

Restoring Europe's Rivers

RESTORE Events: Reporting

Ljubljana, Slovenia

16th -18th November

LIFE 09INF/UK/000032

"Very well organised seminar! Good job!"

Daniela Schneider, State Institute for Nature Protection, Croatia

"I really appreciate that Slovenia has an established river restoration centre (IzVERS) and that it hosted this event".

Darja Stanič Racman, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning

"Thank you!"

Paul Molnar, Politehnica" University of Timisoara, Romania

"Thank you for the possibility to be at this meeting"

Vasiliy Kostushyn, Wetlands International Black Sea Programme Co-ordinator

"Very good workshops!"

Dijana Oskoruš, Meteorological and Hydrological Service of the Republic of Croatia, Hydrology department

The RESTORE project is made possible with the contribution of the LIFE+ financial instrument of the European Community



and works in partnership with



1.0 Event background

The Event took place at the Gospodarsko Razstavisce, Ljubljana, Slovenia, between 16th and 18th November 2011. River restoration planners, practitioners, and other stakeholders were invited from across Europe to take part in four workshops to discuss restoration, land use, public education and tourism issues pertaining to the river restoration. A list of attendees is given in Appendix A.

2.0 Outline of event

The event had a mixture of plenary session, workshops and presentations. The overall sessions can be seen in the event programme (see Appendix C). The event started with an introduction of the road map of the 6th World Water forum process and its relation to river restoration. This was followed by four separate workshops each one hosting different topics:

Workshop 1: Promote integration of aquatic ecosystems conservation and **land (use) planning** and other territorial policies);

Workshop 2: Experiences on reaching consensus on river restoration **good practices** as a means to support delivery of European policy goals

Workshop 3: Reinforce **public education** on water ecosystems and resources preservation and restoration,

Workshop 4: Improve the link between **tourism development** and quality of water ecosystems.

Note: Participants were assigned to the groups by the RESTORE project management team according to their own preference

3.0 Workshop 2 “Experiences on reaching consensus on river restoration good practices, as a means to support delivery of European policy goals. “

This review will concentrate on the findings which are related to the RESTORE partnership

3.1 RESTORE Workshop Key findings

- Drivers are all similar and come from European directives – WFD/ Habitats Directive
- Broad agreement across European countries of the issues
- Lack of stakeholder input into river basin management plans. This has led to very technical documents which are hard to engagement people as part of delivering the measures.

3.2 RESTORE Key lesson for best practice?

- Easy to access web tool
- Translation is an issue. Google translate is not good for complex terminology. The website needs a simple overview of basic information and then a more technical section that could be translated once the value of the information is shown to

fundlers/policy makers. Should our theme pages have a simple overview intro 6-10 lines, then the detail of the theme discussion?

- Countries need to be able to reach a decision themselves on whether information/approaches are viable to them, so provide the information and let others interpret for their situation.

3.3 Findings relating to the RESTORE knowledge management tool

Identifying good practice was a hot topic but there was not a consensus for an objective measure that could be programmatically applied to river restoration case studies. Good practice appears to be very site/context specific and can be constrained by external factors – no obvious ‘one size fits all’ solution. A key driver appears to be the EC Water Framework Directive with the target for ‘Good Ecological Status’, though this is open for interpretation by member states.

Complementary approaches may be needed:

- Users should be directed to ‘good practice’ pages which would include links to specific supporting case studies. These pages and case study identification would have to be performed by suitable community experts.
- Case studies could include a feedback mechanism to permit peer feedback.

Case study approval – key findings that emerged were a desire for a simple email notification mechanism to nominated regional approvers. Draft entries should be visible to all but a page status (e.g. draft/approved) was required.

FORECASTER – none of the delegates questioned appeared to have knowledge of the existing FORECASTER case studies. It is unclear if the delegates were the target audience but it highlights the importance of publicising RESTORE to the community.

Delegates were very positive about the creation of a case study repository. Appendix B lists a number of aspirations that were raised.

3.4 Summary for Target 8.2 By 2015 support a number of integrated river basin plans to include river and water ecosystem restoration measures and/or river restoration pilot projects and/or river restoration plans

River restoration:	General points
Drivers	WFD is the main driver But others include: Fisheries and Habitats & Birds Directives
Obstacles	Money Knowledge Conflicting pressures Evidence Understanding Bureaucracy/permitting Lack of stakeholder input
Opportunities	Knowledge transfer Best practice Guidance

	Evidence Ecosystem approach
We need knowledge on:	Cost-benefit analysis Environmental engineering Catchment planning - we already have knowledge on in stream restoration but not at this larger scale
Need easy access to information:	Relevant case studies - in local languages/ recognising regional differences Interpreted case studies – process/ techniques/ similar environments Technical guidance documents
We need	improve Stakeholder involvement - often the problem of delivery was the lack of stakeholder input to planning & projects remember it does not always have to be expensive – small or simple techniques can deliver just as well remember it is protection not just restoration Field trips for decision makers
people agreed to	Send us case studies Get River Restoration into River Basin Plans Link the RESTORE website to your own website (http://www.izvrs.si/ and English version: http://www.izvrs.si/index_eng.html) Translate key information into your own language

3.5 Questions asked of attendees through the workshop and answers received (arranged according to country)

What do you regard as the principal policy drivers for river restoration in your country and why? E.g. WFD, Habitats and Birds, Floods Directive; Land Use Planning, CAP?	
Slovenia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFD is becoming the main driver Projects carried out pre WRD were driven by erosion control; protection of agricultural land and roads; flood risk; fish passage. - Habitats and Birds Directives - Floods Directive driver to regulation not river restoration - WFD, H&B directive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ because of the need to achieve good ecological and chemical status/potential ▪ need to achieve targets
Croatia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - European directive (WFD, H&B directive) - NGOs - dominance of engineering works, struggle on the side of environmentalists - politics to be the main driver, as well as corruption - national ecological network
Portugal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - forbidden to propose new regulation works - losing agricultural land, floods are not an important issue - urban floods are important
Eastern Europe / central Asia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National legislation – river basin management (mostly legislation in development), - EU WFD seen to be a good model (or necessary as accession countries). - Habitats Directive, Ramsar, Floods.
Netherlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The drivers fluctuate with time, e.g. danger from flooding following a major flood event

UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFD - Habitats Directive - Climate change - Planning policy - Floods Directive
Moldova	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFD
Belgium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFD - Floods Directive <p>(balancing Floods Directive and WFD (ecological status) can be difficult)</p>
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFD and Birds and Habitats Directives to be the main drivers - ecosystems services not in agenda and neither on the radar
In general what do you regard as the main obstacles, to delivering river restoration?	
Croatia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - conflicting uses - lack of knowledge and awareness - benefits of river restoration not recognized yet, public does not understand the importance of river restoration. - mainly engineering approaches - lack of knowledge of civil engineers (river regulations could be done in soft way, but it is not) - younger generation more aware and knowledgeable, but has no space / opportunity - lack of clear targets / directions on RR (which exists well for fisheries) - lack of funding - policy makers does not understand the need for river restoration - land owners/ land use - misunderstanding between different stakeholders/different use of water (water use for drinking, flood protection, hydropower, irrigation, navigation, sediment extraction...) - good legislation but not implemented - gap between the Directives (e.g. different targets of flood Directive and WFD)
Slovenia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proposals to river restoration exist, but fail due too lack of funding - lack of available land / space for river restoration, also conflicts with land owners - engineering plans followed by EIA - water quality as a result of river restoration not understood and not shown as a benefit of river restoration - agricultural land on the floodplains should be protected, not subject to land use change - lack of funding - policy makers does not understand the need for river restoration - lack of knowledge and awareness, misunderstanding between different stakeholders/different use of water (water use for drinking, flood protection, hydropower, irrigation, -- navigation, sediment extraction...) <p>broad public does not understand the importance of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of knowledge of civil engineers (river regulations could be done in soft way, but it is not) - good legislation but not implemented

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - gap between the Directives (e.g. different targets of flood Directive and WFD)
Eastern Europe / central Asia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Money - Understanding (Hydropower/reservoirs) - Political will - Access to best practice - Science base - Cultural issues (corruption) - Regulation - Land ownership - Coordinate amongst sector and countries
Portugal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of funding - lack of knowledge / awareness of benefits of river restoration - confusion re river restoration vs. bioengineering approaches - positive: when building hydropower project, a land has to be compensated
Moldova	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conflicting goals – i.e. restoring navigation in a watercourse and the economic benefit of this (e.g. Moldova) as opposed to the ecological value
Belgium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overly complicated processes – too many levels of river management working on too small an area. i.e. (French speaking part) where there are different tiers ranging from statutory organisations on a large scale to private landowners on the smaller scale
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - showing economic figures would help influence decision makers - hydropower pressure - lack of knowledge / awareness of river restoration benefits - Money and lack of funding – engineers have a lack of funding and profit so don't regard river restoration as economically viable - Cost – benefit has not been proven - Ownership – If land is in private use and the money is not available to buy the land - Lack of education – engineers, river managers do not know enough about river restoration
And what are the opportunities to support you delivering river restoration?	
Slovenia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LIFE EU projects, but these are to be single-site projects only - lack of available floodplain / land - with EU projects co-financing needed, which is often lacking - new opportunities with new (2011) water plan (regulations forbidden) - legislative and Directives: gain the legal framework for river restorations - transborder cooperation at different levels (local, regional, country) - education - experiences from other countries (knowledge sharing)
Croatia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - approaching EU, so hoping EU Directives to become real drivers for river restoration - need for improvement / instalment of new policies in this regard - EU Funds (Funding): governments lack funds; not used as much as possible - transborder cooperation at different levels (local, regional, country) - education

	- experiences from other countries (knowledge sharing)
Portugal	- river restoration embedded in legislation, but lack of implementation due to lack of funding
Eastern Europe / central Asia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to info on case studies and good practices - Willingness to learn (political and scientific) - EU funding, support from WWF and others - Payment for Ecosystem Services and valuation of services - Legislation in place and being developed
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFD and Water Management Plans should be adopted into policy and engineering companies would then need to work to this policy - Case studies of Best practice in Europe - Water management plans - Relationships between water users should be included in Water Management Plans - Information on a) which types of river restoration target Good Ecological Status; b) examples and help on how to reach GES; c) to know when you reach GES - A balance between GES and exploitation of the environment (e.g. for transportation) - Awareness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. People and Good Ecological Status ii. The dangers of flooding - Using topics such as climate change - How much will it cost and who will pay for actions in the river? Would it be the Ministry? - Translate knowledge for policy makers and decision makers so they understand the proposals and understand other perspectives
What knowledge do you need to help you deliver river restoration?	
Slovenia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - knowing the benefits - sharing best practices - collaboration between river restoration planners and ecologists - lack of available data for smaller streams - interdisciplinary approach needed - examples of good and bad practices - guidelines on European level (step by step manual) - knowledge of ecology, requirements ... of target species/habitats and connection with GES/GEP - monitoring practices - communication skills, how to approach to stakeholders - political will for restoration - hydro-morphological status of the rivers, monitoring/assessment - importance to be included in the first steps of land use planning
Croatia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - knowing the river restoration benefits - need for underlying hydrological modelling data - lack of data on hydrology and sediments - lack of finances for equipment for research - interdisciplinary approach needed - examples of good and bad practices - guidelines on European level (step by step manual)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - knowledge of ecology, requirements ... of target species/habitats and connection with GES/GEP - monitoring practices - communication skills, how to approach to stakeholders - political will for restoration - hydro-morphological status of the rivers, monitoring/assessment - importance to be included in the first steps of land use planning
Portugal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - need for more technical knowledge / information - seasonality issues: in summer lack of flow in the rivers - lack of data available per regions
Eastern Europe / central Asia	Most are just starting along this route so the knowledge need is not there yet, but learning from others successes and failures in terms of the process is valuable – so wider case studies than just the technical detail.
general	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - how to? - need for international data on river restoration - clarify what (ecological) river restoration actually is (e.g. bioengineering vs. river restoration) - Need to collect examples of good practice - Need information on how to confirm when you have reached GES
Do you have river restoration plans? Are they at a catchment scale? Do you use them to help deliver the Water Framework Directive with your River Basin Management Plans?	
Slovenia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - list of all measures inside of river basin management plan - in RBMPs no serious / big river restoration plans - Slovenia has two water bodies. 1 is in a poor state which will be restored. 1 is in a bad state to research is underway into what is wrong with this water body. There are larger projects, e.g. LIFE projects, as well as smaller projects
Croatia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - has Danube and Adriatic basin management plans – still general and at a large scale - in RBMPs no serious / big river restoration plans
Portugal	- in RBMPs no serious (no plan yet) / big river restoration plans
Moldova	- has plans for 2 main rivers on a catchment scale. However there is a lack of financial support and a lack of political will. The ministry of the Environment wrote the plan. They also work with Romania because part of the water body is in this country
Belgium	- has no catchment plan but has specific projects which aim to meet WFD and eel and salmon management plans
The Netherlands	- has the catchment scale “Room for the River” project, as well as smaller scale projects
Eastern Europe / central Asia	- Generally no. mostly the IRBM plan stage with transboundary rivers. Some local/municipality river restoration plans (Romania)
UK	yes
What would enable you to deliver river restoration at a river catchment scale? (Can be at the level of policy, knowledge, communications, partnerships, funding, stakeholder involvement etc. Be specific in your answers).	

