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| ***Minutes (draft) from*** | 2019 Joint Eionet workshop - NRCs Biodiversity and Freshwater |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***VENUE***  | Copenhagen, EEA, Kongens Nytorv 6, EEA conference room |
| ***DATE*** | 03-04 June 2019 |
| ***PARTICIPANTS:*** | See Annex 1 |
| ***Co-Chairs:*** | Stéphane Isoard / Beate Werner  |
| ***ANNEXES:*** | Annex 1: List of participants Annex 2: Agenda |
| ***Presentations and meeting documents on Eionet forum:*** | **Biodiversity**<https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents> **Freshwater**<https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-eionet-freshwater/library/eionet-workshops/2019-eionet-freshwater-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-biodiversity/2019-eionet-freshwater-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-biodiversity>  |

|  |
| --- |
| *1st day, Monday 3 June 2019* |
| Beate Werner opened the workshop after which Stéphane Isoard welcomed the participants (Annex1). The objectives of the meeting were to give a policy overview on the nature and water policy and related directives. Another objective of the meeting was to provide an update of current and future EEA activities relevant to both NRC networks; it was discussed how NRCs in future could be involved in EEA development in their respective areas. The day 1 agenda contained plenary presentations whilst most of day 2 was dedicated to breakout groups (Annex 2). Action points and commitments were presented and summarized at the conclusion of the meeting. |
| **Update from the EEA and Commission** |
| Stéphane Isoard gave the presentation: [*Water Framework Directive and Floods Directive – latest news*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-1/wfd-and-floods-directive-latest-news-european-commission).Fotios Papoulias and Anne Teller gave a presentation through Webex: [*Birds/Habitats directives and WFD - Synergies and policy developments*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-1/nature-direcitves-and-wfd-european-commission). Important to note links to several documents on synergies between the nature and water framework directives may be found in this presentation. A clarification was given in relation to the foreseen meeting about the ‘Synergies prepared under NADEG and SCG (November 2019)*’*. The invitation for the workshop will be send to the relevant Ministries, EEA and other relevant stakeholders (both in Nature and Water).Beate Werner and Stéphane Isoard gave the presentation: *Setting the scene:* [*Recent EEA activities Freshwater and Biodiversity*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-1/setting-scene-recent-eea-activities-freshwater-and-biodiversity-stephane-isoard).  |
| **Thematic aspects of joint interest** |
| Peter Kristensen gave a presentation on: [*EEA State of Water report and WISE visualization tool*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-1/20190603-eea-state-water-eionet-nrc-bd_fw-2019a).Carlos Romao explained the nature reporting in his presentation: [*2020 State of Nature in the EU - results from reporting under the nature directives 2013-2018*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-1/2020-state-nature-eu-carlos-romao-eea)*.* A question was asked about whether there was time for a revision of the Article 17 data submission, as the data for the reporting will be processed at the end of August. EEA expected at this point in time that for most of the MS no second submissions were needed, however if MS have delivered on time they can resubmit before the end of August. Markus Erhard provided an update on ecosystem and ecosystem accounting: [*MAES and Accounting support to BD 2020 evaluation*](%E2%80%A2%09MAES%20and%20Accounting%20support%20to%20BD%202020%20evaluation%20%28Markus%20Erhard%2C%20Nihat%20Zal%2C%20Jan-Erik%20Petersen%2C%20EEA%29)*.* Annemarie Bastrup-Brik highlighted the interlinkages between water and forests: [*Forest and water - Managing our natural capital*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-1/floodplains-important-ecosystems-and-mitigators-flood-risks-trine-christiansen).Eleni Tryfon and Anne Lyche Solheim presented: [*Revision of the EUNIS inland water habitat classification*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-1/eunis-inland-water-habitat-classification-eea-etc-bd-etc-icm).It was asked when the revision of EUNIS expected – the revision of level 3 is foreseen by the end of 2019. A link (crosswalk) to the previous classification has already been provided but will need to be updated once the classification has been finalized. |
| **Introduction to the workshop topics** |
| The session on Wetlands was introduced by Marco Trombetti (UMA) on behalf of ETC/ULS with the presentation entitled: [*MAES EU Wide Ecosystem Assessment - the MAES Wetlands Pilot*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-1/maes-eu-wide-ecosystems-assessment-etc-uls)*.* The session on Floodplains was introduced by Trine Christiansen:[*Floodplains: important ecosystems and mitigators of flood risks*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-1/floodplains-important-ecosystems-and-mitigators-flood-risks-trine-christiansen). Stéphane Isoard provided the introduction to the session on ecosystem-based management: [*Ecosystem based management: a tool to implement EEA’s roadmap on natural capital*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-1/ecosystem-based-management-stephane-isoard-eea)*.*  |
| **Wrap up and closing session of day 1** |
| Several presentations were given on the progress of EEA work in order to cover topics that were not going to be the subject of the break out session on the 2nd day, but rather for general information. It was noted that all presentations from the two days will be available on the EIONET website.  |
|  |
| *2nd day, Tuesday 4 June 2019* |
| **Best practice and other country level developments** |
| In the morning country representatives presented the situation in their countries:* Jan Plesnik: [*Can the Ecosystem approach be applied in Fishpond Management*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-2/natura-2000-fishpond-management-jan-plesnik-czech-republic)*.* There was some discussion on the origin of the carp, carp is not native species but it had already been introduced in the Middle Ages, and therefore has cultural value. As far as it is known, they do not reproduce natural systems and they do not escape often in the Czech Republic. In the Czech Republic the majority of the ponds are managed by companies which are mainly focussed on production – many of the smaller private owners are interested in a broader approach. Several of the fishponds do fall under the WFD and under the river basin management plans. Plesnik stated that an important step is to increase the uptake of the ecosystem approach to provide best practice examples.
