of stakeholder organisations (including WWF-UK). There is no fixed timescale for the group's existence.

### Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:

The organisations represented on the Stakeholder Sounding Board are:

#### *Government*

DEFRA (Department for Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs)

#### *Statutory agencies*

Environment Agency (the government's statutory agency for environmental protection in England and Wales)

English Nature (the government's statutory advisor on, and agency for, nature protection in England)

#### *Private sector*

Confederation of British Industry (CBI)

Chemical Industries Association (CIA)

Crop Protection Association (CPA)

Country Land and Business Association (CLA)

National Farmers' Union (NFU)

Water UK (the trade association for UK water companies and water authorities)

#### *NGOs*

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)

WWF-UK

#### *Other stakeholders*

UK Centre for Economic and Environmental Development (UKCEED)

Office of the National Consumer Council (ONCC)

Participation takes the form of regular meetings (approximately 3 or 4 a year), hosted in turn by different stakeholder Sounding Board members. The meetings are chaired by a senior official from DEFRA.

DEFRA also undertakes a secretariat function.

### Major input of stakeholders

Individual stakeholder organisations, or small groups of stakeholder organisations, can flag up issues for discussion. They are then invited by the Stakeholder Sounding Board to prepare a paper on the issue. The paper is discussed at subsequent meetings.

DEFRA may also raise agenda items.

Thus, WWF and UKCEED have prepared a paper on public participation; the RSPB and others have prepared a paper on Wetlands and the Water Framework Directive; the RSPB, WWF, Water UK and the NFU are currently preparing a paper on diffuse pollution.

Outstanding issues:

It is not clear what status these papers have within the government. Although the papers include recommendations for action by government and other stakeholders, DEFRA have not made clear whether they will act on those recommendations, even if all stakeholder organisations agree with them.

The relationship between the Stakeholder Sounding Board and the UK government's internal technical advisory group on implementing the WFD has yet to be clarified.

**Lessons learnt:**

A national forum that allows stakeholders to input directly into policy thinking is genuinely useful. It allows direct access to government officials and provides a mechanism by which government can assess the most important issues. For relatively little cost and effort this enhances the traditional methods of consultation and individual meetings with each stakeholder organisation.

However, it is important that there is full transparency so that stakeholder organisations can see how their ideas and concerns are considered and acted on (or not) by the Government. At the moment, we are still working on this in the Stakeholder Sounding Board.

**For more information contact:**

WWF UK, David Tickner, [DTickner@wwf.org.uk](mailto:DTickner@wwf.org.uk)

## **7. The Wise Use of Floodplains Project in Somerset**

*Our work was made possible through the award of a 50% grant from the EU LIFE Environment Fund programme.*

### **Inspiration points – this example is inspiring because:**

in partnership with other initiatives it facilitated a creative and positive dialogue on the future management of flood events in a catchment, where previously stakeholder views had been polarised for decades to the extent where the conflict had become notorious in national environmental circles.

### **Aim/objective of the project:**

The WUF Project's aim was to encourage the wise use of water resources in river catchments to benefit, people, their livelihoods and their environment. We set out to achieve this by:

1. Generating new options for the sustainable management of flood events across the catchment and annual water levels on the floodplain.
2. Testing methods to find out what were the economic, social and environmental costs and benefits of different options for managing flood events and floodplain water levels.
3. Finding out how the policies of the government and European Union need to be changed to promote sustainable management of the catchment and its floodplain.
4. Passing findings to managers of river catchments across Europe to enable their governments to implement the new EU Water Framework Directive.

### **Scale/unit of planning:**

The River Parrett Catchment in the county of Somerset, South West England. It is the largest river system in Somerset covering 1665 km<sup>2</sup>, about half of the county area and containing five major rivers: the Parrett, Isle, Tone, Yeo and Cary. The floodplain forms a significant part of the Somerset Levels & Moors, which is recognised as of international importance for wildlife.

### **Period:**

January 2000 – March 2002

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?):**

In Somerset, the WUF Project developed new ways of helping stakeholders in the River Parrett Catchment to find sustainable solutions for the management of water, both in flood events and throughout the year.

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

The Project sought to involve "stakeholders" - anyone or any organisation, at whatever level, with an interest in the management of water resources in the Parrett Catchment. Above all, it offered an opportunity for local concerns to be heard. Since the first participatory workshops started in 2000, a wide range of representatives of communities, local interests and organisations ranging from local to national government-level were involved.

### **Methods and tools applied;**

The WUF Project responded to what communities and individuals wanted. Working closely with an existing and (in the United Kingdom) unique forum for local democracy, the Levels & Moors Partnership\*, we held participatory workshops to encourage stakeholders to share views and address problems in partnership. Our workshops were managed through facilitative leadership: all that means is that with the help of group management techniques, stakeholders were helped to work together in a non-conflict environment. The WUF Project Officer was the facilitator for all participatory workshops.

We introduced contextual information, such as the results of new research on the effectiveness of present flood management practices or predictions on the impacts of climate change, and this helped all stakeholders to develop a common understanding of issues.

Participatory working has to be product-orientated to be worthwhile. If a process is not guided by the need to reach a common goal then it will drift and is unlikely to achieve results.

Stakeholders came to agree that no one solution would solve the problems of flood and water management, but that a comprehensive package of measures was needed. Although, at that stage, not all stakeholders could define precisely what their desired outcomes would be if that package was implemented, it provided the bridge to enabled a wide variety of interests to work jointly towards a common goal.

To reach the desired goal of integrated flood and water management, a variety of solutions were generated and appraised by stakeholders in our series of participatory workshops. These solutions were built into a Parrett Catchment Action Strategy, which sets out what community and organisational stakeholders wanted to be achieved by 2050”.

As collaborative working developed between local initiatives, the WUF Project and LAMP managed participatory workshops under an umbrella initiative, the Parrett Catchment Project.

It is estimated that the approximate cost of facilitating the dialogue over two years is approximately €30,000.00 (salary costs of project officer/facilitator). Workshop costs were additional but low at approximately €150 – 180 for each event (hire of the venue and catering for around 40 participants). The overall cost is difficult to estimate accurately, because staff from a variety of organisations donated their time to the initiatives involved. For the LIFE Project, the budget used to commission new research in Somerset was approximately €75,000.00 and partnership organisations provided around €36,000 of in-kind time in support of the Wise Use of Floodplains Project. (Note: all of these figures are provisional.) In conclusion, the total cost of facilitating such a complex dialogue over a two-year period was remarkably low and the gains are far greater than the financial investment.

\*LAMP serves 86 parish councils with wetland habitats on the Somerset Levels & Moors, who in turn represent all local community and organisational interests.

### **Major input of stakeholders**

We invited 85 representatives of local communities and organisations to our workshops and regularly saw 30 – 40 people at each event. The organisations ranged from the major government agencies to single-issue lobby groups. It was the first time in Somerset that participatory working had taken place on such a scale. The generation of new potential solutions to flood and water level management, their appraisal for social, economic and environmental impacts and development of an integrated approach to catchment management are all the products of co-operative working by stakeholders in facilitated workshops.

### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

A series of 27 facilitated participatory workshops, which began in May 2000, produced:

- A statement of the consensus between all stakeholder interests, which forms the basis for a vision for the future management of the catchment and floodplain.
- Eleven “components” or potential solutions to manage flood events, a combination of which will make up an Integrated Flood Management approach.
- A detailed analysis of the policy, funding, administrative and technical barriers and opportunities involving implementation of the eleven components.
- Appraisal of the social, economic and environmental costs and benefits of each of the components.
- Enhanced understanding among stakeholders of the implications of the conservation management objectives necessary to achieve “favourable condition” of the Special Protection Area.
- Initiated a productive dialogue on finding a new balance between agriculture and environmental interests to achieve favourable condition of the Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites, while helping agriculture and other rural industries to work towards sustainable management of an internationally important wetland.
- Produced practical sustainability indicators to monitor the effectiveness of changes in water and land management.

### **Lessons learnt:**

Key lessons have been learnt on making participatory working relevant to the management of a complex environmental issue that concerns a wide variety of stakeholders.

1. Make dialogue relevant to people's lives.

This is one reason why the process worked in Somerset. It centred on a major environmental issue that affected a wide range of stakeholders.

2. Dialogue should be gradual and often.

Frequent small-scale dialogue is better than big one-off events. Expensive one-off events can bring dialogue to a halt by delivering a "verdict" and may not be appropriate in making progress on a particular issue in a particular context. More flexible processes are better at accommodating changes in views and developing consensus. Continuing dialogue is better at establishing and maintaining trust and helps to manage participants' expectations of outcomes more realistically.

3. Maintain the momentum of the process.

Ensure that the next stage in the participatory process can move on from the last one. Discuss issues, generate solutions, appraise them, test them for sustainability and evaluate their effectiveness once implemented. Above all, don't become a discussion forum without purpose.

4. Create trust through impartiality.

This was critical to the success of the process in Somerset. It was the first time that water management had been discussed in a neutral public forum. The WUF Project existed between its sponsoring organisations (the LIFE Project partners): it was not seen as part of them. It was recognised locally that if any one organisation had attempted to "lead" the process, then it would not have worked. The role of the WUF project officer as an impartial facilitator enabled stakeholders to have confidence that they were taking part in a truly participative process not a consultation exercise managed by major interests. Facilitation of meetings through an independent intermediary developed trust among stakeholders and enabled both community groups and government agencies, to participate more effectively.

5. Work to invest time.

Constantly remind participants or potential participants of the need to invest time: without commitment the energy of the process will dissipate. Participants have been very committed to the Somerset process: thirty to forty key stakeholder representatives regularly attended workshops.

**Contacts for further information:**

Barry Phillips, Rural Envir. Facilitation Service, [b.phillips@tiscali.co.uk](mailto:b.phillips@tiscali.co.uk), +44 (01934) 713864

## 8. The Fens Floodplain Project – East of England

### **Inspiration points:**

Active involvement can be sampled effectively by involving communities in a few villages within a river basin.

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

To trial new participation and appraisal methods in a few villages to assess how well they reflected wider concerns across the river basin.

With the aim of gaining a broad understanding of how the public wanted their floodplain developed without the expense of consulting large numbers of people.

Then to compare the results of community participation with the views of other stakeholders obtained through other participation techniques ( e.g workshops, seminars) so as to assess how well the public proposals matched those of key organisations.

### **Scale/unit of planning;**

Sub- Regional – 2 villages within a river basin.

**Period:** 1999-2002

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

To involve local people directly in making floodplain restoration proposals for their local area.

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

A range of local people from school students to adults and retired people in two representative villages. They were invited to make any proposal they wished about making the floodplain more sustainable, socially, economically and environmentally.

### **Methods and tools applied, plus resources;**

A method called “planning for floodplains” was developed. This involved local people putting symbols onto a model to indicate floodplain restoration projects they wanted, for example, new wetland nature reserves, riverside cycleways, more boat moorings for tourists. In both villages three main sets of proposals emerged from the groups of symbols on the model such as:

- establishing a wetland nature reserve
- more boat moorings for tourists
- constructing cycleways along the riverside.

Training for a project officer and an assistant to run the “planning for floodplains” exercise cost 800 euros each. 20 days of an assistants time to prepare, run and write up the community sessions cost 5500 euros. Materials cost around 620 euros. 6 days of project officer time were already accounted for in the project budget. This method assumes there is an officer in place to run and manage the process.

### **Major input of stakeholders**

2% of the population in the two villages sampled made 200 proposals.

A model of each village and its floodplain was made available for people to put proposals on over 2 days in public locations such as the library **and school.**

### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

200 different proposals to contribute to sustainable development of the floodplain were made in each village. Most proposals aggregated into 3 main proposals in each village. The results supported proposals for floodplain restoration from an existing project called “Wet Fens for the Future”. This was valuable validation of the “Wet Fens for the Future” project for the organisations which had invested in its development.

This validation of the Wet Fens Project has encouraged organisations involved to go ahead with practical floodplain restoration projects aimed at 15,000 hectares over 50 years at a cost of 15,600,000euros. In UK terms this is a large scale restoration programme.

**Lessons learnt:**

Positive:

- That even just sampling participation in 2 villages in the sub-region can produce useful data to confirm existing proposals or to assess whether it is worth investing in a larger scale participation process.
- The “Planning for Floodplains” methodology enables any member of the public to indicate easily and quickly the floodplain management proposals they would like to see in their area.
- -The Planning for Floodplains method enables public views to be sampled relatively quickly and inexpensively.