Eastern Europe / central Asia (answers the question - what information is needed to deliver river restoration and with best practice examples)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Long term spatial planning, - Sustainability, - Information on benefits, - SMART targets for setting goals, - Monitoring to 'measure' success and achievement, - Clearly defined indicators of success (measurable values), - Achievement of good ecological status, - Need good link between science and policy, - How to measure societal enjoyment of rivers in terms of 'good practice', - [RESTORE tool should allow for questions to be asked, map based and dynamic.]
Slovenia and Croatia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to remove obstacle from point 2. and use knowledge from point 4 - policy → we need river management plans at catchment level with measures, action plans, responsibilities, all topics connected - knowledge – good data, all kind of data (hydrology, hydro-morphology, chemical data, historical data, biological data, land use ...) - cooperation of all sectors, transboundary cooperation
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - knowledge, finance, money - Better politics which allow the transfer of money more effectively - More convincing arguments to carry out river restoration. i.e. cost-benefit - Better forward planning of how to spend money when it becomes available with a short timeframe e.g. at the end of the financial year - Punishment for bad practise under WFD - More communication explaining case studies to other levels, i.e. where there are currently too many levels of management
What do you consider makes river restoration good practice? Please also add your good practice case studies and useful river restoration guidance to the posters around the wall (or questionnaire provided).	
Slovenia and Croatia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – restorations that meets its targets – clear targets – good plan – good manual – monitoring of background data – funding – experts – consensus of stakeholders – long term function – multi beneficially (ecology, flood protection, ...) – economical feasibility (cost – benefit)
Slovenia/ Croatia & Portugal	<p>#1: Definition of the goal of the river restoration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is it back to the original / pristine state or to what status - explain, understand and know the difference between river restoration and bioengineering - agree on clear long-term vision <p>#2 Work closely with Birds and Habitats Directives and include biodiversity</p> <p>#3 Better collaboration / communication between water managers and</p>

	<p>conservationists</p> <p>#4 Need for cost benefit analysis and for assessment of socio-economic benefits</p> <p>#5 Clear presentation of benefits, also in monetary terms</p> <p>#6 Need for interdisciplinary approach and collaboration</p> <p>#7 Public understands river restoration for conservation purpose, less so as for water resources management</p> <p>#8 Public participation is needed, so do involve communities</p> <p>#9 Availability of data in the pre-project phase is also important</p>
<p>Slovenia; Netherlands; Moldova; Bulgaria; UK</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incorporating flood protection (so not worsening flood risk) - Consider river type i.e. appropriate boulder type to use in project - Linkage to the status of water – e.g. what makes good practice in rivers from similar eco-regions. - Post project information on “What is the environmental baseline, how has this been improved and how has the status been improved?” - Need to ensure we do not restore for the sake of restoration but specifically to restore GES and prove we have done this – i.e. Restore physical and chemical processes which are failing - Communicating to people the possibilities of what can be achieved so they can promote and encourage these possibilities - Schemes demonstrating good practise in terms of specific issues – e.g. for Moldova, a scheme demonstrating good practise in terms of flooding and pollution - Information on how to sell river restoration on a cost-benefit side of things
<p>CASE STUDIES:</p>	<p>Slovenia examples are: BIO_Mura Life project, Želimeljščica, Cerknica lake tributaries (Trstenec and Goriški Brežiček)</p>
<p>What are the solutions you propose to achieve target 8.2?</p>	
<p>Eastern Europe / central Asia (answers the question - how will these countries feed back from this workshop and event?)</p>	<p>A very good range of mechanisms to feed back into each country and neighbouring countries with shared rivers, including:</p> <p>Web portals (Ukraine),</p> <p>Meetings, seminars and conferences of interested groups (All),</p> <p>Study courses for students and teaching (Russia & Romania),</p> <p>Invite international (UNDP) and national experts to events to feed back this information (Georgia, Armenia)</p> <p>Scholarship for students in Eastern Europe/Central Asia</p>
<p>Croatia and Slovenia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more funding - ministry has to recognize the importance of the target and priorities it - inter-governmental cooperation in creation of plans - more local management plans for river sectors that are incorporated in general RBMP - define hydro-morphological assessment and monitoring - top down and bottom up approach - including all stakeholders - control mechanisms well established
<p>Slovenia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - review (lack of) funding and try to incorporate evaluation of economic

	<p>benefits (CBA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - explore willingness to pay among citizens
Croatia and Portugal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - involve public and make solution understandable well in advance (in early phase of a project) - existing RBMPs are to be implemented, better so, and later review them and include improvements - be aware of importance of local communities and stakeholders
Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - involve public into new planning, raise awareness and build knowledge to facilitate implementation of existing RBMPs - enhance networks, organize courses, exchange for young people
Slovenia; Netherlands; Moldova; Bulgaria; UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The WFD text is very a complicated with approx 26 guidance documents e.g. how to create a water body. However there is no guidance document on the “Theory of river restoration” and the “Results of monitoring”. - Provide “How to” information on reaching the required criteria under WFD - The Cost effectiveness of each measure needs to be tacked - More information on the Economic value of environmental services - WWTW – guidance on cost benefit analysis, how to put it together and how to ensure it is correct
All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - agree on method of ecosystem services valuation - planning and thinking in advance – long term vision for planners and decision makers - invest into education and raise awareness - align different policies such as WFD and Floods Directive - river restoration can serve as tool to improve water quality - allocate funds from planning / policy to actual implementation
Do you see a role for the proposed solutions within the WWF6 template?	
Slovenia and Croatia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - exchange of information at different level - web base – more important for young people/experts - events – for managers - field trips (case studies) for scientist, experts, to give experience to persons that will do the river restorations - countries who lag behind (e.g. Croatia) to learn from case studies and collected knowledge
Slovenia; Netherlands; Moldova; Bulgaria; UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It would be beneficial to have guidance documents to give to ‘partners’ who don’t attend field trips, conferences etc. but who need access to this information and best practise also e.g. landowners; policy makers; engineers - We need to share guidance on ‘How to successfully use European funds’ - There is a concentration of funds in certain areas. We need more geographical balance between projects - There should be more partners from less developed states as they need more help. - They also require guidance from the more developed states - Website messages need to be in native languages, particularly with keywords of how to reach information in the target language
All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - field trips yes, to learn from practice

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - participants very much liked Martin’s presentation and expressed their interest in participating at similar workshops - availability of case studies to learn from, to share knowledge - language barrier (RESTORE to be in English) - conference of technical nature
Will you implement the solution within your River Basin Management Plans?	
Slovenia	- implementation of measures given inside the river basin management plans
Croatia	- they have targets inside plans, but plans are general. They need more detailed plans, with more specific measures and action plans
all	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - participants agree this is up to decision makers and not in their power to change or influence anything - in Portugal and Finland river restoration is included in existing RBMPs but not always implemented due to lack of money
Slovenia; Netherlands; Moldova; Bulgaria; UK (answers the question additional sign up)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Link other LIFE projects which are relevant to river restoration and RESTORE - The table agreed to put links to RESTORE’s website onto their own - They also agreed to send us their case studies - We compiled a list of what they would search for under the Wiki tool.

3.7 Summaries

3.7.1 Summary thoughts for Eastern European/Central Asian countries

These countries are in the early to middle stages of setting up Integrated River Basin Management plans. They are based on Central Europe, but are relevant to each country’s own cultural identity and issues. This region requires best practice case examples of the planning and policy side of RBMP’s – not yet the technical details of implementation.

There is interest from this wide stakeholder group of countries. For web based and printed materials the emphasis should be on simple summaries before technical details. The case study information **FOR** RESTORE will be sparse as the policies and infrastructure is not in place yet.

3.7.2 Summary thoughts for Slovenia

There are plans for river restoration but funding can limit their implementation. River basin plans are not delivering river restoration at the moment.

There is still a role for protecting existing rivers with high ecological value. There needs better working relationships between different sectors such as engineers, ecologists; power companies; water managers and conservationists.

3.7.3 Summary thoughts for Croatia

There are targets inside their RBMPs, but the plans are general. They need more detailed plans, with more specific measures to start delivering action. Funding is also a problem. Web based access to expert information.

They must remember that communicating with local communities is key to delivering action.

3.7.4 Summary thoughts for other countries

Most countries have river basin management plans but they are not driving measures at the moment. The plans were mostly technical documents. There should be more communication with local communities as part of delivering WFD and river restoration. They would like to have access to good practice in river restoration and past case studies.

4.0 Overall seminar

Day 1

After the Plenary opening session the workshop programme (see Appendix C) started with the introduction of the road map of the 6th World Water forum process and its relation to river restoration. This was presented by Bart Fokkens from European Centre for River Restoration (ECRR).

Workshops

The workshop programme continued with four separate workshops each one hosting a different topic.

- Workshop 1: Promote integration of aquatic ecosystems conservation and land (use) planning and other territorial policies) by Henk Moen (DLG, the Netherlands);
- Workshop 2: Experiences on reaching consensus on river restoration good practices as a means to support delivery of European policy goals by Antonia Scarr (RESTORE project manager, EA, England and Wales);
- Workshop 2.2: Dutch 'Room for the River' project as an example of a catchment approach to river restoration by Bart Fokkens (ECRR, the Netherlands);
- Workshop 3: Reinforce public education on water ecosystems and resources preservation and restoration by Philippe Dupont (ONEMA, France);
- Workshop 4: Improve the link between tourism development and quality of water ecosystems by Bart Fokkens (ECRR).

Note: Participants were assigned to the groups by the RESTORE project management team according to their own preference.

