

**Seagull WP 2 Water management
International meeting
Gdansk, December 17th 2003**

The meeting started with a silent minute, in honour of Mr Hans-Gunnar Mattisson, The Lyckeby Water Management Association.

1. Presentation of revised timetable and project plan

	Pilot area	Input from WP 2 to WP 1	WP 1
0312		First ideas, strategy	
0401	Activities		SC meeting 9/1 2004
0402		Status report, draft	
0403		Missing from WP 2: workshops/ conferences in PL, RU, LV? Introduction to the WFD in general. Question: Will these activities be performed?	
0404		Status report. Draft, conclusions and suggestions.	
0405		One workshop/country about the draft conclusions (May- Aug)	International ERB conference in Elblag, 25- 27/5. Politicians and officers from the whole ERB. Discussions in different work-shops.
0406			
0407			
0408			Draft JTDP
0409		International conference in Sweden.	
0410			
0411			
0412	Draft, report about pilot activities.	Final report, conclusions and suggestions	
0501			
0502	International exchange conference, together with WP 4. Methods for citizens particip.		
0503			Final JTDP
0504			
0505	Final report, citizens participation		
0506			ERB Council
0507			

There was a discussion about who is the responsible person(s) in each country?

- In Kaliningrad Region, Boris is official appointed as the contact person for Seagull WP2. There is an agreement between the ERB secretariat and the Shirshovs Institute. Boris also has contacts with the Federal Authorities. The TACIS application points out some regional experts. They will be the Russian working group. Boris also wants to add some more experts to the group. They will also add temporary experts when needed.
- In Poland, Carolina has asked for one contact person from Pomeranian region, W-M region and The Association of the Municipalities respectively. Carolina has got the information from Mr Olszewski, that Mr Kucmanski is the main responsible person for WP 2, but this seems a bit unclear. After a discussion with Ms Anna Golec from Pomeranian Region, there was a decision that there will be one official appointed contact person from each partner, which will be appointed latest January 9th. Rafal Kucmanski will send this question to the Association of the Municipalities and to W-M Region, and will give an answer to Carolina before Christmas. Anna Golec will forward the same question to Ms Wroblewska. Carolina will also raise this question at the SC meeting in Latvia in January. ***This is a key question, necessary to solve within some weeks, to be able to run the Seagull project as planned.***
- In Sweden, the officers taking part in the Swedish water working group are appointed by their municipalities.
- Carolina will meet the Latvian water experts in January.

According to the question about an initial workshop or conference about the WFD, Kaliningrad University is responsible for arranging this activity in Russia. Since there will be a workshop within WP 1 in Kaliningrad in January, it might be a good idea to have these workshops in connection to each other. Boris will check this when coming home, and inform Carolina about dates and about the program and participators in the WP 2 meeting.

There also was a discussion about the interest from the local authorities in Poland and Russia. The discussion showed, very clear, the differences in the water administration, which makes it difficult to work in the same way in the different regions. For example, all plans, decisions and money are at federal (Russia) or regional (Poland) level in some countries, in some countries the municipalities themselves are responsible. The interest from the municipalities in RU and PL is nearly zero, since they don't "own" the water question themselves. This makes it even more important to add representatives from the Regions to the Polish WP 2 expert group (see above).

2. Presentation of the results from the Swedish working group

a. Activities

Within the Seagull Water SE there are a *water working group* since one year ago. This group consists of civil servants and politicians from municipalities participating in the Seagull project. The group covers different competences as for example environmental officers, technical engineers, a spatial planner, an Agenda 21 co-ordinator, a biologist etc. This makes

it possible to discuss water issues from different point of views, which is very valuable for the project. Some of the people in the water working group are also active within the Swedish pilot area, the Lyckeby River.

This spring the SE water working group arranged a *regional water conference*, as a way to spread information about the Seagull project and about the coming water framework directive and the changes this will cause. During the conference they used speakers from the national level, among else the National Environmental Protection Agency, the National Board for Building and Planning and the Swedish Association of Local Authorities, but they also presented good examples of local/regional water co-operation. The conference gathered about 100 participators from the municipalities within the ERB area. There were officers as well as politicians, but also private landowners and people from private companies and NGOs. Also Lithuania has arranged a similar conference. According to the Seagull INTERREG project such a starting conference or workshop is supposed to be held in all ERB regions, as a way to raise the awareness of the project and the WFD and as a way to let different kind of people and associations meet and discuss.

