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Purpose of the peer-review

The objective is to set up a simple, voluntary and targeted system to allow mutual learning between peers about WFD implementation and participative river basin management planning.

Who?
Practitioners from River Basin Districts involved in the implementation of the WFD.
1- PEER REVIEW MISSIONS:

• Dedicated to issues selected by Receiving Competent Authorities (RCAs) and implemented by selected volunteer reviewing experts (RE).
• Missions were carefully organised in line with the “Terms of References“ and online preparatory meetings.
• Lessons learnt and tips were summarised in a report elaborate by the experts.

2- HANDS-ON WORKSHOPS on most discussed issues during the missions
Project activities:

- **September 2014**: Launch of the Peer review Secretariat project for 2 years
- **November 2014**: Establishing the protocol to perform the peer-reviews, "manual of procedures"
- **Jan.-April 2015**: Initial call for expression of interest for both RBDs and experts launched and match making procedures
### Project activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February-June 2015</td>
<td>• Elaboration of ToRs with RCAs and first webinars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>• First Peer Review missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. – Oct. 2016</td>
<td>• 4 Peer Review workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to Nov. 2016</td>
<td>• Finalisation of Peer-review missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to Dec. 2016</td>
<td>• Final assessment and report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European River Basin Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate RBD for the Peer Review project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Expressions of Interest from 11 MS

- South Baltic Water District, Sweden
- Tiber Basin Authority, Italy
- Duero River Basin Authority, Spain
- Júcar River Basin Authority, Spain
- Water Management Agency, Luxembourg
- Catalan Water Agency, Spain
- Autorità di Bacino dell'Alto Adriatico, Italy
- River Basin District of River Kokemäenjoki - Finland
- Rhine-Meuse Water Agency - France
- Miño-Sil River Basin Authority - Spain
- Northern Baltic Sea Water District Authority - Sweden
- Danish Water Agency - Danemark
- National Sustainable Energy and Water Conservation Unit and Environment and Planning Authority - Malta
- Ministry of the Environment – Estonia
- Glomma River Basin District – Norway
- Environment, geology and meteorology centre - Latvia
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Geographic distribution of reviewing experts

- 70 candidate reviewing experts from 15 MS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer-Review Project: Missions' schedule</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Management Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autorità di Bacino dell'Alto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriatico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Basin District of River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokemäenjoki Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jucar River Basin Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duero River Basin Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhine-Meuse Water Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glomma River Basin District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Baltic Water District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan Water Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiber Basin Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miño-Sil River Basin Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Baltic Sea Water District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Environment - Nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, geology and meteorology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centre - Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Online meeting/exchanges for the preparation of the mission
- Peer Review mission
- Mission report
Preliminary outcomes and messages
Good participation from MS (RCAs and experts) to join the process.

Gained experience in improving participants’ daily work were declared by the participants.

Developed contacts and networking for future projects.

Low cost for a constructive exchanges and development of a European Common approach in a more practical way.

Required improvement in coordination within the planning cycle’s activities.

Field trips organised in some missions were appreciated by the experts.

Translation for the documentation was important and not always possible.
Peer reviews Workshops

Objectives:

- Compare practical experiences of Member States and basin organisations regarding WFD implementation
- Promote the exchange of questions and solutions
- Address the need for explanatory elements of strategies followed by the Members States and identify the best practices

Outcomes:

- Workshop report gathering the main information
- Presentation of the main recommendations at the "Lessons Learned" workshop and final Peer Review project report
Hands-on Workshops

- **GROUNDWATER** on 8-9 September at the South Baltic RCA in Kalmar (Sweden)
- **DATA MANAGEMENT** on 5-6 October near Nice (France) at International Office for Water
- **PoM** on 18 October in Lourdes (France) before the annual EUROPE-INBO conference
- **LESSONS LEARNED** for the peer review instrument for good practice exchange on WFD implementation between member states on 26 October afternoon before the SCG in Brussels (Belgium)
Hands-on Workshops

PoM:

- Before the EUROPE-INBO conference in Lourdes, 19 - 22 October 2016, focusing on:
  - Water Governance in transboundary basins
  - Adaptation to climate change: resources managements and flood risks
  - 2019 WFD review