* Atilla Takács: [*Ecosystem services mapping in Hungary*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-2/ecosystem-service-mapping-attila-takacs-hungary). This is a project involving species / habitats of Community interest which were evaluated in relation to their conservation status, linked to field survey, habitat mapping, and conservation planning. Landscape character types and landscape character areas were delineated, using a national methodology developing a database. Several examples were given of mapping MAES ecosystem types in Hungary.
* Eddie von Wachtenfeldt - [*Water framework directives and habitats directive – similarities or not?*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-2/integrating-wfd-objectives-eddie-von-wachenfeldt-sweden)Clarification was asked on how the ecological status and conservation status was prepared: it was mainly based on expert judgement, as monitoring information is often lacking; where reference values were available they were used. The solution for differences in classification between the HD (broad types) versus WFD (more classes) might be solved via the management plans. There are no plans to undertake a similar analysis for the Birds Directive. Also, in terms of reporting, there are still waterbodies that do not fall under the WFD or HD i.e. for which a lower level of monitoring and control might apply.
* Rudy Vannevel - [*Impact analysis of measures and drought on surface water*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-2/impact-analysis-measures-and-droughts-belgium). Two clarifications were provided; one on how drought was measured: in principle if it is impossible to take a sample then it is registered as a drought. Secondly, measures are based on the measures described in the WFD riverbasin management plans – some measures are directed on a specific water body, other measures are more on River Basin level. This underlines the importance of providing georeferences (where measures are taken) to be able to assess their impact in the impact study.
* Julien Massetti - [*The French project on the National Biodiversity Observatory*](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-biodiversity/library/meetings-and-workshops/2019-eionet-biodiversity-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-freshwater/meeting-documents/presentations-day-2/national-biodiversity-observatory-key-indicators-communicating-trends-affecting). The ONB project is aimed at making the critical phenomenon of habitats and species loss in France visible, showing the main factors that explain (pressures) and following the way society is responding to it. A number of live links were provided in the final slide to wetland examples.
* Susanna D’Antoni, Laura Casella, Martina Bussettini - [Biodiversity and Water Directives integration in Italy](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-eionet-freshwater/library/eionet-workshops/2019-eionet-freshwater-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-biodiversity/2019-eionet-freshwater-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-biodiversity/meeting-documents/presentations-day-2/ecosystem-based-management-presentation-made-available-italy) - Due to time constraints this presentation was not given and is made available on Forum.
 |
| **Break out session reporting** |
| ***The cross cutting role of Wetlands in policy and practice******(Facilitator: Lawrence Jones-Walters)***In relation to the question on the definition of wetlands, there was a strong feeling amongst the participants that there should be better harmonisation between WFD and HD. Presently WFD does not pick up marginal habitats and tends to deal with open water; HD is more comprehensive in its coverage but in both cases it was felt that temporary water bodies (in particular in warmer southern European countries) tend to be neglected, although they are a rare and declining habitat that supports a number of specialist and rare species. It was felt that the Ramsar definition provides an excellent basis for identifying wetlands (with a high level of ecological quality). In many countries Natura 2000 designation has been preceded by designation as Ramsar. In addition Ramsar provides a driver for wetland identification outside the EU, which gives it an important unifying/benchmarking role. It was suggested that the two directives could be used in a ‘matrix approach’ that would be more comprehensive in terms of picking up the different forms of wetlands. At a more general level ‘water dependency’ was seen to be an integrating theme in relation to wetland definition. River basin management planning was seen to have a strong potential for unifying the delivery of the objectives of the respective directives (also in combination with, for example, agri-environment measures and environmental payments under the CAP).The role of wetlands as an integrating factor was also given high importance by the participants. River basin management plans as they are in fact a form of spatial planning (and spatial planning itself when and if it can be applied to rural but certainly in peri-urban situations) were again highlighted as a useful mechanism for bringing together different sectors around the planning and future management of floodplains and river basin districts. Because the WFD specifically requires stakeholder engagement as part of the RBMP process, this was seen as a way of driving stakeholder participation but also policy streamlining in terms of the different measures/regulations/legislation that are available for the management, protection, restoration of wetlands. Wetlands were also seen as a concept that can integrate the management of different ecosystem types (and manage across eco-zones). It was generally felt that not enough use is made of RBMPs for wetlands protection in this sense. The participants came up with a number of actual examples of where integration has been achieved in different countries and these have been captured and will be made available in summary form in due course.Key points included: the need to harmonise definitions; the idea that a communication networks could be set up around the subject of specific wetlands on local and regional level; that conservation/restoration of wetlands could be integrated in the delivery of a range of different pieces of legislation; we might expand the scope of what we presently think of as wetlands (e.g. in terms of their further definition as carbon sinks, areas for risk management and disaster mitigation, et cetera); provide greater incentives for working together at local and national level; encourage a bottom-up approach; manage wetlands in a more holistic manner. Specifically the point was made that there needs to be a greater realisation amongst sectoral stakeholders of what the possibilities are for finding synergy between different policies and legislation so that these can be better exploited to the benefit of biodiversity and ecosystem services. Finally the group came up with two key statements: “to go for a cross sectoral approach also and especially in the legislative frameworks will deliver better outcomes”; and “wetlands as a ‘communication vehicle’ for public awareness in relation to e.g. climate change, ecosystem services and natural capital”.