

# INTEGRATED APPROACH ON CUMULATIVE EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT

---

D.T2.5.1

Reports from national trainings

Poland

WULS

Version 1

06 2019

---





## 1. General information

<b>Country:</b>	Poland
<b>Date &amp; Place:</b>	25/04/2019; Starachowice (Hotel Senator)
<b>Organizers:</b>	Warsaw University of Life Sciences - SGGW
<b>Documents</b> Please send together with the report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scan of list of participants</li> <li>• Agenda</li> <li>• Photos</li> </ul>	
<b>Further engagement of the stakeholders</b> Please do not forget to send report of the training also to all participants to keep them informed and engaged.  Invite them also to subscribe to our newsletter, on our project webpage (at the bottom of the front page: <a href="http://www.interreg-central.eu/Content.Node/FramWat.html">www.interreg-central.eu/Content.Node/FramWat.html</a> ).	

## 2. Report

### Agenda and main points of the trainings *(max 1000 characters)*

Please shortly describe the agenda of the trainings. Which topics did you cover? Who were the presenters? Did you connect with any other similar project/initiative/event?

Warsaw University of Life Sciences organized the workshop/national training on planning and evaluating the effectiveness of small water retention measures - on the example of Kamienna catchment.

Agenda of workshop:

- Introduction to the FramWat project. Map of valorisation of the requirements and possibilities of small water retention. Proposal for a small water retention (MR) action plan. - **Dr Ignacy Kardel**
- The method for preliminary assessment of the effects of MR activities on static conditions. - **Dr Dorota Puśłowska-Tyszewska**
- Characteristics of the developed hydrological model SWAT and hydraulic model HEC-RAS dedicated to the assessment of the effectiveness of the planned activities in the field of MR for dynamic conditions. - **Dr hab. Mikołaj Piniewski**
- Introduction to the workshop. **Dr Ignacy Kardel**
- Workshop - **Dr Ignacy Kardel, Mgr inż. Paweł Osuch**
- Summary and discussion with workshop participants. - **Dr Ignacy Kardel**

### Participants *(max 500 characters)*

Shortly describe who were the participants, from which sector, institutions, levels, ...? How



many of them, etc.?

Target groups	Number <i>(please attach also list of participants)</i>
Local public authority	16
Regional public authority	9
National public authority	0
Sectoral agency	6
Interest groups including NGOs	0
Higher education and research	6
International organization	0
General public	0

*\*according to the Target groups identified in AF*

**Description:**

The 37 participants included 5 WULS-SGGW representatives, 1 Warsaw University of Technology - Politechnika Warszawska representative and the remaining number consisted of representatives from various institutions i.a.: Municipalities and the Communal Offices (Polish: Urzędy Miasta i Gminy), Regional Directorate for Environmental Protection (Polish: Regionalna Dyrekcja Ochrony Środowiska), Water Management Offices (Polish: Nadzory Wodne i Zarządy Zlewni PGW WP), Forest districts (Polish: Nadleśnictwa), Representatives of municipalities (Polish: Przedstawiciele gmin), State Forests National Forest Holding (Polish: Lasy Państwowe), District Authority Offices (Polish: Starostwa Powiatowe), Agricultural Advisory Centres (Polish: Ośrodki Doradztwa Rolniczego), Agricultural Chamber of the region (Polish: Izba Rolnicza).

**Trainings and discussion *(max 1000 characters)***

How did the trainings and discussion take place (presentation of method, general discussion, in small groups, facilitated by whom)? Which topics/questions did you discuss? What were the main conclusions? *(please attach also 2-3 photos)*

During the training, participants were divided into groups of two with access to one computer. All the training materials were available via a web browser and a temporary link <http://levis.sggw.pl/warsztaty>. Through this link, the participants had access to presentations and the following tools: Valorisation of needs and possibilities for water retention - FroGIS, Choose NSWRM, Plan NSWRM location, Estimate efficiency of NSWRM. At the initial workshop, Dr Ignacy Kardel presented the functionality of the above-mentioned tools. Next, the participants received printouts with tasks that consisted of defining the problem, choosing the right type of action and designating a location of the action on the map. Participants got acquainted with the results of the efficiency assessment for the Kamienna basin. During the discussion at the end of the meeting Dr Ignacy Kardel asked the questions included in Chapter 3 as well as the following:

- 1) Do you have any comments on the valorization map of the requirements and possibilities of small water retention?



- 2) Do you have any experience in evaluation, monitoring or modeling of the effectiveness of small water retention measures? - exchange of experience
  
- 3) What do you know about small water retention measures in your area? What type of measures are they and what is their location? Are they monitored and what are the benefits they provide?
  
- 4) Would you be able to reach an agreement (foresters, farmers, water managers, etc.) in the implementation of small water retention measures (SWRM) in the catchment area? Do you prefer to choose a single action with maximum impact?
  
- 5) Have you developed a SWRM that could be shared with other countries in Central Europe?
  
- 6) What are the incentives of implementing small water retention measures, from the point of view of your organization?