During the spring the Swedish working group gathered *good examples* of voluntary river basin based water co-operation.

In August, the SE working group arranged a work-shop with special invited officers from municipalities and other experts from local water projects. The discussion during the workshop gave the first input to a *SWOT analysis* about local water management in the Swedish ERB area.

In the *Swedish pilot area*, the board of the *Lyckeby River Water Management Association* is *responsible* for planning and implementing the activities. During summer, an English *report about the catchment area* has been produced. They have also made an *attitude investigation* among people living in the pilot area, as a part of the evaluation of this part of the Seagull project.

The working group is running the Swedish part of the work package. Another important objective is to increase the knowledge and the exchange of experiences within the own group. When the group meets, we try to arrange some kind of *internal education*, as a way to spread knowledge within the own region. Project leaders from different kind of water protection projects have been visiting the meetings, telling us about their project. In January next year the group will arrange a short seminar about the Water Framework Directive and other legislation, especially the Act of Planning and Building. A specialist from a private consulting company has made this investigation, using the Lyckeby River as a pilot case. The working group has *invited officers from all municipalities* within ERB to this seminar.

b. Presentation of the report “Water management and water protection. Co-operation in Southeast Sweden. Some examples”.

The today meeting decided to add good examples from the other ERB regions to the final ERB report.

c. Presentation of the report “The Lyckeby river and The Lyckeby River Water Management Association”

This presentation was mainly meant for the people working in the other pilot areas, as information, for comparison and common understanding. But the presentation is also written in a way which makes it possible to put the same information on the Lyckeby River homepage, as public information. Before publishing this as an official Seagull report, we will extend the part about the Water Management Association, their organisation, their ways of working, their budget etc.

According to the Seagull project plan there is supposed to be a description of each pilot area.

d. Presentation of the report “The Lyckeby river. An attitude investigation about water within the EU-project Seagull, study I”

This report will, within soon, be published as an official Seagull report. The University of Kalmar think it would be very interesting to make this kind of investigation also in the other Seagull pilot areas. If there is an interest from other universities, Carolina will forward the contact to the researcher at Kalmar University. The investigation will also be repeated in the end of the project, as a way to evaluate the pilot activities.

e. Presentation of SWOT analysis “Sweden water management at the local level”

The idea is to use this SWOT analysis as a Swedish base for a common discussion within Seagull Water about strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. Will it be possible to present the same kind of analyse for the whole ERB, in the status report?

3. Structure and content of the status report

a. Purpose and objectives

This first status report is meant as information to the municipalities and to the partners of the ERB; they are our target groups. This description will then be the basis for our coming input to strategies and development programme. Also the coming suggestions have the focus on our target groups. Since the Seagull project is a project about *development* it's important to show the connections between water issues and development issues. It is also important to keep in mind the differences in organisation and responsibility. In some of the countries the local level is directly concerned, in other countries the regional or federal level has the responsibility.

b. Content in brief

Carolina presented a first outline, based on the Swedish discussion. This outline is built on four very important parts of the WFD

1. Chemical and ecological status
2. Co-ordination of measures
3. Public participation
4. Recovery of costs

The group decided to hold on to the suggested structure. In the end, perhaps only the conclusions will be presented for the politicians, as a way to reduce the amount of information/pages.

c. Future work and timetable

PL and RU will try to deliver the needed information, including “hard data”, (i.e. figures) latest February 2004. In some parts, the regions will not be able to present this information, instead we have face the reality – no information available.

4. A.o.b.

Boris raised the question about GIS maps. Carolina will check the possibilities within WP 1. Ms Kopec is working on a report, gathering environmental information from all poviats in Pomeranian Region.

5. Next meeting

Carolina will meet Latvian experts January 8.

Seagull Steering Committee in Latvia January 9.

Input to the status report from each region latest February.

Next meeting will be held in March, when the status report exists as a draft. In Poland or in Lithuania.

Carolina Gunnarsson

Attendants:

Malgorzata Bielecka, Institute of Hydro engineering, the Polish Academy of Sciences, PL (item 2-5)

Boris Chubarenko, Shirshovs institute of Oceanology, Kaliningrad, RU

Jadwiga Kopec, Pomeranian region, PL (item 3)

Rafal Kucmanski, Association of municipalities, PL.

Andrzej Lewandowski, Geosciences and Marine research & consulting Co Ltd, PL.

Representative from Regional Water Management Board, Gdansk, PL (item 1-2)

Carolina Gunnarsson, The Regional Council in Kalmar County, SE.