For the purpose of this report we focus on Workshop 2 **“Experiences on reaching consensus on river restoration good practices, as a means to support delivery of European policy goals.”**

The key elements gleaned from this workshop are outlined in Section 2.4 above. (the full list of comments captured can be found in Appendix B):

For the workshop, attendees were assigned into groups based on geographical regions. This was to avoid fragmented discussions (i.e. Table 1: Bulgaria, Romania, Ukraine, Tajikistan, Azerbaijan, Russia & UK; Table 2: Portugal, Algeria, Slovenia and Croatia; Table 3: Estonia, Finland & Slovenia; Table 4: the Netherlands,, Belgium, UK & Slovenia; Table 5: the Netherlands; Slovenia & Croatia)

The questions addressed in Workshop 2 were designed to encourage participants to discuss and identify the principal policy drivers for river restoration in their countries, the main obstacles, and opportunities, as well as identify knowledge needs to support river restoration. Participants also discussed (catchment) river restoration plans, tools to deliver these, and good river restoration practices.

Presentations

After four separate workshops participants participated in three afternoon sessions:

- Key note speech: Stakeholders perspectives by Andrej Sovinc (Head of Sečovlje Salina Nature Park, Slovenia): Stakeholder involvement in river and wetland restoration;
- RESTORE: Sharing best practices across Europe Antonia Scarr (RESTORE project manager, EA, England and Wales), Jukka Jormola (SYKE, Finland), Martin Janes (RRC, UK), and Andrea Goltara (CIRF, Italy);
- Information fair: Good practise exchange, poster presentations, promotion opportunities by Galia Balusheva (Ministry of Environment, Bulgaria) and Olga Zhovtonog (NGO Land and Water management, Ukraine).

Network event

Network event with drinks hosted by RESTORE concluded the first day of the seminar.

Day 2

The second day continued with the parallel workshops sessions with participants attending the same groups as previous day.

Similarly, four different presentations were given to the participants.

- Workshop 1: Promote integration of aquatic ecosystems conservation in land (use) planning and other territorial policies by Mrs. Teresa Fidelis (University of Aveiro, Portugal) on “Strategic land(use) and water management planning” and Mitja Bricelj (IzVRS, Slovenia) “EU Danube Strategy in river restoration planning on”;
- Workshop 2: Experiences on reaching consensus on river restoration good practices, as a means to support delivery of European policy goals by Martin Janes (RRC, UK) on “River restoration best practises” and Natasa Zmolar Zvanut (IzVRS, Slovenia) on “Hydropower and river restoration issues”;
- Workshop 3: Reinforce public education on water ecosystems and resources preservation and restoration by Martina Zupan (GWP Slovenia) on “Communication, education and public

awareness raising” and Lidija Globevnik (IzVRS, Slovenia) on “Case study on public education in Mura river restoration project”;

- Workshop 4: Improve the link between tourism development and quality of water ecosystems by Stephanie Gaucherand (CEMAGREF, France) on “Sustainable Tourism Development” and Marjana Hoenigsfeld Lutra Institute. Slovenia) on “Goricko nature park Case Study”.

For the purpose of this report we focus on the Workshop 2.

The discussion was designed to encourage participants to brainstorm solutions to achieve Target 8.2; they also discussed the role of proposed solutions (e.g. web based knowledge management tool, events, conferences, seminars, and field trips) within the World Water Forum process. Participants were also asked whether they would implement the solution within their River Basin Management Plans. (The full details of the responses are given in Appendix B)

Field trip

After the workshops participants attended the field trip to Cerknica Lake and Skocjan Caves Park. These sites offer a diverse set of examples of good practice watercourse restoration related to sustainable tourism, public education, and integrated land-use planning in the context of IRBM planning. Upon return from the field trip in the evening everyone attended the official joint dinner.

Day 3

On the third day the seminar closed with speeches from high political representatives, the RESTORE project team and plenary discussion:

- Key note speech: Integrated River Basin Management Planning by Dejan Komatina (Executive Secretary Sava Commission IRBM planning and river restoration in the Sava River, Croatia)
- Plenary session: Workshop reports of targets and solutions by Bart Fokkens (ECRR, the Netherlands)
- Report on RESTORE findings by Antonia Scarr (RESTORE project manager, EA, England and Wales)
- Plenary discussion with Bart Fokkens (ECRR, the Netherlands), Hil Kuypers (DLG, the Netherlands), Martin Janes (RRC, UK), Antonia Scarr (RESTORE project manager, EA, England and Wales), Philippe Dupont (ONEMA, France)
- Plenary discussion: Implementation of solutions in IRBM plans by Martin Janes (RRC, UK) and Antonia Scarr (RESTORE project manager, EA, England and Wales)
- Plenary discussion: Milestones towards WWF6, and beyond by Bart Fokkens (ECRR, the Netherlands)
- Official closing by Slovenian Minister of Environment, Director of IzVRS, and Chair ECRR.

Attendance

In total there were 100 people who attended the workshop from a variety of sectors, such as ministries for the Environment, Nature Protection and Land use planning, Meteorology and Hydrology, Institutes for Water, Universities, State organisations, Research, NGO's, River Restoration Centres, International organisations, Government departments, Fisheries, Hydropower and private companies.

Dissemination of Event Outcomes

How will any outcomes from the event be disseminated to

- a) Attendees, - event added to RESTORE and ECRR websites; articles written for the RESTORE website and ECRR newsletter
- b) Other main target audience – a press article was written in the national Slovenian newspaper

Follow Up

What follow up will there be?