Negative

- Time and effort need to be invested in choosing villages typical or representative of communities in the river basin e.g in terms of size, location and characteristics.
- The disadvantage of using samples is that statistically they are small numbers of people and therefore may not reflect wider views across the river basin. The results need to be corroborated against the results of other participation methods in the same river basin (workshops/seminars)

**Further information –**

[www.floodplains.org](http://www.floodplains.org) or via [jac.cuff@virgin.net](mailto:jac.cuff@virgin.net) for the European Environment Bureau.

## 9. National Water Council, “Comité National de l’Eau”, FRANCE

### Inspiration points:

The advice of the National Water Council (“Comité National de l’Eau”) is composed of all partners of the world of water : users, NGO, water suppliers, chairmen of Basin Committees, experts and scientists, State representatives, elected officials, etc. This diversity allows to have deep and rich debates. The approach is participatory and the final advice of the Committee is established through the reaching of a consensus. Debating important water-related issues among all partners is an important tool to increase transparency.

### Aim/objective of the project:

To give advice on the definition of

- water legislation (transposition of Directives, draft laws and draft decrees)
- water policy conducted at the national level
- water policy conducted at the river basin level

### Scale/unit of planning:

- National

### Period:

The CNE exists since 1965.

He had 43 plenary meetings in the past 10 years (several meetings per year).

### Objective of Public Participation

- To give advice on
  - the French river basins
  - all large development projects and water distribution schemes
  - any problem shared by two or several basins
  - any issue related to water laws
- To discuss the preliminary definition of water policy
- To advise the Minister and propose solutions to the issues related to the water acts of 1964 and 1992.

### Who participated and how

The National Water Council was created by the 1964 Water Act. Its composition was defined in 1965 by Decree. Under the Prime Ministers responsibility, the National Water Council is composed of 77 members, divided into 5 colleges :

- 23 water users (chambers of agriculture, fishers’ associations, industrialists, associations of consumers or for environmental protection, tourism associations, water suppliers, etc.)
- 6 chairmen of the basin committees
- 8 competent people (scientists, experts, specialists, etc.)
- 18 state representatives (representatives of the Ministers in charge of water issues)
- 22 elected officials (deputies, department or regional councils, etc.)

### Methods and tools applied:

The CNE is not a registry office of juridical texts. Targeted and well prepared files allow a real debate to take place during the meetings.

- Before the meetings :

The Committee’s Office, hosted by the Water Department of the Ministry of Environment, prepares informations papers which are sent to the members of the Committee.

- During the meetings :

A debate takes place for each point of the programme and any member of the Committee can give his own point of view. The consensus approach is preferred to the voting.

- After the meetings :

The members of the Committee can send supplementary observations to the Office, which adds them to the minutes of the meeting. The minutes are examined and approved at the next meeting.

**Major input of stakeholders:**

The advice of the National Water Committee is obligatory for the elaboration of Water Acts, application texts for Water Acts and the decrees determining the nomenclature for activities subjected to prior authorisation or declaration. For example, the National Water Committee gave recently a major input in the following issues :

- draft law reforming the French water policy
- draft water management plans (“Schémas directeurs d’aménagement et de gestion des eaux” = SDAGE) for 1 oversea department (Guyane) and 2 islands (Martinique and Reunion).
- transposition of the Drinkwater Directive into French right.

**Tangible result (effect) of PP?:**

The large representation of stakeholders in the NWC improves the dialogue between interested parties and ensures a central function for advice or proposition to the Minister.

Comments on the texts are useful and allow a real improvement of them. But above all, the most important result consists in the possibility to organise a real debate on water issues and for water issues.

**Lessons learnt:**

The National Water Committee has become a important tool for the transparency in the field of water policy. It has found a real place and plays a major role in the water policy – related decisions. It has no juridical power but its role is essential : its advice is taken into account when the final decision is taken. Concerning draft laws, prior debates within the Committee help to improve the texts and bring a consensus before the presentation to the legislative assembly.

**Contacts for further information:**

Ministère de l’écologie et du développement durable (Ministry of Ecology and Sustainable Development)  
Direction de l’eau (Water Department)  
20 avenue de Ségur  
75 302 PARIS Cedex 07

Madame Nelly BOBLIN-COLLET  
Bureau de la coordination interministérielle  
Tél : (00 33) 1 42 19 12 63  
Fax : (00 33) 1 42 19 12 69  
E-mail : [nelly.boblin-collet@environnement.gouv.fr](mailto:nelly.boblin-collet@environnement.gouv.fr)

**Web Site :** <http://web/ministere/organismes/old/CNE.htm>

## 10. The S.D.A.G.E. Projects, “Schémas Directeurs d’Aménagement et de Gestion des Eaux” (river basin management plans), FRANCE

### **Inspiration points:**

The success of the dialogue and participation of interested parties will make the success of the SDAGE. To be used by the State services, the municipalities and the users as a reference document, the content of the SDAGE must be well discussed and negotiated, well understood and well accepted.

### **Aim/objective of the project:**

To elaborate the river basin management plan (in French : “Schéma directeur d’aménagement et de gestion des eaux” or SDAGE) which :

- defines the main orientations of a comprehensive and balanced management of aquatic environments and of their use.
- represents a framework for the planning process in the River Basin. Content: environmental assessment: initial status, main problems, quality and quantity objectives, orientations and priority measures (guidelines)

### **Scale/unit of planning:**

- ‘Regional’, river basin level (about 100.000 km<sup>2</sup>)

### **Period:**

1992 - 1997

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?):**

- To obtain a reference document for all questions all over the great basin (from flooding to water quality ...) defining management objectives, strategy and actions
- To reach consensus between all categories of users / stakeholders
- To use the elaboration phase to create a common understanding, a common vision at the scale of the river basin between State services, communities and users.
- To involve people in the definition of the rules of the game : the more people we involve in the process, the more chances we have to see the rules respected.

### **Degree of PP and stakeholders involved:**

The Basin Committee is composed of the representatives of all stakeholders and users in the River Basin (about 100 members):

- 1/3 local elected officials (i.e. mayors, local communities)
- 1/3 users, consumers, NGOs
- 1/3 representatives of the State

The Basin Committee defines the management plan (SDAGE) and co-ordinates the coherence between SAGE Projects. It arbitrates water conflicts, decides on the taxes to be paid by the users and defines action programmes.

### **Methods and tools applied:**

Each Basin Committee created a Planning Commission and several Geographic Commissions (implanted at a more local level) in which a number of debates and meetings took place. Hundreds of interested parties were able to voice their opinions in the meetings of these geographic commissions.

For example in the Rhone-Mediterranean-Corsica (RMC) Basin, the stakeholders were consulted through 10 geographic commissions, 6 technical committees and 7 socio-professional committees. Besides, the SDAGE Project was submitted to the associations by way of a specific dialogue. 1500 written comments from stakeholders and the general public were received.

### **Major input of stakeholders:**

- All stakeholders discuss in detail all the components of the plan, the preliminary reports and the final report, which are modified in consequence and finally accepted by all
- A real involvement of the water users in the decision-making process, including ‘polluters’

- A lot of exchanges between stakeholders, giving some “social learning” about water management (understanding of the diversity of stakes, better acceptance of the different expectations and water uses)
- For example in the Rhône Méditerranée Corse Basin, as regards the associations concerned with environmental protection, they have been a real stimulus for different issues : management of alluvial plains, hydroelectricity, granule extractions from the rivers, etc.

#### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?:**

- The river basin management plan (SDAGE) was elaborated and discussed between all categories of stakeholders within the Basin Committee).
- The decentralisation of the Basin Committee through geographical commissions, users & consumers commissions, allow to involve also local people
- Associations have been stakeholders in the thinking and the decision-making, which is essential. For example, in RMC Basin they achieved great progress as regards the protection of wetlands, flood-prone areas, riparian forests, alluvial groundwater, etc.
- Socially more accepted measures

#### **Lessons learnt:**

Strong points :

- Necessity to implement training and information all along the process
- Concertation and effective participation of users need sufficient delays in order to allow the different consultations to take actively place
- Time is necessary so that the stakeholders of a river basin know and understand each other, speak together, ratify together the diagnosis of the river basin status and think together about the possible solutions to solve the problems identified.

Weak points :

- The SDAGE was elaborated and discussed by representatives: it is a representative and not a direct participation of the public in general.
- The SDAGE document is made available to the general public only after its approval.

#### **Contact for further information:**

Ministère de l'écologie et du développement durable (Ministry of Ecology and Sustainable Development)

Direction de l'eau (Water Department) - 20 avenue de Ségur - 75 302 PARIS Cedex 07

Madame Coralie NOËL - Bureau de l'économie de l'eau et de la programmation

Tél : (00 33) 1 42 19 13 76 - Fax : (00 33) 1 42 19 12 94

E-mail : [coralie.noel@environnement.gouv.fr](mailto:coralie.noel@environnement.gouv.fr)

Web Sites : <http://www.environnement.gouv.fr/ministere/sdage.htm>

[http://www.oieau.fr/anglais/gest\\_eau/index.htm](http://www.oieau.fr/anglais/gest_eau/index.htm)

<http://www.eaufrance.tm.fr/>

## 11. The SAGE Projects, “Schémas d’aménagement et de gestion des eaux” (Local water management plans), FRANCE

### **Inspiration points:**

The scale of these local management plans (about 1000 km<sup>2</sup>) allows to be closer from people and concrete problems. It gives more place for participation than a larger scale.

This example show that time and pedagogy are needed to reach a consensus between interested parties. According to the case, interested parties can decide in the final document to apply the existing water law only or to go a little further.

### **Scale/unit of planning:**

‘Local’, sub-basin level (about 1.000 km<sup>2</sup>)

### **Aim/objective of the project:**

- To start from a local wish and progress towards a large consensus between users
- To involve local people
- To precise the guidelines defined in the SDAGE and to adapt them to local circumstances
- To be closer to concrete questions and implement concretely the guidelines and tools defined in the SDAGE.

### **Period:**

About 5 years

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?):**

- To obtain a reference document for all questions all over the local basin (from flooding to water quality ...) defining management objectives, strategy and actions
- To reach consensus between all categories of users / stakeholders
- To use the elaboration phase to create a common understanding, a common vision at the scale of the river basin between State services, communities and users.
- To involve people in the definition of the rules of the game : the more people we involve in the process, the more chances we have to see the rules respected.

### **Degree of PP and stakeholders involved:**

SAGE is elaborated and discussed between all categories of stakeholders within the Local Water Commission

The Local Water Commission is instituted in order to elaborate the SAGE document. It is composed of the representatives of all stakeholders and users in the sub-basin area (about 50 members) :

½ local elected officials (i.e. mayors, local communities)

¼ users, consumers, NGOs

¼ representatives of the State

Like the SDAGE, the SAGE document is still discussed between representatives, but they are in this case local representatives

The SAGE results of a shared decision of the CLE, completed by a consultation of all the citizens

The general public (citizens) has access to the project during 2 months and can comment on it.

### **Methods and tools applied:**

The elaboration of this type of planning document needs a collective approach, which is based on the local solidarity at the level of the basin or sub-basin. The most important success factor is to create dynamics round the definition of a common project.