***Restoration******(Facilitator: Irene Bouwma)***Overall the participants noted an increase in restoration projects, but at the same time the pressures remain (hydropower, alien species, agriculture, drought prevention etc.) which leads to further degradation. Particularly hydropower was considered as a threat in most countries. Many restoration projects are relatively small – projects on larger rivers are more difficult to implement. In addition, the impression is that work focusses mostly on longitudinal connectivity (easier to realise) rather than on latitudinal (harder to realise because it conflicts with other land uses, involves more stakeholders, increases risk of flooding, etc). Also the major reasons for many of the restoration projects are linked to avoidance of flooding and not so much centred on biodiversity goals. Institutional barriers between different ministries as well as between the different administrations (municipalities/ provinces) along a river stretch are noted by most representatives. But also good co-operation was noted in some countries (Croatia, Spain)The majority of the representatives were not aware of the 15% restoration target for (all) ecosystems, and when asked they indicated that they did not expect their country would meet the target by 2020 (at least for wetlands). In several countries there are notable differences between upstream (less modified) and downstream stretches (considerably modified) of the rivers. A notable exception is Iceland were a low proportion of the rivers have been modified and no plans for restoration are foreseen. Overall, representatives indicate an overview of restoration initiatives is lacking, but also of impacts on water bodies and any assessment of the impact on ecosystems. This makes it difficult to assess how far we are on the 15 % target and when would be reached. The representatives present were also not aware that such an assessment had been undertaken, although some countries (Ireland, Germany) have made an assessment of the current state (baseline). Also, it is foreseen that biodiversity recovery might lag behind due to a late response to the need to put restoration measures for ecosystems and species in place. Ecosystem services as a an approach can provide added value, as well as nature based solutions. The group confirmed that joint meetings are very useful as people take a wider perspective than just their own work on WFD or HBD. In Annex 3 the examples of restoration projects and lessons learned/key messages for the EEA mentioned in the meeting are presented.***Ecosystem based Management (EBM)******(Facilitator: Theo van der Sluis)***The plenary session and break out groups brought many good examples where EBM is actually happening: e.g. in Czech Republic fishponds, in Hungary the national MAES-activity provides examples of the ecosystem services assessment and mapping. Also the Swedish environmental objectives report took an integrated approach in 2017, Flanders has developed assessment and communication tools, and France has implemented an indicator based communication approach. For Wales an extensive example was presented to showcase how a statutory basis for the ecosystem approach has been adopted across all public bodies. Sustainable management is linked to wellbeing, which is incorporated in community priorities. This is translated to 9 principles of sustainable management, which informs local and national policy and leads to sustainable use of natural resources.The Break-out groups brought some key learning points for future policy development:A definition of EBM and clarification is required (users need to understand what EBM is exactly in connection to ecosystem services) – in addition defining an ecosystem unit. The EBM concept can be operationalised further to realize a more common understanding and providing guidance (document). There is also a need for the development and use of harmonised indicators and assessment methods across all ecosystem types. Institutional cooperation and ecosystem understanding is essential, e.g. around wetlands. Streamline all the objectives in one vision but provide site specific solutions.Data sharing and more integrated assessments may help across all ecosystems and on EU level. To further integrate policy and avoid controversy, planners should provide definitions; streamline the assessment methods of the two directives (may be a problem). Define common objectives; define the important implementation and reporting requirements. A prioritization of objectives is essential; however, it was not clear how this prioritisation or policy harmonization could be achieved. One of the main problems is the non-coherent policies as well as scale differences with regard to the objectives (e.g. conflicts between the EBM and the Renewable Energy policy). This proves that the institutional aspects go beyond the usual responsibility of environmental ministries.Furthermore it was discussed that the water policies, though covered by the WFD only indirectly, should include water balance aspects (use it as a tool/approach for environmental planning). Stakeholder involvement is also key to implement EBM. There is a clear need for education and curriculum development within training institutions with regard to e.g. the purposes of the directives.Specific “requests” are made to the EEA for further support or capacity development:* Harmonize the assessment methods and indicators; improve current / develop new indicators (e.g. include indicators for the status of water in SEBI or similar)
* Improve access to data (EEA should properly disseminate the data and materials that already exist and then begin to fill-in the gaps)
* The organisation of Expert meetings on the subject
* Help with the implementation of EBM, provide case studies
 |
| **Group discussion and feedback to plenary** |
|