- Contacts have been added to the RESTORE contacts directory.
- Outputs have been used in follow up events such as talks for the Paris event; articles in the UK River Basin Bulletin

Appendix A**List of Attendees**

First Name	Last Name	E-mail (removed for web version)	Company	Country
Taivo	Anier			Estonia
Maria	Arola		Finnish Environment Institute	Finland
Galina	Balusheva		Ministry of Environment and Water	Bulgaria
Sanja	Barbalić		Hrvatske vode	Croatia
Biljana	Barić		State institute for nature protection	Croatia
Gordana	Beltram		Park Škocjanske jame	Slovenia
Aida	Bezdrob		Agencija za vodno područje rijeke Save Sarajevo	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Aleš	Bizjak		Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenia	Slovenia
Sabina	Blumauer		Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenia	Slovenia
Barbara	Bric		Zavod za ribištvo Slovenije	Slovenia
Mitja	Bricelj		Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenia	Slovenia
Mitja	Brilly		Univeristy of Ljubljana	Slovenia
José	Coelho		Administration of Hydrographical Regions – North	Portugal
Gabriela	Costea		Natural Sciences Museum Complex Galati, Romania	Romania
Elisabeta	Cserwid		National Institute oh Hydrology and Water Management	Romania
Ramona	Curelea		National Administration "Romanian Waters"	Romania
Maša	Čarf		Zavod za ribištvo Slovenije	Slovenia
Dragana	Čavlović		University of Belgrade	Serbia
Andreja	Čerček Hočevar		MOP	Slovenia
Renata	Ćuk		Hrvatske vode	Croatia
Proca	Dumitru		Agency Apele Moldovei	Moldova
Philippe	Dupont		ONEMA	France
Petra	Đurić		State institute for nature protection	Croatia
Tea	Erjavec			Slovenia
Rok	Fazarinc		Inženiring za vode d.o.o.	Slovenia
Bart	Fokkens		ECRR	the Netherlands
Elizabeta	Gabrijelčič		Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenia	Slovenia
Romana	Gaspirc		Wetlands International	the Netherlands
Stéphane	Gaucherand		Cemagref	France

Lidija	Globevnik		Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenia	Slovenia
Andrea	Goltara		CIRF - Italian Centre for River Restoration	Italy
Bruna	Gumiero		Bologna University	Italy
Marija	Habinc		Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenia	Slovenia
Ruth	Hanniffy		Environment Agency	United Kingdom
Darja	Istenič		LIMNOS Ltd.	Slovenia
Blaž	Ivanuša		DRAVA Vodnogospodarsko podjetje Ptuj, d.d.	Slovenia
Martin	Janes		The River Restoration Centre	United Kingdom
Pete	Jeans		SFW Ltd	United Kingdom
Borut	Jerse		European Anglers Alliance (EAA)	Belgium
Jukka	Jormola		Finnish Environment Institute SYKE	Finland
Mihkel	Juhkam		Agricultural Board	Estonia
Lauri	Kask		Estonian Nonprofit Association of River Restauration	Estonia
Iztok	Kavčič		Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenija	Slovenia
Jusipbek	Kazbekov		International Water Management Institute	Uzbekistan
Kashif	Khan		SFW Ltd	United Kingdom
Tina	Kirn		Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenia	Slovenia
Nino	Kizikurashvili		UNDP/GEF project "Reducing transboundary degradation of Kura-Aras River Basin"	Georgia
Dejan	Komatina		International Sava River Basin Commission	Croatia
Annelies	Koningsveld		DLG	the Netherlands
Maja	Koprivšek		University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Civil and Geodetic Engineering	Slovenia
Vasiliy	Kostiushyn		Wetlands International	Ukraine
Hil	Kuypers		DLG	the Netherlands
Harald	Leummens		UNDP-GEF	the Netherlands
Pierre-Nicolas	Libert		Environnement	Belgium
Jana	Meljo		Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenia	Slovenia
Ute	Menke		Rijkswaterstaat-Centre for Water Management	The Netherlands

Yulia	Merzlikina		Russian Research Institute for Integrated Water Management and Protection (RosNIIVKh)	Russia
Henk	Moen		ECRR	the Netherlands
Paul	Molnar		Universitatea Politehnica Timisoara	Romania
Damir	Mrđen		Agency for watershed of Adriatic Sea Mostar	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Miha	Naglič		Institute of the RS for Nature Conservation	Slovenia
Gilles	Neveu		International Network of Basin Organisations	France
Inom	Normatov		Institute of Water problems, Hydropower and Ecology	Tajikistan
Anar	Nuriyev		Baku State University	Azerbaijan
Dijana	Oskoruš		Meteorological and Hydrological Service of Republic Croatia	Croatia
Nastja	Pajk		Zavod za ribištvo Slovenije	Slovenia
Timur	Pavluyk		RosNIIVH	Russia
Josée	Peress		ONEMA	France
Borut	Peric		Park Škocjanske jame	Slovenia
Vesna	Petkovska		Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenija	Slovenia
Katja	Poboljšaj		Center za kartografijo favne in flore	Slovenia
Danilo	Puklavec		Zavod za ribištvo Slovenije	Slovenia
Martin	Pušnik		VGP Drava Ptuj d.d.	Slovenia
Daniela	Radulescu		National Institute of Hydrology and Water Management	Romania
Simon	Rusijan		University of Ljubljana,	Slovenia
Auri	Sarvilinna		Finnish Environment Institute	Finland
Antonia	Scarr		Environment Agency	United Kingdom
Daniela	Schneider		State institute for nature protection	Croatia
Nataša	Smolar-Žvanut		Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenija	Slovenia
Andrej	Sovinc		Secovlje Salina Nature Park	Slovenia
Darja	Stanic Racman		Ministry of the environment and spatial planning	Slovenia
Agata	Suhadolnik		VGP Drava Ptuj d.d.	Slovenia
Dagmar	Surmanovic		Hrvatske vode	Croatia
Sašo	Šantl		University of Ljubljana,	Slovenia
Marija	Šikoronja		Hrvatske vode	Croatia
Susanna	Tol		Wetlands International	the Netherlands
Mojca	Tomažič		Institute of the RS for Nature Conservation	Slovenia
Vahagn	Tonoyan		UNDP/GEF	Armenia

Darima	Tsibudeeva		Moscow technological Academy of food Industry	Russia
Teppo	Vehanen		Finnish Game and Fishries Research Institute	Finland
Uroš	Videmšek		Zavod za ribištvo Slovenije	Slovenija
Ines	Viler		VGP Drava Ptuj d.d.	Slovenia
Rogier	Vogelij		DLG	the Netherlands
Daša	Zabrc		Zavod za ribištvo Slovenije	Slovenija
Joanna	Zawiejska		Institute of Geography, Pedagogical University of Cracow	Poland
Olga	Zhovtonog		Institute on Water problems and land reclamation	Ukraine
Sanja	Zlatanovic		Instite for the Development of Water Resources "Jaroslav Cerni"	Serbia
Katarina	Zore		Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenia	Slovenia
Martina	Zupan		GWP	Slovenia
Maja	Zupančič Justin		LIMNOS Ltd.	Slovenia

APPENDIX B **Outputs from RESTORE Questionnaire, Slovenia**

Q 1 Job Title and Organisation

We had twenty responses from the following countries: Azerbaijan, Russia, Slovenia, Croatia, Portugal, Slovenia, Romania, Georgia, Ukraine, Armenia, Moldova, Belgium.