Questionnaire

Feedback on the Peer Review workshop experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop host</th>
<th>Mediterranean Network of Basin Organisation – Lourdes – France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates of the workshop</td>
<td>18-19 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop topic</td>
<td>Programme of measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the Peer Review workshop answer to your expectations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree: ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Agree: ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Disagree: ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree: ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| In general, were you satisfied with the Peer Review workshop? |
| Satisfied: ☐                           |
| Fairly Satisfied: ☐                |
| Fairly Dissatisfied: ☐             |
| Dissatisfied: ☐                        |

| Which aspects were the most positive from the Peer Review workshop? |

| What do you think could be improved in the management and organization of these workshops? |

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels for Groundwater Workshop and Data Management Workshop]

- Satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
3 topics proposed for the workshop

- **Topic 1:** “Definition and implementation of the programme of measures”
- **Topic 2:** “Effects of the programme of measures”
- **Topic 3:** “Cost”-effectiveness and cost-recovery analysis”
# Peer review missions on PoM

## Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 1: Definition and implementation of the Programme of Measures</th>
<th>Topic 2: Effects on the programme of measures</th>
<th>Topic 3: Cost-effectiveness and cost recovery analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan Water Agency (Spain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duero River Basin Authority (Spain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Júcar River Basin Authority (Spain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miño-Sil River Basin Authority (Spain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian Ministry of Environment (Estonia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glomma River Basin District (Norway)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministries for “Energy and Health” and “for Sustainable Developm., the Environ.&amp; Clim.Ch.” (Malta)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Catalan Water Agency (Spain)**

**Duero River Basin Authority (Spain)**

**Júcar River Basin Authority (Spain)**

**Miño-Sil River Basin Authority (Spain)**

**Estonian Ministry of Environment (Estonia)**

**Glomma River Basin District (Norway)**

**Ministries for “Energy and Health” and “for Sustainable Developm., the Environ.& Clim.Ch.” (Malta)**
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Catalan Water Agency

- **Objectives:**
  - Methodological review for the cost-effectiveness analysis of measures and cost recovery analysis.
  - Assessment of cost recovery through water pricing.
  - Analysis of affordability based in the revenues for companies in different sectors.

- **Specific recommendations:**
  - To be presented by Martin H Larsson.
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Objectives:
- Analysis of the effectiveness of the PoM on: pressures, “water status” evaluation and achievement of environmental objectives (Paloma Crespo Iniesta).

Specific recommendations:
- A good status of the water bodies do not often guarantee a good condition of conservation of habitats and/or of the species related to them.
- An improvement of the coherence and an analysis of the matches and divergences between the Habitats and Species Directives and the Water Framework Directive, are needed.
- The development of governance and coordination measures between different administrations is equally necessary, in particular in order to improve the usefulness and functionality of the meetings of the Committee of Competent Authorities and to achieve a better integrated participation of different administrations.
Objectives:

- Methodological support on environmental and resource costs for recovery of cost water services (Mª Mar Borrego-Marín)

Specific recommendations:

- The analysis of cost recovery for water services remains a difficult task in which there are many institutions involved and where financing mechanisms are not well defined in the most of cases.
- With regard to environmental and resource costs, additional studies are necessary to realize the calculation procedure and its contribution to global recovery ratio (methodology development).
- There are serious doubts about the effectiveness of the calculation of environmental costs including those derived from water bodies with less stringent objectives: uncertainty in its calculation, meaning of these costs, interpretation of the values obtained. The same happen with the resource costs.
Gomma River Basin District

**Objectives:**
- What are the strength and weaknesses of the programmes of measures? How can they be improved?
- Are the **priorities** clearly defined in the programmes of measures?
- Are the programmes of measures and the water information system Vann-Nett well correlated?
- How well do we implement WFD policies into physical measures? (Niklas Holmgren & Vicent Westberg)

**Specific recommendations:**
- To be presented by **Marte K. Rosnes**
South Baltic Water District

- **Objectives:**
  - Improvement on coordination and implementation of the rural development Plans with the agricultural measures
  - Evaluation of “Economic analysis”: environmental costs

- **Specific recommendations:**
  To be presented by Paolo Mancin
Topic 1:

“Definition and implementation of the programme of measures”
PROGRAMME OF MEASURES IN PRACTICE

Supplementary measures

Basic measures

Source: Ministry of the Environment, Quebec, Canada
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Characterisation of the district

Is GES likely to be achieved in 2015?

