

D.T3.5.2 - REPORT FROM NATIONAL POLICY DIALOGUE

POLAND
WULS-SGGW

November 2019





1. General Data

Country:	Poland
Date & Place:	27th of November 2019 Hotel Senator, ul. Bankowa 7, 27-200 Starachowice
Organizers:	Warsaw University of Life Sciences WULS-SGGW
Documents Please send together with the report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scan of list of participants • Agenda • Photos 	

2. Report

Main points of the dialogue / short summary *(max 2000 characters)*
 Please prepare short summary of the dialogue with main messages so that we can use it as an article or promotion for social media, web page, etc.

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 - **Dr Ignacy Kardel**
- Legal procedures for implementing small water retention measures - **Mgr Ewa Badowska-Domagala**
- The concept of mitigating the effects of drought and floods in the Kamienna catchment - **Dr Ignacy Kardel**
- Evaluation of the effectiveness of NSWR measures - **Dr hab. Dorota Mirosław-Świątek**
- Decision Support System in the field of planning and implementation of NSWR measures - **Dr Ignacy Kardel**
- Support in the field of planning and implementation of measures with workshop participants - **project team**

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 attached also list of participants)</i>	
Local public authority	16	
Regional public authority	6	
National public authority	0	



Sectoral agency	1
Interest groups including NGOs	0
Higher education and research	5
International organization	0
General public	0

**according to the Target groups identified in AF*

Short description (if necessary) of the participants:

The 28 participants included 4 WULS-SGGW representatives, 1 solicitor from Górnicki Durowicz Badowska - Domagała law firm 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), State Forests National Forest Holding (Polish: Lasy Państwowe), District Authority Offices (Polish: Starostwa Powiatowe), Agricultural Chamber of the region (Polish: Izba Rolnicza).

3. Outcomes

Please provide short feedback from your stakeholders on below topic (the ones that you have discussed):

Feedback/comments on the Concept plan / results from the testing (max 1000 characters)

During the training, participants had access to computers and they could follow the presentation carried out by project members by checking on their own how the presented tools work. 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. Dr Ignacy Kardel presented the functionality of the above-mentioned tools.

Participants were asked 1) Do you have any general comments or ideas on the presented concept plan for mitigating the effects of drought and flood in the Kamienna basin?

In their responses the participants focused on individual measures proposed to be carried out in the Kamienna catchment. The representative from the Agricultural Chamber of the region commented that inclusion of green cover (ground cover) crops is disadvantageous for farmers as it worsens soil structure. Employees of the Water Management Offices said that they had a programme which included afforestation of the reservoirs banks but due to erosion the planted trees and bushes didn't survive. Additionally fishermen could have contributed to this issue as they prefer easily accessible water banks. A participant from the



State Forests National Forest Holding raised the issue that afforestation is difficult to carry out on protected areas and on fallow land that needs to be first transformed officially into forest areas. Those procedures are time consuming and involve several different public administration offices. Four forest districts in the region participate in the forest small retention project for the years 2014-2020 (but the location of those activities is outside of Kamienna catchment). It is a long process as it requires a cooperation with Water Management Offices which issue approval decisions. Quite often a tender is required and it gets cancelled.

Participants noted that for water supply Staszic Channel (steel mill Nietulisko) better to use the Kamienna River because it has a greater available flow, however, Dr. Ignacy Kardel responded that it would be very expensive.

Feedback/comments on the draft structure of the Guidelines (Steps) (max 1000 characters)

Workshop participants were asked 2) Would you change anything in the table of contents of the small water retention planning guidelines? Is something missing? Is it constructed in a way that supports the planning and implementation of small retention?

The participants didn't have any detailed comments, the layout seemed appropriate to them. The foresters advised to obtain inspiration from the guidelines for the forest small retention project for the years 2014-2020. The importance of educating youth was raised in order to ensure a better understanding and awareness of water related issues among the society. Implementing local small scale actions such as building permeable parking lots, rainwater gardens and rainwater collection could significantly improve water retention. If more inhabitants took care of water retention on their properties less highly-specialised programmes would be required.

What are future steps/plans in terms of preparation of the Action Plan? (max 1000 characters)

The presentation on legal procedures for implementing small water retention measures delivered by Ewa Badowska-Domagala was well received and very informative for the participants who said quite often those procedures are very complicated. Participants also pointed out the need to improve the availability of cost calculations and means of obtaining funding for implementing NSWRM.

A representative of the Regional Directorate for Environmental Protection pointed out that any NSWRM such as an oxbow restoration, located at a Natura 2000 protected site requires an assessment of their impact on protected plant or animal species. Usually Protection Action Plans for Natura 2000 includes activities that are approved for implementation. In order to create a NSWRM at a site that doesn't have a Protection Action Plan a procedure specified in the Act of 3 October 2008 on the Provision of Information on the Environment and its Protection, Public Participation in Environmental Protection and Environmental Impact Assessments (Official Journal of the Laws of 2013, Item 1235, as amended), needs to be carried out. In order to obtain information if a given Natura 2000 site has a Protection Action Plan the Regional Directorate for Environmental Protection needs to be contacted.

Feedback on usability of the tools and how they can be used after the project ends (max 1000 characters)



Participants agreed that the tools are useful but also indicated that at times the tools are too complicated or the technical terminology used for navigating is too specialized.

Feedbacks/proposals for follow-up/future activities

Participants were asked 7) Is it possible for you to use the tools prepared as part of the FramWat project after its completion? How can these tools be used in the future?

A representative of the Regional Directorate for Environmental Protection pointed out that beaver activity could be included as a NSWRM and in the tools. Beaver dams allow for water storage in the area and do not require any costs to establish or maintain. The disadvantage is that those activities can't be controlled or managed but in general beavers are advantageous in terms of improving water storage in the area. Buying out land where beavers are active and cause damage to crops could be considered.

The complicated procedures that involve several different public administration units seemed to be a large issue for the local managers which complained about the difficulty in communication between them. Establishing cooperation between different units could be a bigger focus in the future.

Another important factor is educating the society about small water retention measures they can implement in their own backyard.

Please add input/comments from stakeholders also on other FramWat outputs (based on the questions defined in the Concept Note):

FroGIS (O.T1.1.)

Workshop participants were asked 5) Do you have any comments on the tool for valorisation of water retention needs (FroGIS)? How do you assess its usefulness after the FramWat project is over? Is using it difficult or easy?

Water Management Offices and Forest districts representatives expressed an interest in utilizing the tools. Currently updates of water management plans are prepared by contracted companies but the participants commented that with the use of FramWat tools, training and support this task could be carried out by Municipal Offices.

Effectiveness of NSWRMs (O.T2.1)

Participants were asked 6) Do you see the need to assess the effectiveness of measures using static and dynamic methods and tools proposed in the project?

Workshop participants reported a difficulty with the interpretation of measures and dimensions used in the effectiveness assessment.

Decision support system (Act. 3.4.)

Workshop participants were asked 4) Do you have any comments on the decision support systems (DSS)? How do you assess its usefulness after the FramWat project is over? Is using it in the proposed form difficult or easy?

Education tab is very important and more attention should be given to disseminating its content. Responses also included feedback that the used terminology is too difficult.

Cost analysis (act. 3.3)



Participants were asked 3) Do you know the costs of implementing small water retention measures? If so, please provide an example (investment type, scale of implementation, costs) now or later send us an email.

Representative of the Water Management Office said that the construction of 4 dry flood protection reservoirs costed 18.5 mln PLN. Another mentioned project included the construction of flood protection dikes but the participants concluded that it's an old concept and the planned costs are already outdated.

Other comments