|  |
| --- |
| In the meeting a short report was given on the morning and afternoons discussion. Some questions were raised and discussed and in the plenary session feedback was provided. On the wetlands breakout session the remark was made that WFD only has a minimum size limitation for reporting. The optimum size of a water body is the size that allows the objectives of the Directive to be most efficiently achieved. It is also good to refer to MedWet definition for wetlands [[1]](#footnote-2). |
|  |

 |
| **Meeting summary and conclusions** |
| [Stéphane presented the summary and action points of the meeting](https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-eionet-freshwater/library/eionet-workshops/2019-eionet-freshwater-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-biodiversity/2019-eionet-freshwater-workshop-copenhagen-jointly-biodiversity/meeting-documents/summary-and-action-points). Short and concise minutes of the meeting will be sent in a draft version for comments within the next 4 weeks, including the outcome of break-out sessions. The following action points were noted:* Follow-up on Commission presentation on synergies:
	+ Informing EIONET about further planning of the Synergies Workshop prepared under NADEG and SCG (November 2019)
	+ Distribute (= to all NRCs and NFPs) the list of 4 guidance documents prepared to stimulate synergies during implementation (see the commission presentation, further information to follow in the context of the synergies workshop after summer).
	+ Prepare input from the joint Biodiversity / Freshwater NRCs workshop (e.g. practical examples) (EEA)
* Consultations:
	+ Please participate in the ongoing consultation on the EUNIS freshwater revision, which makes a large step towards a common classification with the WFD broad types; consultation is open until 23rd June 2019; (All participants)
	+ In the future also the following reports are scheduled which are open for consultation:
* EEA report ‘Floodplains: ecosystems and mitigators of flood risk’ (Publication Q4)
* EEA report ‘Water and agriculture’ (Publication 2020)
* EEA report ‘European bathing water quality in 2019’ (Publication 2020)
* EEA report ‘Integrated assessment of bathing water quality’ (Publication 2020)
* EEA report “state of nature” (consultation and publication 2020)
	+ Briefings on SEBI, MAES – results BISE (all part of the end 2020 communication package
* Please send us summaries and links to any relevant case studies
* Webinars:

Please come back to EEA on any issues needing webinars on more specific points for biodiversity, nature, water or reporting in either of the areas (all participants)* Miscellaneous:
	+ All presentations are already uploaded on Forum (use the links previously sent by emails)
	+ AMR 2018 workshop report: <https://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-eionet-freshwater/library/meeting-note-antimicrobial-resistance-and-urban-waste-water-treatment>
	+ Thanks to Attila Takács for the photos taken during the workshop: following the agreement given by all participants during plenary, they can be used and are to be found under: https://drive.google.com/open?id=13e6E4Rb1Q\_N03DNDTUhJDo8yIWBPn0Ha
	+ Be aware of the upcoming event: 2019 WISE-SoE Freshwater data-call (1 October-31 December 2019)
 |
| **Meeting evaluation** |
| The URL to the survey for evaluating the meeting is as follows: <https://ec.europa.eu/eusurvey/runner/EIONETmeetingCopenhagen2019> To allow EEA further improvements of their EIONET workshops, including the format for future meetings, participants are kindly requested to give their feedback to the quality of the event by fill the meeting evaluation survey. |
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**Agenda**

**2019 Joint Eionet Workshop - NRCs Biodiversity and Freshwater**

**‘Synergies between biodiversity and water quality with special focus on assessments’**

***Monday 3 June, 13.00 - 4 June 17:00, EEA Conference Room, Copenhagen***

*Chair: Beate Werner & Stéphane Isoard*

|  |
| --- |
| **Day 1 - Monday 3 June** |
| **12.30 – 13:00** | **Registration** |
| **13:00-13:30** | Welcome & introductions* Outline of the workshop – Beate Werner & Stéphane Isoard, EEA
* Quick tour de table of individual introductions and expectations of the meeting
 |
| **13:30-14:40 Update from the EEA and the Commission** |
| Presentations 2x15 mins, 1x30 mins: 60 mins. General questions and discussion: 10 minutes | * Commission presentations on relevant water-related policy developments (Nominee, DG Environment C1/C2, remote connection, tbc)
* Commission presentations on relevant policy developments for biodiversity/nature (Fotis Papoulias, DG Environment D2, remote connection)
* Update on key EEA activities (Beate Werner & Stéphane Isoard, EEA)

***Questions – clarification of technical details, general points: 15 minutes*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **14:40-15:50 Thematic aspects of joint interest** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Presentations 4x15 mins: 60 mins. General questionsand discussion: 10 minutes | * State of Water and State of Nature reports and visualisation tools (Peter Kristensen, Carlos Romao, EEA)
* MAES and Accounting support to BD 2020 evaluation (Markus Erhard, Nihat Zal, Jan-Erik Petersen, EEA)
* Forest and water - Managing our natural capital (Annemarie Bastrup-Birk, EEA)
* EUNIS revision freshwater ecosystems (Eleni Tryfon, EEA; Anne Lyche Solheim, ETC/ICM)

***Questions – clarification of technical details, general points: 10 minutes*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **15:50-16:20 *Coffee Break*** |
| **16:20-17.45 Introduction to workshop’s topics** |
| Presentations 3x20 mins: 60 mins. General questionsand discussion: 20 minutes | * The cross cutting role of Wetlands in policy and practice (Markus Erhard, EEA; ETC/ULS)
* Restoration: Floodplains/River connectivity/Relevance of green infrastructure (Trine Christiansen, Gorm Dige, EEA)
* Ecosystem-based management (protected areas management, RBMPs, pressures, measures, joint delivery of nature and freshwater directives) (Stéphane Isoard, EEA)

***Questions – clarification of technical details, general points: 15 minutes*** |
| **17:40 -18.00** | **Wrap up and closing of the first day meeting (dinner arrangements, starting time for day 2, et cetera)** |
| **19:00** |  ***Joint dinner (optional – self paid)*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Day 2 - Tuesday 4 June** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **08:30-09:00** | **Registration**  |
| **09:00-09:40 Energiser: key issues from the themes and introduction to breakout sessions** |

|  |
| --- |
| **09:40-10:50 Best practice and other country level developments**  |
| 4 - 6x10-15 minutes each. Maximum 60 minutes in total. General questionsand discussion: 10 minutes | **Country presentations**To be provided for final version of the agenda – countries are asked to submit proposals for presentations. 1. Czech Republic (Natura 2000 fishpond management, Jan Plesnik)
2. Hungary (Ecosystem service mapping - Attila Takács)
3. Sweden (Integrating WFD objectives - Eddie von Wachenfeldt)
4. Belgium (Impact analysis of measures and drought on freshwater conditions - Rudy Vannevel)
5. France (National Biodiversity Observatory: key indicators for communicating trends affecting biodiversity in France - Julien Massetti)
6. Norway (tbc)

***Questions – clarification of technical details, general points: 10 minutes*** |
| **10:50-11:20** ***Coffee break*** |
| **11:20-12:30 Breakout sessions**  |
| 11:20-11:30 | Introduction to the parallel groups (Lawrence Jones-Walters, ETC/BD-WENR)Moderators: ETC/BDContent support: ETC/ICM, EEARapporteurs : Member countries |
| 11:30-12:30 | First round – 3 parallel breakout groups1. **The cross cutting role of Wetlands in policy and practice**

(Moderator: Lawrence Jones-Walters) Wetlands are an ecosystem type within the MAES, but they often ‘fall between’ legislative instruments and established classifications. Thus they are not always subject to consideration by WFD as they are too small or are ‘wet but heavily vegetated’, and are not included as protected areas within the Natura 2000 series as they fail to meet the quality standards or are too small for targeted management. Many, however, have been designated as N2000 or are within flood plains that are the subject of River Basin Management Plans. In all cases they have the potential to fulfil a role as a boundary object that, in the context of MAES, can assist in integrating legal and financial measures, bringing together policy makers and land managers and can contribute to the overall streamlining of policy. The group will discuss * The potential of wetlands for providing an ‘integrating factor’ in relation to policy and practice.
* In the context of MAES, issues and opportunities in relation to the delivery of ecosystem-based management and policy streamlining.
* Specific examples of good practice, both in terms of actual ecosystem-based management and policy integration (or trade-offs, for example where policy delivery produces poor results for one or another sector).
* Key learning points/messages for the EEA.
1. **Restoration**

(Moderator: Irene Bouwma)The restoration of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, wetlands and floodplains is an important goal, with associated targets, at global, European and national level. It is included in the Aichi targets and in the European Union’s biodiversity strategy to 2020. Both have the aim of restoring at least 15 percent of degraded ecosystems (in the EU strategy by 2020). The group will discuss:* The current situation in relation to restoration target within their country, including the role of water and biodiversity policy (and their potential for synergy together and with other policy instruments).
* Issues in relation to the delivery of restoration targets and initiatives.
* Specific examples and good practice that show the restoration of wetlands and floodplains and their specific aspects; the restoration of river connectivity and effects on biodiversity; and the relevance of green infrastructure in water and “wet nature”.
* Key learning points/messages for the EEA.