- Basic measures will suffice
  - Choose the most cost-effective measures
  - Combine all measures
    - Assess their impact
    - Programme of measures

- Basic measures will not suffice
  - Define supplementary measures
  - Assess their cost-effectiveness
    - Are the costs disproportionate?
      - yes
        - Choose the most cost-beneficial measures
        - Go for a derogation
      - no
        - Choose the most cost-effective measures

BASIC MEASURES

E.g. drinking water directive (98/83): nitrates < 50mg/l; pesticides < 10µg/l

What possible measures to comply with these norms?

Preventive
Co-operative agreements with farmers: change in cultivation methods around abstraction points (grasslands, no chemicals, no manure spreading...)

Curative
New treatment facilities: denitrification, filtration

vs.
compensation
What possible measures for improving the water flow?

**M1. Reduce water demand**
   A- Water Saving Programme (WSP) in the agriculture sector:
      ✖ reduce the demand
      ✖ implement more efficient technologies
      ✖ ...
   B- Water saving programme (WSP) in the urban sector

**M2. Increase the efficiency of the water distribution networks**
   A- In urban areas
   B- In rural areas

**M3. Import water from another basin**

E.g. given existing uses and their likely evolution, it is necessary to increase the water flow of a river (+50l/sec.) to reach GES.

Measures required to fill the gap in water quality between the result of business-as-usual evolution and GES.
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- Catalogue of measures
- Cross directives approach:
  - Links CAP – WFD, Natura 2000 – WFD
  - FD, WFD, MFSD
- Involvement of stakeholders
- Implementation strategy
3 main discussions points

1: “Good examples and lessons learnt in your CA, basin, MS...”

2: “Main difficulties, constraints identified”

3: “Recommendations, solutions, improvements”
Topic 2:
“Effects of the programme of measures”
Models
Monitoring the implementation of the Plan

* Definition of a dashboard of indicators, built in order to provide information on the concrete implementation of the Programme of measures and RBMP.

* Indicators could be published on a yearly basis in addition to setting and reporting against clear 6-year objectives at each RBMP cycle. This would contribute to allowing progress in meeting WFD objectives to be tracked throughout the planning cycle.

The RCA should collect and prepare a whole set of “implementation follow up” information.
## Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of effect of measures</th>
<th>Water Quality</th>
<th>The percentage water bodies which meet water quality standards compatible with Good Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>the percentage of water bodies achieving ecological status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Waterbodies not reaching good chemical status but with a trend reversal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicators related to measures implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators related to measures implementation</th>
<th>Wastewater directive</th>
<th>Number of WWTP planned and designed Number of WWTP constructed and under operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Length of rivers concerned by restoration measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of protected drinking water intakes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicators related to the economic impact of PoM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators related to the economic impact of PoM</th>
<th>Water price</th>
<th>Mean price paid for water and Sanitation paid by households, Industry and Agriculture………………</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Words and Ideas?

- Models
- Follow-up of implementation:
- Monitoring
- One-out all-out?
- How to communicate
3 main discussions points

1: “Good examples and lessons learnt in your CA, basin, MS...”

2: “Main difficulties, constraints identified”

3: “Recommendations, solutions, improvements”
Topic 3: “Cost-effectiveness and cost-recovery analysis”
For more information:

All materials related to the Peer review mechanism can be found on the project website:

www.aquacoope.org/peer.review/

For any further information feel free to contact the Peer review secretariat at the following email address:

peer.review@oieau.fr
Peer-Review Mechanism
for Water Framework Directive Implementation

PROGRAMME OF MEASURES WORKSHOP

Ms. Tatiana Ortega
MENBO+JRBA
Lourdes (France)
October 2016
Establishment of a Peer-Review Mechanism

**Objectives:**
- Revision for the overall construction of POM
- Approaches for assessing effectiveness of measures (methodology)
- Approaches for assessing costs and benefits of the measures
- Financing sources of the measures addressing the main environmental problems (Philip Caruana)

**Specific recommendations:**
Malta Ministries

- **Objectives:**
  - Public engagement and stakeholder support in the implementation of the programme of measures (Ifigenia Kagalou)

- **Specific recommendations:**
Objectives:

- Expected effect of measures and setting of exemptions in the field of agriculture
- Priorisation of measures (Mikael Gyllström)

Specific recommendations: