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Context and objectives

• Pursuing the goal to play a more active role for EUROPE-INBO, CEENBO, MENBO in the 2013-2015 CIS, through Better coordination between CIS works and Networks activities

• Organise works and exchanges on current subject of interests with the high diversity of Europe-INBO members, in this case on NWRM and river restoration

• Preparatory works with NIHWM, ECRR, ONEMA and Network representatives

• Balance between presentations and works in groups
Online Questionnaire

• Acknowledgment of the multiple benefits and strengths of NWRM and RR projects:
  Cross cutting approach, coherent with several Directives
  Local/Regional adaptability

• Interrogations on:
  How to choose the NWRM or RR project adapted to a specific issue?
  What are the means, potential sources of funding and the political will?
  How to evaluate the quantified effects and cost-effectiveness?

• Identification of the main obstacles or/and levers for their implementation:
  Still a relative lack of technical guidelines and capabilities, awareness, funding, regulations, integration, related governance
  Difficulties to mobilize all the stakeholders and actors
Introduction session

- Definitions and Outcomes of ERR Conference 2014 - Mr. Bart FOKKENS, ECRR
- Outcomes and recommendations of RESTORE project - Mr. Martin JANES, River Restoration Centre UK
- European Context and outcomes of NWRM EU Project - Mrs. Lucia BERNAL, European Commission (online)

- Hydromorphological pressures, a real issue for WFD
- Knowledge existing but gaps remaining
- Strong needs to exchange and build community of practices
- NWRM and restoration subjects have been taken onboard in the EU water policy; Blueprint, CIS products, NWRM Project
- Integration of policies needed
Already some recommendations

- Multiple benefits seeking
- Ensuring Sustainability of knowledge
- Condense knowledge in an accessible information base
- Successes is determined by people... Societal choices
- Innovation in linkages between Integrated River Basin Management and river restoration

Consensus on:

- Cross-cutting issue and multiple benefits of Restoration and NWRM
- Needs to be included in the RBMPS and FRMPs
- But needs remain for actual delivering of measures
Theme 1: How to integrate European directives and policies through river restoration measures and NWMRs

Presentations:
• Restoration of Russenski Lom River near Ivanovo Rock Monasteries
  Cristian TETELEA, WWF
• Experience feedback Project Orbigo, Rosa HUERTAS, Conf. Hidrográfica del Duero

2 working groups
Main outcomes and recommendations

- River restoration and Natural Water Retention Measures are highly cross-cutting. Therefore they are a good mean to integrate policy objectives (WFD, Habitat and Bird directives, flood directive, etc.) and institutions (administration in charge of water, urban development, rural development, agriculture, etc.)

- Need for “committees”/”councils” with representatives from the different sectors and levels to ensure coordination, including transboundary committees when relevant (with political, technical and financial support).

- Need to efficiently describe, understand and take into account local stakeholders interests to create ownership

- Articulating the different scales: national level for decision process, local/regional for implementation, local level for local stakeholders involvement. Keeping in mind basin approach and in particular: downstream/upstream solidarity

- Communication: promoting successful project in order to demonstrate concrete benefits (demonstrative value: “seeing is believing”); promotion of soft measures (e.g. buffer zones, wetland restoration) as opposed to hardworks (dikes, dams). Raising awareness through a wide range of media (movies, internet, etc.)
Theme 2: Better engagement with local communities in ecosystem restoration projects

Presentations:
- Outcomes and main recommendations from CERCEAU project, Christophe BOUNI, ASCA
- Ciobarcui Wetland Project, Dan BADARAU, Apele Romane
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Main outcomes and recommendations

- Depending on the context, implement a **real adaptive participation** in order to reach acceptability.

- Time is important and needed (convincing, planning, demonstrate long term benefits).

- Establishment of a local coordinating body (required by regulation).

- Clear roles and responsibilities between implementers and the local community – A ‘river contract’ e.g. France [SAGE] (examples also Morocco, Italy).

- Use established and respected **locally based NGO** to manage project.

- Use local knowledge to inform the planning and stress on ‘affectivity’ of the water basin (historical heritage, school programmes).

- Use multiple terminologies (economic, social, cultural, ecological…) and avoid too much technical language.

- Local community ‘ambassadors’ from successful projects used to explain their initial concerns and the benefits they have seen.

- Local environmental fund (work with local businesses/industry to financially support local projects).
Follow-up

* Presentations and full groups findings to be put on INBO website
* Written product 4-6 pages
* Usefulness of those recommendations for effective implementation in our basins...
* Presenters to reflect on the findings?
Thank you for your participation!
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