- A facilitator (a technician or an engineer) is employed at the beginning of the project in order to manage the whole process
- At the beginning, the facilitator organises information meetings for the members of the Local Water Commission on water issues and the role of the SAGE document. He informs also all the elected

officials of the basin and raises the awareness of the different partners and stakeholders within the river basin

- A lot of meetings of the Water Local Commission take place in which the people concerned can debate to produce the plan from the beginning to the end of the elaboration process
- Thus, the members of the Local Water Commission go in common from a step to the next, with preliminary reports which are really discussed in detail, modified and finally accepted by all stakeholders:
  - assessment of the initial status of the basin and tendencies,
  - definition of water quality and quantity objectives,
  - determination of the rules for the aquatic environments preservation and the actions to be planned.
- When the project of SAGE has been elaborated by the Local Water Commission, it is made available for comments to the general public during 2 months in public places.
- The project can be modified by the Local Water Commission to take into account the comments of the public before the adoption by the Prefect.
- After the adoption of the plan, the Local Water Commission follows the implementation of the plan and for this purpose it has 2 meetings / year.
- During the whole process, communication tools are used to raise and maintain the motivation of both the stakeholders and the general public (some booklets are regularly distributed to all homes)

#### **Major input of stakeholders:**

- All stakeholders discuss in detail all the components of the plan, the preliminary reports and the final report, which are modified in consequence and finally accepted by all
- A real involvement of the water users in the decision-making process, including ‘polluters’
- At the local level of the sub-basin and in the SAGE preparation, local associations can speak in the name of the river itself

#### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?:**

- A lot of exchanges between stakeholders, giving some “social learning” about water management (understanding of the diversity of stakes, better acceptance of the different expectations and water uses)
- Progress towards a shared culture
- Decentralisation of the decision
- Concrete implementation of the existing water law and definition of some supplementary water regulations at the level of the sub-basin.
- Socially more accepted measures

#### **Lessons learnt:**

-Strong points :

- With regard to the SDAGE, the SAGE is closer from concrete questions and is at a more adequate scale for participation
- It is necessary to implement training and information all along the process
- It is necessary to have clear ideas on the common objectives, to put in place a solid but also open institutional organisation
- It is essential to work at the adequate scale and adapt to the context
- The Local Water Commission is a place for the dialogue between the different stakeholders of the territory. The representiveness of the composition of the Commission is an essential success factor.
- Importance of human resources : the staff must be adapted to the stakes and the context
- It is essential to maintain the motivation of everybody all along the process and to show the progress realised with the concrete actions made during the whole elaboration of the SAGE

Weak points :

- the asymmetry of information among stakeholders biases discussions
- the slowness of the process, mainly for legal, political and institutional reasons

- the consultation of the general public is only formal, when the draft is already developed and complete

**Contact for further information:**

Ministère de l'écologie et du développement durable (Ministry of Ecology and Sustainable Development)

Direction de l'eau (Water Department)

20 avenue de Ségur

75 302 PARIS Cedex 07

Madame Coralie NOËL

Bureau de l'économie de l'eau et de la programmation

**Tél : (00 33) 1 42 19 13 76**

Fax : (00 33) 1 42 19 12 94

E-mail : [coralie.noel@environnement.gouv.fr](mailto:coralie.noel@environnement.gouv.fr)

Web Site : <http://www.sitesage.org/>

## **12. The Drôme river S.A.G.E. (Catchment Water Management Plan), FRANCE**

(The Drôme river SAGE was the first SAGE to have been completed, following the procedure established in the 1992 Water Act)

### **Inspiration points:**

#### **Aim/objective of the project:**

- To elaborate a tool for management regulation of the Drôme River
- To solve the priority problems of the catchment which are the quantity management of the water resource and the maintenance of beds and river banks.
- To precise the guidelines of other aspects of the water management.

#### **Scale/unit of planning::**

Local / catchment

The Drôme river SAGE covers 83 communes and a catchment area of 1,640 m<sup>2</sup>. The total population is 42,500 inhabitants.

#### **Period: 1994-1997**

- Technical studies, discussions and local meetings from 1994 to 1997 (3 years).
- Consultation and approval in 1997.
- In the final SAGE document, the Local Water Commission and the different stakeholders involved fixed themselves a period of 5 years to update the document.

#### **Objective of Public participation (Why PP):**

The SAGE is a process of local consultation, negotiation and consensus to reach agreed objectives regarding water management between the different interested parties and river users.

The Drôme valley area is characterised by a beautiful countryside and varied heritage value through the rivers of the catchment, their underground water tables, and their dependent wetland ecosystems. The objectives were to protect these assets and to ensure a better appreciation of them, taking into account the different water uses and ensuring preventive action against risks.

#### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

- The Local Water Commission (participation of stakeholders)  
The SAGE is drawn by a Local Water Commission instigated by the State Prefect. The SAGE is submitted to the Basin Committee, local government institutions, chambers of commerce and agriculture and the general public for consultation before being voted by the Local Water Commission and then officially approved by the State prefect.  
The Local Water Commission for the Drôme river was composed of 44 members :
  - 50% local elected officials,
  - 25% representatives of State services and departments,
  - 25% representatives of local water users groups (agricultural irrigation, gravel extraction, leisure activities, associations, etc)
- The Basin Committee (consulted)
- Local elected officials (consulted)
- Chambers of commerce and agriculture (consulted)
- The State Prefect (final decision)

#### **Methods and tools applied:**

- Meetings of the Local Water Commission at the level of the basin
- Sub-basin meetings
- A specific facilitator (who was also a technician) was in charge of the preparation of meetings, the communication during the whole process concerning the progress of the works, the technical secretariat and the writing of the SAGE.
- The draft was made available to the general public for comments in public places (during 2 months).

- The Local Water Commission published during the process regularly a journal to inform the population living in the basin of the different activities done in the catchment.
- The document is now under implementation and the Local Water Commission still publishes regularly this journal.

**Major input of stakeholders::**

About 20 meetings of the Local Water Commission  
 Numerous sub-basin meetings  
 Consultation of the general public

**Tangible result (effect) of PP:**

The process has gone through three main steps at which a consensus between all categories of stakeholders and users was reached : assessment of the current situation, definition of management priorities, evaluation of necessary measures to achieve these objectives.

The SAGE objectives were translated into 6 actions plans related to : water resources, river channels and banks, water quality, risk management, natural heritage ecosystems, tourism and leisure activities.

**Lessons learnt:**

Agreement on the SAGE was possible through a local will to make public interest a priority.

The Drôme river was perceived as a linking factor and gave an identity to the whole valley area and to the whole consultation process.

The consensus obtained on the SAGE document ensures the further application of the SAGE (implemented since 1997), the coordination between existing structures and a sustainable presence in this field.

**Contact for further information:**

Ministère de l'écologie et du développement durable (Ministry of Ecology and Sustainable Development)

Direction de l'eau (Water Department) - 20 avenue de Ségur - 75 302 PARIS Cedex 07

Madame Coralie NOËL

Bureau de l'économie de l'eau et de la programmation

**Tél : (00 33) 1 42 19 13 76**

Fax : (00 33) 1 42 19 12 94

E-mail : [coralie.noel@environnement.gouv.fr](mailto:coralie.noel@environnement.gouv.fr)

District d'aménagement du Val de Drôme

Cours Verdun

26400 CREST

Tél.(00 33) 4.75.25.43.82

Fax.(00 33) 4.75.25.44.96

[www.icpdr.org](http://www.icpdr.org)

### **13. National Commission for Public Debate, “Commission Nationale du Débat Public” (CNDP), France**

#### **South Branch High-Speed Train Rhine-Rhone Project**

The National Commission for Public Debate (CNDP) was created in 1995 by the law n°95-101 of 2 February 1995 to reinforce the awareness of the environment in the big development projects.

The Commission is composed of members of the Parliament, local representatives, magistrates, society representatives and qualified personalities.

The Commission organises itself, when it is requested to do so by a petition, a public debate, or it asks the contracting authority to organise it. The debate has to deal with the objectives and characteristics of the main operations.

The public is invited to express itself but the contracting authority is not legally obliged by its answers given to the public.

The debate, which length is set for 4 months (prolonged for 2 months if needed), has to find its place at the beginning of the process. The president of the special commission prepares a report of the development of the debate and submits it to the president of the National Commission of public debate. The CNDP, after hearing the president of the particular commission, proceeds to a general discussion of the debate report. The president of the CNDP prepares a balance sheet and makes it available to the public with the report.

In application of the law of 27 February 2002 (Local Democracy Law), the CNDP will become an independent authority, looking after the respect of public participation during the complete development of a project. The CNDP will be charged of giving advice and recommendations to favour and develop public participation.

#### **Inspiration points:**

- The CNDP uses a wide range of methods and tools for information and participation of the public.
- From a meeting to the next, the contributions of the public are added to the documents distributed to the participants for the discussion (“actors book”).
- The contracting authority takes into account the opinions of the public who participates in the debate and the project might be changed in consequence.

#### **Aim/objective of the project:**

The new High-Speed Rhine-Rhone rail line is registered under the national High-Speed Railway Plan with the mission of combining “the relations north-south between Germany, the north of Switzerland and the east of France and the Mediterranean and Spain” on the one hand and, “the relations east-west between Paris, Bourgogne, Franche-Comté, the south of the Alsace and Switzerland”, on the other hand.

#### **Scale/unit of planning:**

Four regions: Alsace, Bourgogne, Franche-Comté and Rhone-Alps.

The territory of the debate counts 4,5 million people from Strasbourg to Lyon.

#### **Period:**

From the 15 of March to the 15 of June 2000 (3 months).

#### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP):**

The CNDP was requested by the French Nature Environment federation (NGO) for organizing a public debate on this project. The CNDP considered that this important developing project was of national interest and had to be decided after a public debate, in which it could still be possible for the public to make some comments to the project and improve it.

#### **Who participated and how (Degree/Form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

- The CNDP chose one special commission charged of the organisation of the debate composed of personalities of the press, the railway workers, the development administration, the teaching profession, the environment and the associations circle.
  - The French Rail Network as the contracting authority
  - The “organised public” (representatives, service directors, economic authorities, etc.)
  - The press
  - The associations and the NGO’s
  - Individuals (“non organised public”)
- The actors of the debate participated during the whole period of the debate.

### **Methods and tools applied:**

The methods used to inform the public:

- The “support file” (6000 were distributed): provided by the contracting authority, made up of a general description of the objectives and the main characteristics of the project, the estimation of the economic and social stakes, the identifications of the principal environment impacts and the estimate of the economic and social cost of the project.
- The Internet site (6500 visits, 70 per day)
- The “letters of the debate” or “lettres du débat” (2 700 000 were distributed): The purpose of these information letters was to inform the public of the existence of the debate and to mobilize it regularly to participate and to communicate information on the evolution of the debate. They were made in collaboration between the contracting authority and the special commission.
- The visits to the special commission to consult all the documents of the project

The methods used for public participation:

- The public meetings (10 in different cities)
- The question-answer system (2000 questions received):
- The prepaid T cards: used to ask for information and questions.
- The mail: for sending remarks, opinions or thoughts.
- The toll-free number: an answering machine took the messages
- The E-mail: on the Internet site it was possible to ask questions and consult all the answers given
- The “contributions” (85): all the mails received at the commission which showed one particular position
- The “actors book” (10): a selection of some of the observations from the public were published in so-called “actors books” (“cahiers d’acteurs”) and distributed
- The contribution of the press (163 articles published in the regional press, 26 in the national press and 10 press meetings in the 10 cities where the public meetings took place)

### **Major input of stakeholders:**

- 10 public meetings
- 200 questions-answers
- 85 “contributions”
- 10 “actors books”

### **Tangible results of (effect) of PP:**

- The objective of making the project known by the public (in the 4 interested regions) was fulfilled: 6000 support-files were distributed, 6500 visits to the Internet site, 2 700 000 “letters of the debate” were distributed, 190 press articles on the subject were made.
- The means of expression which were made available to the public were innovative and numerous: 10 public meetings in 10 different cities, 2000 questions received at the particular commission, 85 “contributions” and 10 “actor books”.
- The contracting authority considered that some of the solutions given by the public were going to retain its attention.

### **Lessons learnt:**

- Individuals could participate and were given the same importance as the representatives, even if these representatives could represent in certain cases thousands of people.

- In the public debates, the interventions are sometimes superficial and there is not the same level of participation in all meetings. For different reasons of costs, time and availability of the stakeholders, the meetings are not enough and to participate, it's necessary to know how to talk in public, which can be difficult for the general public.
- The question-answer system lets everyone, according to the method which suits him, ask one or more questions, with the assurance of having an answer from the contracting authority through the special commission.
- The system of the "actor book" has permitted to create further considerations between the different actors inside the public itself.
- The debate has confirmed the interest of the public for these types of democratic consulting process in a moment where the project is not totally defined and where there is still place for making modifications.
- The role and the interest of the regional and local press was very important for the public debate as a support to all the information that had to be given to the public.

**Contact for further information:**

Commission Nationale du Débat Public

Ministère de l'écologie et du développement durable (Ministry of Ecology and Sustainable Development)

Direction de l'eau (Water Department)

20 avenue de Ségur

75 302 PARIS Cedex 07

Tel : (00 33) 1 42 19 20 26

Fax : (00 33) 1 42 19 17 90

**E-mail:** [cn-debatpublic@environnement.gouv.fr](mailto:cn-debatpublic@environnement.gouv.fr)

<http://www.environnement.gouv.fr/ministere/comitesconseils/cndp-fiche-descriptive.htm>

## **14. Information letters with regard to the implementation of the Water Framework Directive Germany (Thuringia),**

### **Inspiration points:**

Continuous and current information of the public; possibility to ask questions

Early involvement of the public with regard to the implementation process especially in Thuringia, i.e. already before discussing specific measures, increases acceptance and understanding of the WFD objectives.

### **Scale/unit of planning:**

Thuringia (one of the 16 German Lander), national/regional/sub-basin level

### **Period:**

During the whole implementation process, i.e. at least until 2009. Three information letters have already been published.

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

Detailed information and involvement on local and regional level in order to prepare the basis for the establishment of the program of measures and the river basin management plan or rather the Thuringian parts of them.

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

The target group are especially the persons or organisations interested in water management issues. They have the possibility to become acquainted early with the objectives and necessary steps of the WFD and to express their ideas and proposals.

### **Methods and tools applied;**

At the moment the information letters (six pages) are published twice or three times a year (available in printed form or via internet ([www.thuringen.de/tmlnu](http://www.thuringen.de/tmlnu), see: EU-Wasserrahmenrichtlinie, only in German). At the end of the letters a contact person is named (phone and email). It is possible to get the information letters automatically by email.

### **Major input of stakeholders**

The implementation process has just started, so there is less input than a huge interest from the stakeholders in as much information as possible.

### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

The until now huge demand for the information letters encouraged the Thuringian Environment Ministry to expand this approach in the future. The information letters and the contact to the ministry should be used also as platform with regard to other Thuringian ministries and to other of the 16 German Lander. The information should become intensified and specified, e.g. by information on special issues.

### **Lessons learnt:**

There is already a huge demand for detailed information. Early and open information and communication is the key for a coherent and on time implementation of the WFD.

### **For more information please contact:**

- [www.thuringen.de/tmlnu](http://www.thuringen.de/tmlnu) (EU-Wasserrahmenrichtlinie, only in German)
- Heide Jekel  
Federal Ministry for the Environment,  
Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety  
Division WA I 2 (B)/Water Law  
P.O. Box 12 06 29, 53048 Bonn, Germany  
Tel.: 0049/1888/305-2521, Fax: 0049/1888/305-3334  
mailto: heide.jekel@bmu.bund.de

## **15. River Basin Management Plan Maas/sub-basin Niers, Germany (North Rhine-Westphalia),**

### **Key- words;**

Information and consultation of the public, organised public, regional fora, non organised public

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

Pilot project with regard to Article 14 WFD in North Rhine-Westphalia (one of the 16 German Lander). Involvement of the organised public/the stakeholders in the first implementation phase until 2004 (inventories, review, analysis) on regional level. Information of the broad public in the relevant region with regard to WFD in general (objectives, implementation steps etc.).

### **Scale/unit of planning;**

Sub-basin level (the sub-basin of the Niers is divided in three parts in order to have three regional discussion and information fora (upper, middle and lower Niers).

### **Period:**

Since 2 years. Until 2004 (end of first implementation phase). At the moment it is likely that public participation by regional fora will be continued until the end of the implementation process.

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

To enable information, stakeholders' input and a consensual approach from the beginning of the implementation process on.

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

In the three Niers fora: Municipalities, districts, water companies, water associations, chambers of agriculture, forest authorities, nature conservation ngo's, biological planning units, the Netherland authorities and stakeholders (all of the relevant region), 30 – 40 persons per forum. Round Tables: Information, discussion, distribution of relevant materials, exchange of experience, involvement with regard to data collection.

Broad public on regional level: Internet site ([www.niers.nrw.de](http://www.niers.nrw.de)), possibility to ask questions.

### **Methods and tools applied;**

In the three Niers fora: Meetings at the moment once a year (sufficient for the first implementation phase, later on perhaps more frequent), internet site for each forum (only accessible by password, with all relevant information and discussion material)

Broad public on regional level: One information flyer until now (general information with regard to the WFD), Internet site ([www.niers.nrw.de](http://www.niers.nrw.de)), press reports.

### **Major input of stakeholders**

Stakeholders in the three fora delivered the necessary data for the first implementation phase until 2004 (impacts, pressures etc.).

### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

In the three regional fora none of the stakeholders feels discriminated, it is a balance of to give and to take, open and positive discussions, good atmosphere with regard to the next implementation steps. Experiences could be used for the North Rhine-Westphalia guidance paper on pp.

### **Lessons learnt:**

Huge interest of the stakeholders to participate in the implementation. The regional approach and the discussion in smaller groups proved their worth (it was already useful in the past before the WFD with regard to alluvial water programs). It is a lot of work but it is necessary to allow useful discussions and to create acceptance and understanding.

This approach is already used in some other parts of North Rhine-Westphalia and is likely to be taken over in all sub-basins or parts of them in the territory of North Rhine-Westphalia.

**For more information please contact**

- [www.niers.nrw.de](http://www.niers.nrw.de) (only in German)
- Heide Jekel  
Federal Ministry for the Environment,  
Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety  
Division WA I 2 (B)/Water Law  
P.O. Box 12 06 29  
53048 Bonn  
Germany  
Tel.: 0049/1888/305-2521  
Fax: 0049/1888/305-3334  
mailto: heide.jekel@bmu.bund.de

## 16. Erne sustainable wetlands cross border Ireland and Northern Ireland

### Inspiration points

this example is inspiring because Erne Sustainable Wetlands was an inspiring example of public participation because:

- It tried participation at different scales
- It produced a model for catchment management designed to facilitate the maximum amount of participation in a manageable way
- It tested a sustainability appraisal technique, The Local Sustainability Model, a tool for communities and professionals to appraise the sustainability of management options.
- It succeeded in achieving local action by communities that will result in sustainable, or 'wise use', of water and land resources.
- It developed an environmental educational field study course, 'Wise Use of Wetlands', for professionals and communities to help create a greater awareness and understanding of catchments and the complexities of catchment management.

### Aim/objective of the project;

Erne Sustainable Wetlands aim has been to identify ways of achieving integrated and sustainable, or 'wise use', of water and land resources for the benefit of people and wildlife within the Erne catchment.

### Objectives

Seeking ways of restoring water quality and the effective management, or 'wise use', of the catchments wetlands were the main objectives.

The project has achieved its objectives through:

- Development of a framework, or process, to help demonstrate, in practical ways, how the public could be engaged in a decision making process within the catchment.
- Development of a common vision and set of values that sets out the 'desired future condition' for the future of the Erne catchment. It describes stakeholder values for river, floodplain and catchment management for which measurable objectives can be developed subsequently.
- Exploration of issues and management proposals for sustainable management of water and land resources that are practical and have public support.
- Development of criteria and impact indicators to help assess the sustainability and impact of management proposals.
- Application of the Local Sustainability Model to assess economic, social and environmental sustainability of the management proposals.
- Development of a catchment scale, impact assessment methodology.
- Examining how policies need to be changed to promote integrated and sustainable management of the catchment.

### Scale/unit of planning

The Erne Project tested participation at three different scales:

- Catchment
- Sub-catchment
- Cross-border partnership (c1000km<sup>2</sup>)

The project took place over a two and a half year period, from November 1999 to March 2002

### Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?) Who organised it?

The Project Officer, Janie Crone, trained as a facilitator, developed principles for participation, designed the participatory process and facilitated all the workshops and training events. The participatory process was designed to help demonstrate, in practical ways, how the public could be engaged in a decision making process within the catchment.

The process initiated was open and inclusive so that anyone with a management responsibility, stake or interest in the catchment could contribute to discussions, and each workshop started with, in a sense, a blank sheet of paper.

To help encourage informed action, the process involved elements of education, awareness raising, information sharing and training. The project used Participatory workshops and events.

Training and capacity building were key elements to: Increase commitment to the process; develop ownership of the process; develop lasting skills at all levels; be cost-effective

Above all the process was about achieving consensus not a compromise – a solution that everyone is prepared to live with.

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning?**

The Erne Sustainable Wetlands participatory process involved different levels of participation at different times. Some of the process (Questionnaires, Community Mapping) was concerned with gathering information and public awareness, while other parts of the process, (themed workshops and prioritising workshop), asked stakeholders, together with statutory and non-statutory organisations, to prioritise and make choices that gave stakeholders an equal role in decision making.

#### **Stakeholder Participation and inclusivity**

Every person living within the Erne catchment should be considered a stakeholder. A stakeholder is any person, group or organisation who can impact on or be impacted by decisions made about land and water management. The population of the Erne catchment is approximately 150,000 people over an area of 4340 km<sup>2</sup>. The population is mainly rural and dispersed with an average density of 29 people per km<sup>2</sup>.

The process in the Erne tried as far as possible to include anyone who wanted to get involved. All workshops were publicly advertised through local newspapers, local newsletters, leaflets/posters and direct mailings.

In the time constraints of the project (effectively the bulk of participation had to run from September 2000 to Feb 2001) it would have been impossible to get full participation, and even the 10% (which would have been 15,000) required for a true representative sample, would have been difficult to reach. However, over 150 stakeholder groups, community organisations and development associations were contacted in the course of the project. Each group has a stake in the future of the Erne wetlands through, either, economic considerations, social life of communities or environmental concerns. In terms of inclusivity, therefore, many of the organisations and groups involved represented large numbers of people, for example, the local wildfowler group that was involved has a membership of over 400. Also many elected councillors were at the meetings and have representative status. In these terms therefore, though the figures for ‘individuals’ present would suggest low percentage involvement true representation was much higher.

### **Methods and tools applied; Include resources used if known (time, money)**

Participatory Methods included: Facilitative Leadership, Stakeholder Dialogue, Participatory Appraisal, Community Survey, questionnaires, and the Local Sustainability Model. Members of the community, stakeholder organisations and project Steering Group have been trained themselves in some of these methods.

### **Indicative costs of some of the methods**

Facilitative Leadership £3098 (pounds)

Participatory Appraisal Training £3960 (pounds)

5-day training programme for 10–16 participants.

### **Major input of stakeholders;**

Stakeholders were central to the success of the Erne Sustainable Wetlands project. An early decision in the project was to include stakeholders in the process at a very early stage so that they were involved in shaping the outcomes in a

### **Tangible results (effect) of PP?**

Within the time constraints of a project, it is difficult to give a true estimation of the tangible results of public participation.

There are several measurable results:

- There is more understanding of public participation within statutory and non-government organisations
- PP has been put on the agenda of many organisations, if only at a discussion level.
- An expectation and momentum has been created within the Erne catchment.
- A long term vision has been created
- A management model has been created for continued participation

### **Lessons learnt**

The initial process was designed to provide a framework for participation at the scale of the river basin / catchment. The process was successful in achieving its objectives. There was good discussion and debate, and each workshop developed issues into management proposals. However, a deeper analysis of the participants of the workshops showed that the process did not attract wide support and participation at community level.

By initiating the process at catchment level, many community stakeholders did not feel they could contribute to discussions because:

- They could not relate their local experiences to a catchment / river basin scale.
- There was often a lack of knowledge and awareness about catchment issues and the ability to make the link between action and impacts.
- They were not always confident about sitting around the table with ‘specialists and experts.’
- There was a real feeling that statutory agencies do not listen to the communities needs and it would be a waste of time.

### **Sub-catchment and Cross-Border Partnership Participation**

Sub-catchments are river catchments that feed into the overall river basin / catchment. They are hydrological units within the larger hydrological unit, which is the river basin or catchment.

During the early stages of the Erne participatory process, community participation with a large community partnership, Upper Erne Link (several individual community groups formed into a large partnership), had involved Community Survey and Resource Mapping workshops. These workshops fed into the overall understanding of issues, but more importantly highlighted the value of working at a much more local level than catchment.

People relate to the environment immediately around them, and to issues that impact on their lives. Experience of working within a focus area, (between Newtownbulter and Belturbet, an area of c100km<sup>2</sup>), has highlighted that:

- People feel a sense of local ownership and pride,
- Have a lot of local knowledge,
- Can often make the link between local actions and local impacts,
- Feel more able, and have the capacity, to take action at a local level.

This is not to say that the public are not capable of providing valuable contributions to a decision making process at the scale of the catchment. They are, but the process of engagement needs to start at a more localised level to help build capacity and confidence.

Summary: Need to build a catchment management structure that people feel confident with and able to participate in. To successfully engage people in a decision making process at river basin / catchment scale requires a structure of localised groups.

### **Contacts for further information:**

JANIE CRONE, **Erne Sustainable Wetlands Project Officer** : [abocurragh@utvinternet.com](mailto:abocurragh@utvinternet.com)  
European Environment Bureau via [jac.cuff@virgin.net](mailto:jac.cuff@virgin.net)

## **17. Integrated Reconnaissance of the river Rhine, Waal and IJssel (so-called RVR and IVB projects)**

### **Inspiration points:**

Consultation of experts, NGO's and other governmental organisations in a reconnaissance study at River Basin Level

### **Aim/Objective of the project:**

The Dutch government has developed its policy "room for water", but asked the regional offices of the Ministry of Public Works to develop in an open approach, in close cooperation with the other government organisations, to give advise on the possibilities of water management with a waterflow of 16.000m<sup>3</sup>/s (till 2015) and with a situation of 18.000m<sup>3</sup>/s or more afterwards (with further climatic changes...) Four projects are initiated of which two RVR and IVB are discussed below.

### **Scale/unit of planning**

Regional level (involving 2 provinces)

Scale 1: 375.000

### **Period**

1998-2001

### **Objective of PP:**

- to use the knowledge and experience of other government organisations for the development of water management options in the coming decades and hence improve the quality of the national policy.
- To develop commitment and support for the formulation and implementation of this national policy

### **Who participated and how (degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning**

The open interactive process is formed by:

- a steering committee
- a close cooperation with other governmental organisations. In steering committees, the 2 provinces, municipalities, the regional office of PW, VROM and LNV as well as the waterboards are represented. They are responsible for the decisionmaking and the advise to the government on further policies. (Before only the regional office of PW developed such studies and gave advise)
- an expert group (of government staff (and representatives of NGO's)
- In the IVB project the projectteam has been supported (in a later phase) by three "working groups" of experts per theme: 1. waterflow, use and land use 2. juridical and governmental issues 3. communication. The juridical aspects are of large importance as room for water demands a number of changes in the current laws and procedures. The RVR project organised reflection groups with representatives of NGO's)
- open communication
- from the start the projectteam showed a positive attitude towards interviews, questions by stakeholders and took care to produce clear reports, and leaflets to inform about the progress and results
- symposia (IVB). The IVB project has organised two symposia. One for the governors and the other one for NGO's and interested citizens. The aim was to explain about results of the screening study sofar, to create understanding and support and to seek reactions and advise on the proposed measures.
- information evenings for the general public (IVB)
- a (DVD) film putting water management in a historical perspective, bringing interests together under the flag of security and illustrating all proposed measures and its consequences. The objective is to inform people, provide them the knowledge they need, generate understanding for the necessity and gain insight on the different perceptions and

ideas people have. What are the consequences of these measures for the user, inhabitants and local governors?

- “Kitchen table” conferences with the ministry and farmers in the area. Which measures are possible?
- Consultation rounds (interviews) among the parties involved on how to proceed.

The government has based its decision on policy making on the results of the study on “watermanagement in the 21st century” (so-called WB21). This study has also been interactive in a sense that it formulates a strategy by organising:

- Expert meetings focusing on different topics (like agriculture, nature conservation, recreation, shipping, town planning and international aspects)
- Expert meetings and research on different policy instruments
- Research on the coherence between regional- and the national water systems

### **Methods and tools**

- See above: expert groups; working groups per issue; open communication; interviews; symposia; information evenings; DVD film; “kitchen table conferences”; consultation rounds

### **Experience and lessons learnt**

- Only after a thorough problem analysis and the generation of guidelines for water management, the project organised discussions with NGO’s ..... The idea was that the government should have a sense of direction before other parties become involved in the discussion. The topic is difficult as the problem is security and national interests are at stake ....
- However, in retrospect, the consultation of other parties and stakeholders would have been useful half-way the process in order to share problemownership and invite people to generate solutions....
- The province is eager to take the role as process manager. They are responsible for the integral area development and fear that the Ministry has a dominant say in the plan development (see reaction minister)
- A reconnaissance study becomes more effective if combined with proposals for alternative measures or scenario’s. The latter makes conflicting interests but also chances for new solutions clear. For example, the measures as proposed by IVB made the interest of the different parties clear and evoked the development of new alternatives by these stakeholders. The RVR project decided not to come with a plan but provides a kind of toolkit with 1000 measures, without indicating the location of possible measures and its effects. Discussion on what where, when and for whom was postponed and thus agreements among parties was still missing.
- The strategy that is currently being developed on watermanagement in the next century was still missing at the start of the study. Hence, pre-conditions and directives were not clear. The IVB project took initiative and developed new pre-conditions which could (with approval of the Hague) could be used in the further development of measures..
- Communication towards citizens about progress and results is poor in the RVR project. People do not see the necessity of this study yet.
- Projects were implemented (funded by EEC) in the riverbeds while the policy on watermanagement in the coming century is still being developed. This resulted in one project in a confusing situation where the government appeared to be unreliable. In the other project “no-regret” measures were formulated to be financed by these EEC funds

### **(Tangible) Result**

#### **1. A new style of government**

- The steering committee wants to continue its cooperation and appreciates the atmosphere of trust, good relationship and the working together. *“we want to continue this cooperation*

*like wise people that make sense”. “it is a form of careful decision making in a phased approach”*

- Other government organisations and NGO’s like the department of agriculture and nature conservation have gained understanding for the interests of PW and the importance that is being attached to security (“nature is more flexible than security”). Hence, they search for alternative policies like security in “wet nature”. The feeling of mutual understanding and trust has grown among the different organisations involved
- NGO’s showed new initiatives, E.g a waterboard developed their own alternative solutions (and published it in a newsletter)
- also farmers came up with constructive alternative solutions for water management in specific areas.

## 2. Water management issues

- General outline for water management in the riverbasin (of the river Rine)
- Development of a vision on spatial planning in relation to water management by Provincial Government and Department of VROM in the region
- Different alternatives are developed and the effects of each are indicated
- The question has been answered; within the existing watersystem the river water can be accomodated (16.000 m<sup>3</sup>/s) through improved maintenance and measures within the system
- The weak parts in the watersystem (with respect to security) are indicated in the region
- No alternatives, but different measures are developed that can be implemented sequential (IVB):
  - in between dikes
  - flowing through the Biesbosch
  - green rivers (after 2015)
- No regret”measures are proposed (that are subsidised by EEC) , which can be directly implemented (and shows direct results to those who have been involved )
- “It is no longer a study on civil-technical measures, but an organic process, focussing on security through creating room for water.... Measures need to be flexible in order to anticipate further changes and the effects of measures.....All relevant parties (organisation) share the problempereception and measures..!” (projectleader)

## 18. IIVR project, integral planning of the Veluwe Lakes, the Netherlands

### Inspiration points

This project shows an example of shared responsibility among several authorities in developing an integral plan. This shows a number of institutional challenges and gives examples of different forms of participation in different phases of the process

### Aim/objective of the project

The Veluwe lakes are managed by several authorities, each with its own policy and instruments to manage the different parts of the water and its border. Besides these local and regional authorities (in total 20), also non governmental issue groups, have their concerns and interests. Hence a situation has occurred where plans are not in line with each other and often have conflicting interest, like those of nature, recreation, fishery and transport by water.

In 1996 an integral planning project has been initiated by the Ministry of Public Works and water management (PW) in the region. The intention is

**Scale ;** Regional

**Period:** 1996-2001

### Objective of Public Participation

An open planning approach was chosen with the following objectives:

- to achieve more consistency in existing and future development.
- to develop a high quality plan which is feasible and widely accepted

### Who participated and how (degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning.

The project has chosen for a co-operative style (see chapter 2) in which the different authorities and non-governmental organisations (NGO) (or interest groups) work together and have an equal say in the final outcome. The interaction is organised through:

- **a steering-committee**, formed by governors of the different government authorities. They gave direction to the process and take decisions. The steering-committee is supported by the initiative-group.
- **an initiative group**. This groups of experts; government employees en members of NGO's, discussed the content of the planning process.
- **consultations of citizens and interest groups**. In addition, several sessions are organised to consult citizens and interest groups and give them an chance to share their problem perception and generate ideas.

A project team facilitates the planning process. This team consists of staff of ministry of public works. However they have a separate office, their own name and logo and work independently. An important motive of the project team for this approach is that citizens should not be burdened by the fact that the government is divided in state, provincial and other government organisations.

In the process the four steps of start, problem inventory, generating solutions and action can be recognised. After each steps decisions are made on how to proceed.

#### 1. Start

- process plan (1996),
- developing a terms of agreement with all authorities (1997),
- organising team and steering committee, task assignment

#### 2. Exploration of current situation

- inventory of all problems, issues and first ideas (summer 1997).  
*Government Authorities in 3 provinces, NGO and citizens (total 300) participated by attending one of eight sessions. 400 issues came up. During the*

*sessions an atmosphere for brainstorming and an open mind has been stimulated by all kind of exercises. Cartoon artists visualised and hence stimulated the discussion (see illustration). Experts participated in the sessions but were asked not (yet) to react. Also, non-participants were consulted, to verify the outcome. After the sessions all problems were clustered and analysed with the help of the expert-centre. A report with results has been sent to all participants.*

- the steering committee approved the outcome and the continuation of the process.

### **3. Generating solutions**

- generation of ideas and solutions (summer 1999)

*During sessions with 170 participants ideas and solutions are developed for the problems. Creativity has been stimulated with different tools and techniques (a/o varying from artistperformance, brainwriting techniques to the use of GIS design to indicate the location of problems and solutions). During this session all kind of knowledge and ideas are brought together and induces citizens, interest groups, project team, experts and authorities to look at solutions from a different point of view. After the sessions the expert-centre analyses and further develops the ideas into "building blocks".*

- inventory of actual situation and on-going projects, a structure analysis and zone map

- scenario development.

- impact analysis.

*The effects were indicated per scenario during a 2-day session where experts and users indicated criteria and effects using objective arguments and their own experience and knowledge*

- decision making by the Steering Committee on the strategy to follow (end'99)

### **4. (Preparation for) implementation**

- development of a plan indicating what, where, when and by whom have been implemented

*8 working groups consisting of members of the initiative groups and key-persons have developed in 3 sessions of a day a detailed plan for the different aspects like nature, recreation, economic development etc.*

- setting up of a terms of agreement (on the responsibility for the implementation)

- decision by the steering committee on the implementation of the plan (nov 2000)

- implementation of the plan in 3 phases, starting in 2002 .Moments for reflection were planned in order to be able to adjust the plan to new developments and insights.

### **The results:**

- Governors were enthusiastic. They took their responsibility by dividing the costs for implementing the proposed 38 measures.
- the response of all participants in the process has been positive.
- New forms of cooperation have started among government authorities (at different levels), within their offices and with NGO's
- NGO's have improved the quality of the plans. They introduced new perceptions and arguments and kept others sharp (e.g. by posing questions like what is at the interest of the users?)
- NGO's have broadened their scope and got feeling for the interests of the others parties involved. They formed on their own initiative a new consortium of recreation and nature conservation groups have developed a plan (or vision) indicating their mutual interests as well as disputes (on their own initiative)
- The central office of PW in The Hague appreciated the outcome of the process as it gives an integral plan with an overview of different measures, arguments and priorities. It also shows the (financial) contributions of the other parties involved.
- The plan consisted of long-term measures but also activities that can be directly implemented, which motivates the different parties.

## Lessons learnt

Lessons learnt with respect to the process are:

- take time for the start
  - o The start took almost two years, as the authorisation of the project and the co-operation of authorities took time.
- indicate the pre-conditions and/or a sense of direction before starting interactive sessions with citizens and interest groups.
  - o The large amount of information gathered during the inventory was another reason for delay. It took a considerable amount of time to process all data and compress it into a number of clusters that could be used in the next step of generating solutions. In retrospect the interactive sessions were too open in a sense that no restrictions, preferences or pre-conditions were indicated. For the citizens it may have been easier if there was a sense of direction (as developed by the steering committee, showing their ambitions and scope
- make a tailor-made process design during the start of the process
  - o Only half-way, a total process design for plan development has been made. At the start of the problem inventory it was not clear how to proceed with the large number of problems (sometimes even contradicting each other).
- integrate the interactive planning process in the formal decisionmaking procedures.
- involve the governors actively and support them in their new role
  - o The major role of governors is to provide a clear assignment.
  - o They need to be involved in the problem definitions, to make sure they are committed and see the necessity to act.
  - o Governors do not want to be involved in sessions to generate solutions (they don't feel secure nor capable to do so...). They rather discuss the generated options and directions how to proceed (and choose). Informal meetings help to get a feeling for their political context and their attitudes towards possible solutions. They need time to discuss proposals and generate support within their own organisation. The attendance of governors during public "information-evenings" is positive as they can indicate their role and dilemma's.
  - o It is the role of the project leader to keep all governors committed to the process and major outcomes
- Work with an independent project team
  - o Although it consisted of staff of the ministry of public works (PW), they have gained the support and trust of the other parties as care takers of their interests. Since there were two different provincial governments involved and the central topic was water, the project team of PW appeared to be the logical process manager. Provincial's authorities have showed a growing interest in the role of process manager (as integral spatial development has become their major concern)

## 19. Waterplan for the municipality of Hilversum

### Inspiration points

It shows an example of consultation of stakeholders in the process of developing an integral water plan for a municipality. Collaboration is based on common sense of urgency

### Aim/Objective of the project:

A municipality-waterplan is an integral plan, which indicates the policy on the management and use of water in the city. In the municipality of Hilversum the existing plan did not get the support from all other organisations involved. Moreover, the political situation was even further sensitive as the municipality was in financial problems and in ward under the central government. Also physically the situation was complex. Deep water levels led to a shortage of water, while an old-fashioned water sewage system caused problems of flooding and pollution. Complexity augmented due to the responsibility of different organisation for water management (the province for deep groundwater; the water board for surface water, bottom and banks; the service for water management and sewage system for policy preparation and maintenance, while the municipality cares for the water quality below ground surface. Hence, the local governor decided that an alternative approach for the plan development was necessary

**Scale/unit of planning;** Municipality

**Period;** 1995?

### Objective of PP:

- to de-politicise the situation,
- to create a high quality plan and
- to strengthen new forms of co-operation.
- to create understanding and support for the integral use of water within the municipality by developing a sustainable plan.