### 3. Outcomes

Did you include any of the below proposed questions/topics into the discussion? If yes, please provide short feedback from your stakeholders:

Topic to be discussed with stakeholders	Stakeholder Feedbacks
<b>T2 - Effectiveness of the NSWRMs</b>	
Does the Static method on effectiveness assessment reflect the expectations of stakeholders, what are their expectations?	According to the Regional Water Authority, this method initially seems to be too complicated. However, due to the small amount of input data, it is relatively easy to use.
Which other indicators of water retention (using N(S)WRM) should be incorporated into the Static method on effectiveness assessment?	No answer
Are there experiences among the stakeholders with assessing, monitoring or modelling the effectiveness/relevance of the same type of measure within different climate regions, ecoregions, etc.?	No answer
How to assess the effectiveness of NSWRM - a request to provide a good case study or an already existing method	This can be done by comparing agricultural yields on neighboring plots and by monitoring surface water levels and



	groundwater levels.
What can be done to improve the accuracy of the Static Method to assess the cumulative effect of N(S)WRM in the river basins? Is it anyhow possible to assess the cumulative effect of N(S)WRMs?	No answer
What is the appropriate scale to assess effectiveness of measures or to propose measures to the decision makers or stakeholders? Is it water body catchment, river basin, other division of land? Can decision maker/stakeholder (land owner/user) think at a catchment scales?	Appropriate scale for measures located in the river is sub-catchment and for others is a parcel.
Are different kinds of stakeholders (foresters, farmers, water managers, etc.) willing to implement measures on the river basin with cumulative effects or rather choose one measure with maximum effect for their concern? How the priorities can be chosen?	<p>As experience has shown the most popular choice for achieving the maximum/best effect, is a reservoir construction. The sustainability of investments as well as costs should be taken into account when setting the priority. An important element is also the possibility of obtaining additional funds for specific types of measures.</p> <p>Additionally during the meeting a problem with communication/integration between different kinds of stakeholders (foresters, farmers, water managers, etc.) in connection with N(S)WRMs, was mentioned. Most often, communication between different groups occurs in emergency cases on a formal path. An aspect of financial benefits (co-financing) becomes important - especially in the case of farmers.</p>
Is it possible to cover all problems of a particular pilot area within Expert variant and Local preferences variant of the Concept plan? Are they covering all problems/issues identified within Strategic documents of different policies?	Expert variant corresponds with Strategic documents but it is not possible to cover all problems because we can't predict for a long time how the pilot area will develop and how the weather, water quality and needs of water retention will change.
Is it possible to use dynamic models for assessing the effectiveness and/or cumulative effectiveness of N(S)WRMs? Which ones? For each type of N(S)WRM, if not, for which of N(S)WRMs?	There was no clear answer because none of the stakeholders carried out modelling.
Is it possible to use dynamic models to verify the results of the static method to assess effectiveness?	There was no clear answer



All Work Packages	
Are there any good practices in implementing NSWRM that could be shared among partners/countries in the region?	The Polish government is considering increasing the use of groundwater resources for agricultural irrigation during drought.

**Stakeholders' feedback** *(max 2000 characters)*  
 What were stakeholder's comments/observations on the developed methods and planned FramWat outputs?  
 Were they interested to be further informed, involved into the project activities as defining the indicators, their values determination/estimation, dynamic modelling, measures proposals?

The interest in FramWat outputs was quite high (especially regarding the possibility of marking potential problem areas on the map and about the Catalog of measures), which seems to be a positive result of the meeting. Stakeholders were interested in the possibilities of the Landscape Valorisation Method (VM) and GIS Tool for identifying locations where N(S)WRM are needed. They were interested to be further informed and involved into the project activities. The tools seemed transparent and justified to stakeholders. However, during the meeting there were also many comments about the catalog of measures, problems, possibilities of implementing as well as restrictions. Stakeholders pointed out that it is also important to maintain existing measures. The educational aspect was also mentioned. Stakeholders also pointed to the financial aspect as the main factor encouraging the implementation of measures (especially in the agricultural sector). In addition, it is important to spread awareness about N(S)WRMs and flood plains in the area of planned construction - at the stage of issuing building permits. The group of foresters spoke about a carried out monitoring related to reservoir retention - environmental inventory before and after the implementation of technical activities.

**Outcomes** *(500 characters)*  
 What would you consider to be the main outcomes of the National Trainings? Summarize in few points.

- The main positive outcome of the National Training is the integration of stakeholders, opportunity to test the tools, the discussion and exchange of experiences regarding N(S)WRMs.
- Stakeholders indicated which N(S)WRMs are most commonly implemented; what are the problems, limitations and their opinion on them.
- Stakeholders also indicated as an important element - a balanced approach (flood protection and NSWRMs).
- We managed to practically train stakeholders in the selection of activities and applying them on the map and discuss the results FroGIS, proposition lokalizacji NSWRM in expert variant and static tools.

**Next steps**  
 Were there any further steps agreed with stakeholders on the National Trainings?

We mentioned to the stakeholders that the project is developing the Decision Support



System and it will contain a number of educational elements and it will be possible to test it in the Kamienna River basin

#### **Organizer's feedback on the process**

Let us know if you like the way work with the stakeholders is organized within the project (plan, communication, etc.). What is missing? What kind of support would you like from us next time? Share your recommendations, comments, etc.

We believe that meetings with stakeholders are very important because they will be users of the tools developed in the project. We do not see that there is too much to add to the scope of these meetings due to the fact that we are limited in time. It is worth organizing them near interesting NSWRM implementations that also include a trip.