Respondents were from sectors such as Universities; Public bodies; private companies; State departments for Nature protection and the Environment; Meteorological and Hydrological Services; Institutes for Water

Their backgrounds ranged from fields such as research; student; lecturer; hydrologist; Expert advisers, Civil Engineer.

Q 2 What new knowledge have you gained from attending the workshop?

People found that the workshop was interesting and useful with new information on river restoration. They were particularly interested in finding out that the majority of people and organisations are dealing with the same obstacles, e.g. lack of funding, lack of available land, and how they overcame these obstacles. They learned what drivers and attitudes other countries have, and what incentives they use.

The response to the best practice case studies was the most positive with people learning innovative solutions which they are keen to replicate in their own regions. They also learned about projects happening in their own countries and on a wider scale, the value of stakeholder engagement for these projects and the long term nature of many projects.

Respondents learned how to include river restoration into their River Basin Management Plans and how to build connections between experienced institutions and policy.

They learned about RESTORE and the database, as well as about organisations such as the ECRR, and they made new contacts and possible partners.

Q 3 Are you willing to help disseminate information gained at the workshop Y/N

If so how would you do it and to what type of organisation?

Eighteen out of twenty people were willing to disseminate information from the workshop in a variety of ways:

- Informing students and University supervisors, in person and through presentations, particularly the future specialists in water management as well as implementing new ideas and practice through fieldwork
- Sharing information with
 - Ministries of the Environment
 - water management organisations
 - NGO's
 - Administration/State organisations
 - Project designers
 - Nature protection institutions
 - Government officials
- Using upcoming seminars, workshops and conferences to reach stakeholders
- Putting information and best practice on the internal websites of national institutes and emailing a link to national stakeholders, environmental institutions, policy makers and practitioners
- Reports to fellow working group members
- During everyday work with colleagues and stakeholders e.g. fishermen; engineers
- Through meetings with experts
- Through nature conservation guidelines
- By publishing best practice techniques and options for practitioners, water users, students and stakeholders in their target language.

Q 4 We are developing a database of European river restoration case studies linked to information associated with river restoration.

Would you find this useful? Y/N

Nineteen out of twenty respondents would find this useful.

What type of information would you search?

- Case studies
 - Best practice
 - Good and bad practice
 - European experience
 - Strengthening the banks of the river
 - Flood risk management/Flood prevention
 - Different restoration options according to different natural conditions

- Restoration options relevant to specific eco-regions
- Different types of restoration
- Different pressures
- Different scales

- Guidance
 - Objectives of river restoration
 - River restoration - where, what how?
 - Most appropriate techniques
 - A guidance document which integrates the case studies as opposed to simply a catalogue of projects
 - Sustainability
 - Steps in planning and implementing river restoration projects
 - Project analysis
 - Action plans
 - River morphology
 - Approach to regeneration

- Monitoring
 - Biomonitoring
 - Mitigation measures for species/habitats
 - Did the project improve the ecological status?
 - Sediment transport link between spatial waters and underground flow
 - Were the goals of river restoration achieved?
 - Impact of restoration on biological communities
 - Info on number of target species/habitats
 - Results

- Funding
 - Results
 - Cost benefit
 - Cost efficiency
 - Economic value of ecosystems and how to measure it
 - Economic effect (Qualitative and quantitative)
 - Funding opportunities
 - Cost of techniques

- External/Post project
 - Public involvement
 - Use by the public
 - Promoting success
 - Follow up
 - Stakeholder involvement
 - Organisations involved
 - Law enforcement

Q 55 Can you recommend any good practice case studies for the database?

- Biomura LIFE+ project;
- Meller projects of Limnos Ltd.

- Soča river regulation;
- Cerknjško Lake stream restoration
- LIFE project WLPHY on www.walphy.be

Q 6 Can you recommend any good practice guidance or research?

- Information on Ukrainian rivers and their conservation at www.uarivers.net
- Irish guidance on river restoration and management of rivers with non-technical solutions
- Manual of river restoration techniques by RRC
- Publication of Limnos Ltd. In Slovenian language (Eco-remediations, watercourse restoration book - not proof-read)
- Cerknjško Lake stream restoration
- The practice in Japan

Guidance needed: A guidance document on how to implement the Water Framework Directive.

Q 7 Will you implement the WWF 6 solution within your River Basin Management Plans?

There were a variety of positive and negative responses as some of the respondents are not in a position where they have control over RBMP's.

If so where will that be? and how do you plan to do this?

- Through national or international funding (Slovenia)
- River restoration projects are already included in the RBMP's (Portugal)
- Some RBMP's have measures which will use the relevant information from WWF6.
- They will implement the WWF6 Solution in measures for the RBMP including one measure which is for a database of best practise (Slovenia)
- Kara-Aras River basin (Georgia)
- The RBMP's are still draft and are being reviewed to make them compliant with EU WFD. Their implementation will take some time (Armenia)
- The South Bug river where a project had a strategic action plan supported by the Basin council (Ukraine)
- Sava RB, Mura RB, Drava RB, Danube RB (Croatia)
- They have already implemented the WWF6 solutions with the Protection of nature in Water Management Plans (Slovenia).

Q 8 Are there any themes or topics you would like to see presented at future river restoration workshops?