**3. Ecosystem-based management** (Moderator: Theo van der Sluis)Ecosystem-based management “is a strategy for the integrated management of land, water and living resources in the context of a holistic approach”. It can also include the practice of ‘Policy Streamlining’, which can involve the joint implementation of measures and policy instruments under e.g. the Nature Directives, the Water Framework Directive, common agricultural policy and other approaches to integrating different policies and aims, such as River Basin Management Plans - RBMPs. Such an approach should result in increased management effectiveness and synergies. The group will discuss:* The current situation in relation to ecosystem-based management at country level, including examples of policy streamlining.
* Issues in relation to the delivery of ecosystem-based management and policy streamlining.
* Specific examples of good practice (e.g. coordination of management, both inside and outside protected areas), both in terms of actual ecosystem-based management and policy integration (or trade-offs, for example where policy delivery produces poor results for one or another sector).
* Key learning points/messages for the EEA.
 |
| 13.00-14:00 Lunch |
| 14:00-15:20 | Second round – 3 parallel breakout groups**1. The cross cutting role of Wetlands in policy and practice****2. Restoration** **3. Ecosystem-based management** |
| **15:20-15:45** ***Coffee break*** |
| 15:45-16:45 | * Presentations from breakout groups + discussion and questions

(Moderation: Lawrence Jones-Walters, ETC/BD-WENR) |
| 16:45-17:00 | * EEA to close with some preliminary conclusions

(Stéphane Isoard & Beate Werner, EEA) |

**Annex 3 Best examples and lessons learned mentioned in the break out sessions**

**Breakout session on Restoration**

**Best examples**

* Spanish and national strategy for green infrastructure, connectivity and restoration (End of 2019)
* Vitoria- Gasteiz – urban area: wetland as part of green belt of the city. Restoration started in 1194 – now Ramsar + N2000 site (Spain)
* Life project TREMEDAL: 5 regional administrations – restoration of many small wetlands
* Room for the river project Netherlands – Rhina and tributaries
* Restoing brackish situation by partly opening Haringvlietdam (Netherlands)
* Many small remeandering and fish passages in streams in the Netherlands
* Floodplain restoration Gudbrandsdalslagen (Norway)
* Lake restoration Vansjo – main problem eutrohpication measures relate to sedimentation ponds, treeplanting (Norway)
* Research on the identification of potential flood forests in Finland
* Project HYDROPLAN – restoration of hydrological regime of Kemeri National Park (Latvia)
* Restoring the natural river Valley of Dviete (Latvia)
* Skadarvsko lake – project financed by GIZ (Montenegro- cross border)
* Restauration of the bed of the river Drac in the French Alps (France)
* Lower Avrino river (Italy)
* Mareta river (Italy)
* Reconnectiong some strethces of the PO river (Italy)
* Restoration of connectivity and migration in Carpathian river Biela Tornawske (<https://biala-tarnowska.org/konytare-migracji>)
* Restoration of floodplain meadows in Warsaw region in Natura 2000 site (PBL140004) [www.lakawarszawska.pl](http://www.lakawarszawska.pl))
* Natural flood management as priority in national policy (UK)
* River trusts – NGO with river restoration projects (UK)
* River restoration centre – coordinate researhc/ advice and project planning (UK)
* Plan Loire – Life restoration of habitat along the Rhine (France)
* Restoration of habitats in Parnu river (Estonia)
* LIFEIP CLEANEST- development of an integrated water management and its modern tools in Estonia
* Poltsamaa river restoration (Estonia)
* Rhone river – remeandering (Switzerland)
* Sigma Plan (Belgium)

**Key lessons**

* More restrictions on spatial planning to avoid inappropriate land use of floodplains (eg. Urbanization, agriculture)
* There is a time lag for biodiversity recovery after measures are taken
* Important to undertake a historical river catchment analysis
* Important for countries to strart gathering data on were measures are taken and the area influenced by these measures
* 15 % target not well known amongst people attending
* Flooding (disaster prevention) and water quality seem to be the reasons for most restoration projects
* Make an assesment of both restoration as well as further degradation
* Provide more clarity on what is considered as degraded and what as restored – maybe link it to WFD definitions
* What about groundwater?
* Check the application of article 4.7. In many cases permits for hydropower were already granted in the past – still dams are built that do not take article 4.7 into account !
* Exchange of examples of good practice is helpfull so we understand better the problems and solutions
* More often undertake joined meetings
* The approach presented in the workshop to work from data to knowlegde but also vice versa was appreciated
* Do review the causes (hydropower/ agriculture etc) and do not only focus on the remedy (restauration)
* The importance of river basin management planning was reconfirmed
* Increase co-operation within countries and between countries on this issue
1. https://medwet.org/aboutwetlands/wetland-terminology/ [↑](#footnote-ref-2)