### Who participated and how (degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning

The participatory style was a "consultative" one. When considered necessary the project team consulted interest groups and organisations (in total 25).

The project team was formed by the Municipality, responsible for developing the plan. They were supported by a Steering Committee consisting of members of the other organisations involved; the province, the waterboard, and an institution responsible for clean water. Whenever necessary governors were consulted as well as interest groups.

### Methods and tools applied

Participation was organised through:

- discussion sessions per theme
- rounds of information supply
- consultation evenings a/o to enable interest groups to give comments and indicate priority to proposed measures.

### Tangible Result (effect) of PP:

- the solutions were no longer solely found in technical measures like bigger pipes and pumps, but a shift in attention took place towards increasing the human capacity to find solutions for the source of problems
- a waterplan was developed in combination with a plan for a new sewerage system
- the high quality plan drew all the attention, while the battle for competence among different organisation was put at the back bench
- close cooperation between municipality, waterboard and province in a political sensitive situation with strong competition among parties. They all supported the final plan.

**Lessons learnt:**

- the well structured process helped creating clarity on when and how which persons or organisations could participate
- the governors gave room to the projectleader to manage the process with authority (which was usefull in the political sensitive situation)
- the latter requires that both governors and process manager have a good working relationship and keep constantly in touch on when the governor should play what role and the other way around.
- governors want to be able to choose and need to know the effects of the different alternative solutions

**For more information please contact:**

## **20. Scotland: Scottish Environment Protection Agency and Scottish Executive; Participation, Consultation and Capacity Building in Transposition Processes**

### **Inspiration points – this example is inspiring because:**

During the past 2.5 years a number of events were organised to increase organisational capacity and understanding of the WFD across a range of bodies in Scotland. This process helped inform debate and discussion of key WFD issues and enhanced mutual understanding of issues of agreement or concern. A wide range of public and private organisations actively engaged in and contributed to this process.

### **Aim/objective of the project:**

The general aims of the activities undertaken and described were:

- To inform a range of public authorities, NGOs, sectoral interests and other stakeholders of progress in Directive transposition in Scotland, notably around periods of formal public consultation around legislative proposals,
- To inform debate and build organisational WFD capacity and knowledge and;
- To allow effective and informed engagement in debate of during transposition

### **Scale/unit of planning:**

These information sessions, seminars and workshops were undertaken at a range of different scales and levels of input including:

- National (as part of national preparations for WFD transposition)
- Sectoral (individual sectoral groups were involved in specific events)
- Issue specific (individual WFD issues were identified for specific discussion)

### **Period:**

Spring 2000 – Ongoing

### **Objective of Public Participation:**

In Scotland many of the component parts of the WFD are not presently in place e.g. water abstraction or impoundment controls, controls on river engineering or an equivalent of River Basin Management Planning. Implementation of the WFD, therefore, presents major challenges to many organisations and interested parties.

The objectives of the participation exercises undertaken in Scotland were, therefore:

- To inform a range of organisations and interested parties of WFD transposition and implementation activities and to engage them in these processes,
- To inform a range of organisations and interested parties of present interpretations of key WFD issues, and to discuss and debate these,
- To encourage meaningful discussion of WFD issues by interested parties to increase mutual understanding of positions and views,
- To increase organisational capacity in respect of WFD understanding to allow meaningful input to key WFD consultation exercises.
- By the encouragement of participation in these early WFD stages to build capacity across a range of organisations and interested parties to benefit future RBMP and Characterisation processes and activities.

### **Degree of public participation and stakeholders involved:**

The information and participation exercises undertaken in Scotland were organised in different ways to allow different sectors, issues and geographic scales to be considered. Ranges of stakeholders were,

thereby, brought into the process at different stages and in situations in which they were confident and comfortable.

Stakeholders engaged in the process included:

- Local Government
- “Industry”
- Rural Land Use (agriculture, forestry etc)
- Freshwater Fisheries
- NGOs
- Environmental Groups
- Public and Government Agencies and Departments
- Other interested parties via inclusive and open events

### **Methods and tools applied;**

This example was essentially a sequence of information session, workshop and conference events undertaken throughout preparations for WFD consultation stages.

In order to be most effective a range of approaches were taken which are summarised below:

- Events were sectoral (to allow key audiences to be met) or;
- Issue specific (to allow key issues to be considered) or;
- Wider events (to allow open discussion and resolution of issues and differing opinions from, for example different sectoral groups),
- Stakeholders participated in all of these event types.

A range of groups made presentations on particular WFD issues and aspects of particular relevance to them. This direct and public involvement reduced the perception that these events were the sole responsibility of individual organisations.

Events were organized and managed by different partnerships according to subject matter

Many events were jointly organized By the Scottish Executive and SEPA. Other partnerships, however, organised different specific events. E.g. the Scottish Executive and WWF were responsible for the provision of a workshop specifically considering public participation in the WFD.

By using these different approaches to different events to encourage engagement of different groups broad inclusion in the WFD process was generated.

### **Major input of stakeholders**

Stakeholders were involved in different ways within the process. Some made presentations reflecting their particular expertise, concerns or responsibilities, some debated technical interpretations of particular WFD areas while others played key roles in managing events. Particularly in the early stages of this process general information on the WFD was required to inform later debate and discussion; initially SEPA and the Scottish Executive fulfilled this role. Facilitated sessions allowed the active involvement of parties not specifically leading or presenting any of the events or topic discussions.

Participating numbers ranged from 30 – 40 for sectoral seminars and workshops to in excess of 100 for more general events or where a sector or issue of particular significance was considered.

The sequencing of events around formal consultation processes and stages allowed the introduction of key consultation questions for debate. In this way the consultation responses of stakeholders could be informed by open debate and discussion of issues and on a greater understanding of WFD implications for themselves and of other groups. An increased mutual understanding of WFD issues was delivered.

### **Tangible results of public participation exercises?**

The series of events produced, or helped to produce:

- Increased organisational capacity and understanding of WFD issues,
- Enhanced mutual understanding of respective organisational positions, concerns and interpretations,

- Provided opportunities to resolve issues of concern and to re-assure groups of interpretations,
- Helped inform responses to WFD formal consultation exercises.
- Introduced many of the new WFD concepts and requirements (to Scotland) to key groups at the start of the process,
- Started the WFD process of public participation at an early stage in Scotland and provided a start point on which to build future processes, procedures and trusted relationships.

### **Lessons learnt:**

A number of key lessons have been learned during and as a result of this process in Scotland. Some of these are summarised below:

- It is clear that participative approaches similar to that summarised can be hugely beneficial in building organisational capacity of all bodies involved. It is certainly the case that by opening the WFD debate in Scotland throughout the transposition process that more informed and valuable contributions from a wide range of groups have been received and generated.
- Where the approach taken in Scotland has been particularly successful has been in targeting input both sectorally and at appropriate times within the process, e.g. linked to SE consultation periods. That participative and consultative exercises, processes and opportunities should be focussed and targeted and meaningful in order to deliver most benefit to the overall process is perhaps the key lesson.
- The continual and ongoing engagement of stakeholders during the past years has improved and developed the dialogue and relationships between organisations. This continued commitment to engagement in the process is better than single one of events.
- The WFD is an ongoing and iterative process so participative and consultative opportunities must be provided on an ongoing basis to allow continued meaningful engagement in the range of WFD processes.
- It is apparent that what is delivered is never enough! There remain calls for a wider and more inclusive approach still to WFD implementation. In many cases these are reasonable expectations and aspirations that SEPA and the other Responsible Authorities must try to meet, address and manage.

### **Contacts for further information:**

Callum Sinclair  
 SEPA South West  
 5 Redwood Crescent  
 Peel Park  
 East Kilbride  
 Strathclyde  
 G74 5PP

Michael Kellet  
 Scottish Executive  
 Environment Protection Unit  
 Victoria Quay  
 Edinburgh  
 EH6 6QQ

Tel: 01355 574298  
 Fax: 01355 574688  
 E-mail: [callum.sinclair@sepa.org.uk](mailto:callum.sinclair@sepa.org.uk)

Tel: 0131 244 0219  
 Fax: 0131 244 0245  
 E-mail: [Michael.Kellet@scotland.gov.uk](mailto:Michael.Kellet@scotland.gov.uk)

## 21. Global flood defense plan in river Júcar

### **Inspiration points;**

Involvement of public in flood management decisions. Coordination of measures at three scale levels

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

Combination of structural and non structural measures for flood control and defence in a plain with a very high urban development.

### **Scale/unit of planning;**

River Jucar floodplain (about 4000 km<sup>2</sup>)

### **Period:**

1998-2004

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

To involve stakeholders and public in general on flood management decisions. To coordinate measures at river basin, regional and local levels.

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning**

Jucar River Authority signed an agreement with CEDEX to elaborate different hydrological and hydraulic studies on floods in the river Jucar in 1998. These studies were presented in an open workshop in Valencia in March of 1999. An ad hoc committee was created to participate in the studies including representatives of the municipalities, NGOs and users associations. In 2000 several actions were decided. Among them, the elaboration of flood risk maps. These maps were presented in a workshop in Valencia in April 2002, after a long consultation process with the affected administrations and public in general.

### **Methods and tools applied;**

Workshops, technical documents and meetings. Flood risk maps and basic documentation have been included in a CD with GIS tools that allows their visualisation and analysis. All this information have been distributed free of charge.

### **Major input of stakeholders**

Flood risk maps mean a compromise between urban development and flood control with important economical impacts. Stakeholders has to be involved in the final decision.

### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

Flood risk maps are at present, the main basis for future urban development.

### **Lessons learnt:**

- Coordination between different administrations is an important aspect of the Public Participation Process.
- Transparency is always crucial and the only way to ensure that decisions can be accepted when high economical interests are involved.

### **For more information please contact:**

[www.mma.es](http://www.mma.es) (in Spanish); [manuel.menendez@cedex.es](mailto:manuel.menendez@cedex.es)

## 22. Alcobendas - city of water for the 21<sup>st</sup> century

### **Inspiration points;**

Awareness raising on water consumption and change of attitude towards water consumption

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

To raise awareness of the population, local authorities and SMEs in Alcobendas, a Madrid suburb, on water consumption in order to create a culture of treating water with respect.

### **Scale/unit of planning;**

Alcobendas, a satellite town at the outskirts of Madrid, with 90.000 inhabitants.

**Period:** 2000-2001

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

To engage the public in water savings

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

A broad range of the inhabitants, authorities and local SMEs

A wide range of activities, information and media coverage: just for publicising the results (see below), the following was carried out:

- press conference attended by 30 representatives from press, radio and TV
- the project office received more than 1.000 calls and visits by media-rep's
- 4 TV reports on water-saving systems
- 17 programs on "Olca Alcobendas"
- 14 interviews on other radio stations
- 113 articles published in various magazines and graphic media
- a total of 250 journalists were informed about the project

### **Methods and tools applied;**

A comprehensive package including:

- Exchanging technical and scientific information to encourage the introduction of effective water-saving technologies and programs and water demand management
- Promoting new regulations
- Stimulating the water-saving technology market
- Promoting changes in the productive sectors
- Increasing public awareness of the need to participate actively in saving water
- Offering an example of the introduction of effective water saving measures in new homes
- Publicising the results and methodology so that they can be adapted to other towns

### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

Estimated water savings for Alcobendas: 102.200.000 litres per year

### **Lessons learnt:**

The most important aspect of the "Alcobendas - city of water for the 21<sup>st</sup> century" is not the savings in absolute terms, but the creation of mechanisms that produce a permanent change of attitude towards saving in the use of water in cities.

### **For more information contact:**

WWF Spain, Alfredo Lopez, [aguascont@wwf.es](mailto:aguascont@wwf.es)

Henrik Dissing, WWF Denmark, [h.dissing@wwf.dk](mailto:h.dissing@wwf.dk)

### **Available reports**

[www.wwf.es](http://www.wwf.es)

## **--under discussion Formal standing mechanisms for public participation on water issues in Spain ---**

### **Inspiration points**

Formal mechanisms for active public involvement, at River basin districts and national level.