- River restoration case studies
 - More field trips and practice in the field to teach people new solutions in river restoration
 - Examples of "bad" practices (these can sometimes more valuable than "good" practice examples)
 - More examples of best practices and case studies - perhaps present one case study in a very detailed manner - how was the work done, stakeholder involvement, which materials were used etc.
 - Techniques which have been tried and tested and still successful years later providing good results on improving the ecological status of the watercourse
- Technical details

- Additional information on how to carry out river restoration in different conditions
- How to choose which restoration method is best and how to decide where river restoration would provide the highest return in the RBMP
- More technical support - not just showing but also "teaching" people how to make some decisions
- A guidance document with technical and practical case studies would be of great help to show the links between river restoration and ecological status
- Technical details on how to do specific restoration measures
- Non-technical methods of river management
- Monitoring and preparation
 - Bio-monitoring practices
 - Guidance and action plans in detail
 - More methodological materials including setting up of targets for river restoration for different geographic regions
- Economics
 - Economic value of ecosystems and examples of how to calculate and measure it
 - Cost-benefit analysis of river restoration projects and cost efficiency
 - how to use Europe's economic funds

Q 9 Are you interested in being involved with future RESTORE activities/events/ receive information? Y/N

Nineteen out of the twenty respondents were interested in being involved with future RESTORE activities/events and receiving information.

Day 1 Wednesday 16 November 2011

14:15-16:00

Workshop 1 – WWF6 theme 8 and topic 8.2 “Experiences on reaching consensus on river restoration good practices, as a means to support delivery of European policy goals”

14:15 - 14:30 Talk – setting out the workshop / the WWF6 theme / the EU review of policy drivers for river restoration / key message there is information on river restoration but we need it accessible - the 15 mins – Toni & Romana (Toni to present)

14:30 – 15:10 round table discussions – each table to go through questions 1-4 – they will relate to the policy drivers review so we can understand in particular if the issues are the same in Southern and Eastern Europe. As the review was a bit light in these areas.

Who facilitates – Romana, Natasa, Andrea, Susanna, Ruth, Martin, Jukka, Bart, Toni

15:10 – 15:30 – each table reports back to the rest of the group their findings – the facilitator will need to get each table to nominate have a rapporteur. We will need to get all this recorded.

15:30 – 15:40 - Presentation by Bart Fokkens about Room for the River in the Netherlands as an example of a catchment approach to river restoration.

15:40 – 16:00 round table discussions – each table to go through questions 5-7.

Who facilitates – Romana, Natasa, Andrea, Susanna, Ruth, Martin, Jukka, Bart, Toni

Each table to produce a written summary on their findings (bullet points are fine) – the facilitator will need to get each table to nominate have a rapporteur. We will need to get all this recorded.

We will need: pens and flip charts and the tables set up as five round tables.

Purpose: Aim is to seek solutions, to get feedback, guidance, collect case studies and best practices and to seek advice.

Day 2 Thursday 17 November 2011

9:00-11:30

Workshop 2

“Experiences on reaching consensus on river restoration good practices, as a means to support delivery of European policy goals”

9:00 – 9:20 Martin Janes to present : River restoration best practices

9:20 – 9:40 Introduction: Natasa Smolar: Hydropower and river restoration issues

9:40 – 10:40 – round table discussions on questions 8-9. WWF 6 target solutions and the role of River restoration good practices. Do they have a solution? And will they implement it.

Who facilitates – Romana, Natasa, Susanna, Toni, Ruth, Martin, Jukka, Bart

10:40 – 11:00 – each table reports back to the rest of the group their findings – the facilitator will need to get each table to nominate to have a rapporteur. We will need to get all this recorded

11:00 – 11:30 – wash up session to have any further questions/ discussions and agree our target/ who will commit to a solution? (panel of speakers and facilitators)

Purpose: To discuss and gain commitment for solutions, seek collaboration and way forward

We will need: pens and flip charts and five round tables set up as a number of round tables

1st day Workshop 1 – 14:30 – 15:10 round table discussions

- Use questions 1 – 4

1st day Workshop 2 – 15:40 – 16:00 round table discussions

- Use question 5 – 7

2nd day Workshop 1 - 9:40 – 10:40 round table discussions

- Use question 8 – 9

On the wall through out the workshop

Two posters for people to write on or attached post it notes.

- Can you recommend any good practice river restoration case studies at research or operational levels? In particular do you have any at a larger landscape scale?
- Can you recommend any good river restoration practice guidance at research or operational levels? In particular do you have any guidance for delivery at a larger landscape scale?

On the next page a questionnaire collected at the end of the workshop on day 2.

(See Appendix B)

Workshop questions:

1. What do you regard as the principal policy drivers for river restoration in your country and why? E.g. WFD, Habitats and Birds, Floods Directive; Land Use Planning, CAP.
2. In general what do you regard as the main obstacles, to delivering river restoration?
3. And what are the opportunities to support you delivering river restoration?
4. What knowledge do you need to help you deliver river restoration?

5. Do you have river restoration plans? Are they at a catchment scale? Do you use them to help deliver the Water Framework Directive with your River Basin Management Plans?
6. What would enable you to deliver river restoration at a river catchment scale? (Can be at the level of policy, knowledge, communications, partnerships, funding, stakeholder involvement etc. Be specific in your answers).
7. What do you consider makes river restoration good practice? Please also add your good practice case studies and useful river restoration guidance to the posters around the wall (or questionnaire provided).
 - note to facilitators we would like to know what type of schemes they consider as good practise/ what is needed to deliver good river restoration schemes / what makes a river restoration scheme successful.

Target 8.2: *By 2015 support a number of X integrated river basin plans to include river and water ecosystem restoration measures and/or river restoration pilot projects and/or river restoration plans.*

8. What are the solutions you propose to achieve target 8.2?
9. Do you see a role for the proposed solutions within the WWF6 template?
 - web based knowledge management tool
 - events/ conferences/ seminars/ field trips
10. Will you implement the solution within your River Basin Management Plans?