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

In accordance with the Spanish law, when legislation is affecting the interests of the citizens, they must be heard, either directly or through associations which represent them.

The Water Act includes the legal existence of several formal mechanisms for the active public involvement :

- To inform the public on the water resources and demands status.
- To involve stakeholders and public in general on the river basins planning process.
- To involve interested parties in the water resources management.
- To inform the public in the effectiveness of the measures taken.

### **Scale/unit of planning;**

Spain

### **Period:**

Regulation on Water Public administration and planning was approved in 1988.

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

To involve stakeholders and public in general on water management at both river basin and national levels.

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

The “Consejo Nacional del Agua” (National Water Council), is the highest advisory body on water issues at national level and includes representatives from civil society (user associations, environmental NGO’s, trade unions, business associations, scholars, etc). National Water Council procedures are legally implemented. According the Regulation on Water Public Administration and Planning (Royal Decree 927/1988) in each Water District, the so called “Junta de Gobierno” (Government Board) deal with the water management issues in the river basin. At least, one third of their members must be water users representatives. The so called “Asamblea de usuarios” (Users Assembly) of the “Juntas de explotación” (Exploitation Boards) has to coordinate the management of the hydraulic infrastructures in the Water District.

Water planning in each water districts is mainly directed and approved by the so called “Consejo del Agua” (Water Council). At least, one third of the total number of Water Council members has to be of the representatives of the stakeholders.

**Methods and tools applied;**

Formal mechanisms are applied according law. Additional tools are used:

- Web sites for discussion prior to formal meetings
- Informal meetings for expertise consultancy
- Workshops for public information.

**Major input of stakeholders**

- River Basin Hydrological plans have been developed and approved by the Water Councils.
- National Hydrological plan was discussed and approved prior discussions in the Parliament.

In both cases, stakeholders produced important inputs as:

- Measures for increasing the control of the measures taken
- New elements for environmental protection
- Definition of new priorities for monitoring.

**Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

Day by day water management in river basin districts in Spain.

**Lessons learnt:**

- Transparency in the technical assessment is essential. Managers and technicians usually do not communicate well to the public (maybe they do not know well how to do it) the reasons to adopt some decisions.
- In Spain, the existence of legal procedures for public participation in the decision process offers different valuable tools.
- Public Participation is specially important in arid areas where conflicts among users usually arise.
- In Spain, the existence of legal procedures for public participation in water management at river basin level is not a best practice, it is an obligatory practice.

**For more information please contact:**

[www.mma.es](http://www.mma.es) (in Spanish)

<http://hispagua.cedex.es/> (Spanish)

## 23 The Water Forum in the Balearic Islands

### **Inspiration points**

This example is inspiring because it is promoted directly by the Environment Council of the Balearic Government and designed and organised by the Development and Ecology Foundation (ecodes), a member of the EEB and a serious and responsible organisation. Also, the perception of the participant stakeholders seems to be very positive regarding the first two initiatives encouraged: the Pitiusic and Menorca workshops.

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

The main objective of the Water Forum in the Balearic Islands is the participation of citizens in drawing up an analysis of the current situation as regards the management of water and the construction of a basic consensus for water policies in the Balearic Islands. This consensus would contribute greatly to moving the management of water towards a sustainable model, which the population of the islands desires, in this case with reference to the management of hydrological resources.

### **Scale/unit of planning;**

Balearic Islands (Eivissa, Formentera, Mallorca and Menorca, 5.016 sqKm), Western Mediterranean, Spain

### **Period:**

2001-2003, as a minimum.

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

The main objectives of this initiative are as follows:

1. To achieve, in a context of neutrality, communication between business, social and institutional groups without the habitual intervention of the news media;
2. To create informal environments for meetings between the leaders of social sectors often involved in confrontation;
3. To make sure, in a context of negotiating, that parties receive information on the conflicts from the appropriate technician in the local government;
4. To ascertain, without the intermediation of the news media, and without bilateral negotiating tensions, the main concerns of the principal community leaders of the sectors most relevant to the management of water on the three islands;
5. And, also, to ascertain shortfalls in the focuses of social organisations in relation to the management of water;
6. To detect the main sources of conflict, and the position held by the range of sectors in this regard, and the nuances of these confrontations
7. To ascertain points for a basic consensus for water in the Balearic Islands in order to construct a new culture of water in the Balearic Islands.

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

In 2001, the project aimed at the participation of the full range of stakeholders, including individual citizens, local, insular and autonomous administrations, NGOs, representatives of political parties, land owners, water supply, water treatment and desalination technicians, consultants, etc. The aim was for the groups to be as heterogeneous as possible, ensuring the presence of women and old and young people, who still appear to be under represented sectors in the water management field. 32 people were invited to every workshop, and 23 average attended each of them.

### **Methods and tools applied;**

For the first phase (Pitiusic Islands and Menorca workshops in 2001) the Logic Framework method was used. This method consists mainly in discussing within the whole group or 4-5 people the proposals of every participant and their appropriate setting in a certain diagram. The final results are a series of logical trees

consensuated by the whole group. In this case, the proposals represent the main problems and main solutions for solving them regarding water management in the three islands, Ibiza, Formentera and Menorca.

In Mallorca, during the 2002 phase, the EASW (European Awareness Scenario Workshop) methodology might be applied. This is a more complex group method, following in essence the same path but in a more closed and fixed way. The EASW Initiative was launched by the European Commission DG XIII D in 1994 as a pilot action to explore new possible actions and social experiments for the promotion of a social environment favoring innovation in Europe.

For more information see <http://www.cordis.lu/easw/home.html>

Both methods require skilled consultants. For the Logic Framework Workshops, one facilitator was in charge, helped by three assistants, also skilled, and, in this case, an abbreviated version was implemented, lasting only a whole day (from 09:00 to 20:30, including lunch and several coffees in between). The usual version usually takes 2 days.

The EASW method requires a larger number of consultants (4 to 6), and cannot be successful if shorter than one day and a half.

Indicative costs: the first phase of the Balearic Forum cost about 30,000 euros

A EASW workshop costs about 13,000 euros to run.

#### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

Until now, some encouraging initiatives have arisen from a few stakeholders who organised themselves to push the Administration on specific topics. For example, in Menorca, a member of Menorca Reserve of the Biosphere and a technic from the Sant Lluís Towhall, were freely assigned by the rest as responsible for asking the insular authorities about the project to organise an Insular Water Administration, against the Balearic existing one. Despite this initiative not being *a priori* positive for the Balearic Government (who promotes the Forum), it is seen as a good movement within the whole participation process.

Contact for Further information:

\* Fundación Ecología y Desarrollo/gea21. Plaza San Bruno,9 - Of. 1ª. 50001 Zaragoza (Spain)/ Tous i Ferrer, 12, entlo. C, 07003 Palma, Mallorca, Balearic Islands (Spain).Tel +34 976 298282/+34 971728218. Fax +34 976 203092/+34 971728218. [www.ecodes.org](http://www.ecodes.org)

\* Direcció General de Recursos Hídrics, Conselleria de Medi Ambient, Gran Via Asima, 4ª, 07009 Polígon Son Castelló. Palma, Mallorca, Balearic Islands (Spain). Tel. +34 971 177141. [www.caib.es](http://www.caib.es)

## 24. The Emå River , Sweden.

### **Inspiration points;**

sustainable development by encouraging commitment and support from local people in restoration of the area and implementing environmental measures. Catchment area management

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

Environmentally and economically sustainable development in the catchment area.

### **Scale/unit of planning;**

Catchment area of 4 500 km<sup>2</sup>.

### **Period:**

1994 -- ongoing

### **Public participation objectives (Why PP?)**

- To contribute to sustainable development by encouraging commitment and support from local people as regards restoration of the area and other environmental measures
- To use knowledge and experience from NGO's and other stakeholders
- To avoid new and, if possible, solve old conflicts.

### **Who participated and how (degree/form of public participation) in the different planning phases:**

Municipalities, county administrative boards, NGO's, etc., cooperated in different working groups from 1994 onwards (from 1997 there were 8 groups).

Different associations took part in these working groups such as the Emå River Council, farmers associations, owners of fishing waters, angling associations, local history associations, nature conservation associations, municipalities and tourism enterprises.

### **Methods and tools applied;**

PP is achieved by holding seminars, information meetings and hearings, circulating documents (e.g. objective documents) for comments, forming working groups (those in the group bring information back to their organisation and vice versa) and distributing newsletters, etc. Minutes from the various meetings were taken and distributed. The fact that the general public were also involved at the sub-catchment level was useful.

### **Major input of stakeholders**

They have been involved in concrete restoration measures and other environmental action and have provided input for the information documents.

### **Tangible result (effects) of PP?**

Two new by passes for trout, have brought sea trout (*Salmo trutta*) back to the upper reaches of the river after a 50-year absence. In 2001, more than 90 fish migrated through the bypasses. New bypasses are planned for further up the river. Spawning grounds for stationary stocks of trout have also been restored. These measures are the result of cooperation with the general public and other stakeholders. A complete inventory and risk assessment of storm water in towns and on the roads has been carried out. Two stormwater dams are being built in 2002. Seventeen working groups of more than 200 farmers have been established. One industrial site has been remediated with 35 000 tons of cadmium and 9 000 tons of lead-contaminated material having been removed. There are also plans to remediate a mercury-contaminated lake. As from 2002, the water flow from nine hydropower dams will be coordinated in accordance with a new drought protection plan (flow management plan).

A fishery plan on the sub-catchment level has been finalised for the whole catchment area. Biotope mapping of all rivers and streams (a total length of 800 kilometres) has also been performed. All these measures are the result of public participation.

**Lessons learnt**

It is important for the general public to derive local benefits and see tangible results of their input and involvement. People are more interested in providing input and being involved if the problem concerns their own neighbourhood.

PP takes a lot of time and involves both education and information initiatives as well. It is important to create different fora for participation and discussion.

Summary: The project has had the EU's Water Framework Directive (WFD) as its starting-point. Many people have been involved on different levels in the process. The public have been involved in tangible measures. Different forms of participation attract different stakeholders.

**For more information please contact:**

[www.emaprojektet.h.se](http://www.emaprojektet.h.se)  
Bodil Liedberg-Jönsson,  
[bod@hultsfred.se](mailto:bod@hultsfred.se)

## 26. The Fyrisån River Water Association, Sweden

### Inspiration points

Involvement of relevant stakeholders in the water association board  
Information supply to the public and hence promote sustainable water management

### Aim/objective of the project;

To protect and restore the river and provide information for the general public by monitoring water management activities (extraction, aquaculture, etc.) and thus use the river's resources in an economical and sustainable way.

**Scale/unit of planning;** Catchment area: 2 000 km<sup>2</sup>.

**Period:** 1962 – 1983 -- ongoing

### Public participation objectives (Why PP?)

- To involve relevant stakeholders in the water association board
- To inform the public and hence promote sustainable water management

Who participated and how (degree/form of public participation) in the different planning phases:

Members of the water association board represent municipalities, industrial plants, irrigation associations, drainage associations and dam-owners. Angling association representatives, etc., can also sit on the board. Many actors such as schools, farmers, NGO's etc., are involved in different projects in sub-catchment areas on the local level.

### Methods and tools applied;

Seminars, information meetings and hearings were held. Working groups made up of members of the general public were organised. They represented people from different sub-catchment areas. Several environmental projects (one of them supported by WWF) have been started and are connected to the water association.

Activity days were organised when local people helped to restore the lakes by e.g. clearing reeds along the riverbanks to create better conditions for animal life.

Meetings with landowners on the implementation of the proposed measures were also held.

### Major input of stakeholders

Activity days to restore lakes were organised as well as discussions with landowners about necessary measures for the restoration and sustainable management of the wetlands. Stakeholders have provided good suggestions for how to restore the area further, e.g. mapping contaminated sediments, etc.

### Tangible result (effect) of PP?

Reconsideration of some of the water permits awarded to avoid too low a water-flow in the lake system.  
Restored wetlands by landowners and others. Measures have been implemented at the local level.

### Lessons learnt:

A positive way of working in the water association is to initiate (small) water projects and ensure the involvement of the public in these projects on the sub-catchment level.

Summary: PP limits the costs of tangible measures. People do various forms of voluntary work within different non-profit associations.

### Formal procedures for PP

Water associations are regulated by the Swedish Water Association Act as legal entities.

**For more information please contact:** [www.uppsala.se/miljokontoret](http://www.uppsala.se/miljokontoret) (in Swedish only), Anders Larsson, [Anders.Larsson@mk.uppsala.se](mailto:Anders.Larsson@mk.uppsala.se)

## **25 The Municipality of Örebro's water management plan, Sweden.**

### **Inspiration points;**

A total of about 70 different authorities and organisations upstream of the catchment area and within the municipality's borders have been consulted on a draft plan.

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

To develop a water management plan as a complement to the municipality's overall land and water use plan. A further aim is to fulfil the regional and national environmental objectives for surface and groundwater

### **Scale/unit of planning;**

The area of the municipality is 1600 km<sup>2</sup> divided into several catchment areas.

### **Period:**

Pre-1990 - ongoing.

### **Public participation objectives (Why PP?)**

To fulfil the requirements for public participation under the Swedish Planning and Building Act of 1987 concerning consultation in the development of overall plans.

### **Who participated and how (degree/form of public participation) in the different planning phases:**

A working group and steering group consisting of civil servants have been implementing the project. A total of about 70 different authorities and organisations upstream of the catchment area and within the municipality's borders have been consulted on a draft plan. Their opinions and comments were acknowledged by the working and steering groups. The adjusted document was circulated again for consultation.

Those involved included farming and water conservation associations along with Örebro University.

### **Methods and tools applied;**

Consultation was effected by holding seminars, information meetings and hearings and by circulating proposed land use plans for consideration by the parties involved.

### **Major input of stakeholders**

Input from farming associations concerning voluntary versus compulsory measures for farmers. Input from the water conservation associations concerning their present role in monitoring and nature conservation associations regarding species protection measures. Örebro University indicated how sensitive areas should be defined and protected and supported the project by disseminating information to the general public.

### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

The steering and working groups met with stakeholders to answer questions and justify their actions. Much of the latter's input is important so that the water management plan can be revised. This will also affect the development of the land-use plans.

### **Lessons learnt:**

It is important for the public to see tangible results and direct benefits from their input and involvement.

### **Formal procedures for PP**

Consultation on advisory overall plans and detailed development plans is compulsory in Sweden under the Planning and Building Act of 1987. The public also has access to reports and documents in the public domain under the Swedish Administrative Procedure Act of 1986.

### **For more information please contact:**

The municipality of Örebro.

stadsbyggnadskontoret@orebro.se

Bodil Liedberg-Jönsson, [bod@hultsfred.se](mailto:bod@hultsfred.se)

## **27. River Tyreså (Tyresåproject), Sweden.**

### **Inspiration points**

The civil servants and the authorities have found it important to listen and to take care of the attitudes and the different wishes from the public and to handle conflicts.

Public participation, working groups, programme of measures,

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

To achieve environmental goals to protect the nature values, recreation values and to handle the problem of eutrophication.

**Scale/unit of planning;** Catchment area: 240 km<sup>2</sup>.

**Period:** 1993- - 1997

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

To inform and to get response and involvement from the public to restore a system of lakes.

To give concrete advice on what the individual can do to protect the lake.

To learn from the wishes and different attitudes of the public

To handle conflicts in a pro-active way

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

A steering group was set up consisting of politicians from the municipalities. The working group was formed of representatives from the municipalities, county board and from the water users (tot 11 pers). The working group has close contact with the sportsfishing associations, house-owners associations and many other associations within the catchment area which is quite densely populated (240000 inhabitants). After the first introductory meeting some interest/issue groups were established: recreation/outdoor life, local history and eutrophication. These working groups have regular meetings once a month with these groups. The public participated also through panel debates.

### **Methods and tools applied;**

Study circles, meetings, panel debates (280 people took part in one of these panel debates).

### **Major input of stakeholders**

A list of measures has been developed on what the public can do to avoid pollution of the lakes and river.

### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

The working group has established information channels to and from the public and the associations.

Walking paths are established around the lakes and along the streams and the quality of the surface water has been improved one class in the Swedish environmental criteria. The sewage systems for private households have been improved. There is work going on to protect the area as an ecological parc (through the Swedish environmental code).

### **Lessons learnt:**

The civil servants and the authorities have found it important to listen and to take care of the attitudes and the different wishes from the public and to handle conflicts. Its important to keep up the enthusiasm of the public. This takes time and lot of personal resources. The measures must be so concrete that those who lives in the area knows that the problems and the solutions belong to them.

### **Formal Procedures for PP**

Through the Swedish administrative law the public (= everyone) has the right to have access to the official documents. Sweden has a system to consult the public and stakeholders in the production of land use plans.

**For more information please contact:** [www.tyresan.org](http://www.tyresan.org) (only in Swedish), Goran.andersson@ab.lst.se

## **28. Helcom MLW, Baltic Sea Region - text needs to be corrected**

### **Inspiration points;**

Trans-boundary co-operation on river restoration, elaboration of sustainable development strategy, coastal catchment planning and management

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

Co-operation at coastal catchment level in 5 large areas on nature conservation, wetlands restoration, water management and community development within the framework of joint demonstration project "Helcom MLW" based on ICZM approach.

### **Scale/unit of planning;**

Some of these several thousand km<sup>2</sup> (and linked to the largest river catchments in Europe - Nemunas, Odra, Vistula); 3 of the areas being transboundary.

### **Period:**

Ongoing since 1995 (1999)

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

Mobilising of local communities for contributing to international environmental objectives

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

The core of PP was the establishment of locally based advisory groups, including in principle all relevant stakeholders in a round-table approach throughout the various stages of the planning process. Combined with various communication efforts directed at the broad public.

### **Methods and tools applied;**

Round-table group discussions with all stakeholders. Media, information boards, leaflets, public meetings, consultation on draft plans.

PP include awareness raising activities regarding the role and functions of wetlands (and the areas' international importance to biodiversity conservation) on one hand, on the other hand particularly support for development of alternative income sources on the other hand

### **Major input of stakeholders**

Knowledge on local situation, local development context, co-ordination with other relevant programs, ideas for demonstration activities.

### **Tangible result (effect) of PP?**

Local community and several stakeholders committed to continue the process - regrettably halted due to lack of external financing (international donors as well as national funds)

The locally based NGOs (e.g. "Rusne Fund for Nature" and "Kintai Sailing Club" in the Nemunas Delta shared by Lithuania and Russia) has benefited substantially from participation in the process, while at the same time has contributed through disseminating key information to the own networks (e.g. local farmers).

### **Lessons learnt:**

Lessons learned: in these areas, poverty is widespread and it is impossible to raise local attention and support for delivering these "environmental services" to the international community without a trade-off in terms of development support

A local, holistic sustainable development process is imperative for sustaining an adequate contribution and accepts of international environmental objectives. It is possible BUT also time-consuming to establish such a process, and its context must inevitably be in the shape of a trade-off: what does the local community get

from the national / international community in return for accepting certain development regulations and restrictions?

The locally based NGOs (e.g. “Rusne Fund for Nature” and “Kintai Sailing Club” in Lithuania) consisting of environment-interested farmers constitutes the core in maintaining at least some type of process following the withdrawal of the project-funded process momentum.

Establishment of a local sustainable development structure will in the long run be imperative for sustaining such a process as well as constituting the local capacity for interactions between international / national environment objectives and local development needs. Further, particularly in resources-weak rural communities (which are of particularly relevance in an Eastern European context) such a structure will also contribute significantly in a broader sense to strengthen local development opportunities and capacity. One such example could be the Solway Firth Partnership in Scotland.

**For more information contact:**

Lennart Gladh, WWF Sweden, [lennart.gladh@swipnet.se](mailto:lennart.gladh@swipnet.se)

Henrik Dissing, WWF Denmark, [h.dissing@wwf.dk](mailto:h.dissing@wwf.dk)





## 29. Danube River Commission / Danube Environment Forum

### **Inspiration points;**

Planning at river basin level. Linking between district, basin and local level.

### **Aim/objective of the project;**

Dialogue on trans-boundary River Basin Planning, establishment of WG on WFD, development of Issue Paper on WFD, ensuring public participation in the Danube River management and co-ordination through setting up the *Danube Environmental Forum (DEF)*. DEF is an NGO platform with combined local and regional structure, established in 1999 to promote NGO participation in government fora, programmes and initiatives. The DEF network and operation is still under development.

### **Scale/unit of planning;**

Planning of the Danube River basin ‘occurs’ at a range of levels from sub-catchment/communities to international commissions. Participation of stakeholders happens in different ways at different levels in the overall process. The cascade of approaches to public participation from working with communities directly at one level to ensuring that representative organisations are involved at an international level is a good illustration of how public participation means different things at different levels but should have a common set of principles of transparency of process and inclusion.

**Period:** Ongoing since 1994

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

Danube Regional Project supports Danube Environment Forum (Assembly of NGOs)  
Linking between district, sub-basin and local level.

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

Stakeholders are observers to the Commission, which implies full participation, no voting rights. Involvement of international stakeholders, e.g. WWF as observer to the ICPDR. A large number of smaller (national and local) NGOs are connected with this through co-operation platforms, notably the Danube Environment Forum.

### **Methods and tools applied;**

Observer status granted to NGO representatives at meetings of the Commission. *The International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR)* is the co-ordinating body for international aspects of the Directive’s implementation. ICPDR is promoting public participation in the planning process, through financial support to the ICPDR Information System, including the Danube Watch, as well as operating networks such as the Danube Environmental Forum (DEF), MLIM and AEWS. NGO observers attend the ICPDR Meetings, and provide significant input to the work of the Commission (for example in the establishment of an Ecological Expert Group).

### **Major input of stakeholders**

Development of Issue Paper on WFD  
Participation in several WGs under the ICPDR  
Providing of knowledge on local issues as well as trans-boundary dimension.

### **Result (effect) of PP?**

International co-operation on sharing of experiences and joint focusing (MS+ACs+nonACs) on river basin planning and WFD implementation

### **Lessons learnt:**

Co-ordination structures are needed in order to provide small (national and local) NGOs direct or indirect access to international river basin co-operation, e.g. through representatives appointed from joint NGO

platform. Larger NGOs with international program may play a facilitating role for linking smaller NGOs with the international structures.

**Formal procedures for PP in the river basin**

NGOs can be granted observer status to the ICPDR

Considered most feasible way of handling public participation at river basin district level

**For more information contact:**

ICPDR Secretariat

Charlie Avis, WWF DCPO, [charlie.avis@wwf.hu](mailto:charlie.avis@wwf.hu)

**Available reports**

[www.icpdr.org](http://www.icpdr.org)

## 30. Lower Danube Green Corridor, Bulgaria, Romania, Ukraine, Moldova

### **Inspiration points;**

Trans-boundary co-operation on wetlands restoration, role of NGOs, large-scale RBM, involvement of international stakeholders, ensuring coherence with local level participation through pre-project interviews on environmental awareness and social assessments

### **Aim and scale of the project;**

4-country trans-boundary co-operation on wetlands restoration, management and protection aiming at nutrient retention from the Danube River, totally encompassing 700.000 ha (hereof some 200.000 ha for wetlands restoration).

### **Period:**

Preparations started end of 1990'ies, LDGC officially endorsed in 2000, ongoing - expected to be a multi-year program.

### **Objective of Public Participation (Why PP?)**

Awareness raising among the broad public as well as selected target groups, e.g. local municipalities. Mobilising local community in order to ensure preparedness for utilising new development opportunities

### **Who participated and how (Degree/form of public participation) in what phase of the planning:**

NGO-participation in the drafting of the concept and concrete activities

Strong local participation in the detailed design at local level anticipated within the framework of a joint overall project steering group

NGOs involved in development and implementation of Communications Strategy for the LDGC

Involvement of international stakeholders, ensuring coherence with local level participation through pre-project interviews on environmental awareness and social assessments

Local NGOs involved in development and implementation of Communications Strategy for the LDGC, a.o. Green Balkans (Bulgaria) and After School Club (Romania)

### **Methods and tools applied;**

Travelling exhibition, local events, press and media work, leaflets, meetings with local municipalities and other stakeholders, fundraising with international donors.

### **Major input of stakeholders**

Fundraising, personnel, knowledge, motivation, commitment, international contacts, pictures, creativity, local contacts.

### **Result (effect) of PP?**

Increased public support at local level for the wetlands' restoration activities

### **Lessons learnt:**

Trans-boundary commitment and actions on using wetlands restoration as a measure (nutrient retention) for addressing non-point source pollution, the interviews showed a positive attitude to wetlands restoration while at the same time revealing lack of basic knowledge on wetlands functions leading to the need for a Communications Strategy

International and local NGOs can play a significant role in mobilising the public for e.g. wetlands' restoration activities

### **For more information contact:**

ICPDR Secretariat

Charlie Avis, WWF DCPO, [charlie.avis@wwf.hu](mailto:charlie.avis@wwf.hu)

Henrik Dissing, WWF Denmark, [h.dissing@wwf.dk](mailto:h.dissing@wwf.dk)