

D.T1.3.2 START-UP STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

Workshop summary (Bavaria)

Version 1
06 2017





1. Summary & analysis of current gaps (input from the stakeholders about their specific challenges in daily operations)



In our workshop we organized the discussion with the invited stakeholders dividing them into three groups. Each group discussed issues of water resources protection in daily operations of the stakeholders as well as possible solutions related to the topics of integrated land use management. A summary of the group discussions is given below, followed by a

summary of proposed solutions.

When dealing with integrated land use management strategies, we basically need to deal with contrasting objectives and subjective ideas of the specific weighting of each objective. Principally, compromises are found on the basis of compensation measures which are mostly of financial nature. In this context, the stakeholders discuss the problem of available (public) funds for the implementation of (water)resources-friendly land management practices. The most relevant Bavarian compensation programme for resource-friendly land management actions is the KULAP (Kulturlandschafts-programm) programme. KULAP has generally been designed for the implementation of different land use practices and not as a water protection zone related funding. In contrast, if a protection zone ordinance regulates different management actions, a further funding by KULAP is not possible for these specific actions. This can be related to the fact that KULAP is a programme of the StMELF (Bavarian State Ministry for Food, Agriculture and Forestry), while funds and questions related to water resources protection measures are matters for the StMUV (Bavarian State Ministry of the Environment and Consumer Protection). Moreover, the stakeholders state that available funds for KULAP are already overstrained which further constitutes a difficulty in getting financial compensations for (water)resources-friendly management strategies.

According to the stakeholders, another gap in their daily operations is represented by the short-term nature of general (legislative) thinking and policy implementations. While decisions are made for short-term actions, we might not be able to see the effects of those actions during the same time span, since (depending on the respective natural system) those effects mostly become visible on a long-term scale. So once we could see the effects of one specific action, there might be newer (policy)directives and new actions to implement (e.g. the Act and the Ordinance on Fertilizers and Fertilizing passed in 2017). Moreover, the stakeholder identified problems in the implementation of the directives they have to comply since they seem to be contradictory and/or repetitive in some aspects. In this context, the stakeholders point out the



importance of the efficiency and the missing preparation of each single person in the process of complying with the legislative requirements. Thus, we are not able to relate certain effects to one specific action and the stakeholders suffer from long-term planning uncertainties.



A further issue raised by the stakeholders was the little involvement of local communities in the development of the protection plans: plans are presented to the community as a finished work and little discussion is allowed to find more appropriate site specific solutions. The little involvement generally leads to less acceptance of planned measures that could be decreased if site specific actions would be planned in cooperation with the affected land users. In this context, the stakeholders noticed that when their interests are affected by the implementation of a measure, then local stakeholders show a higher acceptance than those who just operate their business in the respective region (and live somewhere else). The stakeholders identify the reason for this behavior in the fact that local stakeholders feel more the problematic issues about planned measures and recognize the advantage of a solution, while stakeholders which are not so much connected to the territory do not feel the related danger/problem.

Further gaps in daily operations result from uncertain climatic conditions and the impacts of climate extremes. For the future, the stakeholders expect droughts to happen yearly and therefore they consider droughts to be more problematic for agriculture than floods.



Finally, the stakeholders identified the distrust between the parties involved in water resources protection as a general problem. As an example, a representative of the farmer's association mentioned the fact of a measuring well exceeding specific parameter thresholds in a catchment. The water authorities did not want to inform the land user

which of the measuring wells has been exceeding the thresholds (even though they are obliged to by law), since they feared that farmers might only change their land management actions near the respective well.



2. Summary of solutions proposed by participants

Following both the new Act and the new Ordinance on Fertilizers and Fertilizing, some stakeholders proposed to generally rethink the usage of manure. The mentioned ordinance now includes that farmers (with specific livestock) have to provide greater storage capacities for manure and need to store it for a longer time. Thus, the stakeholders think about a more diverse usage of manure as a raw material.

About the legislation and the general procedure of establishing land management plans for e.g. water protection zones, the stakeholders point out the importance of defining more site specific solutions. The stakeholders described this idea as difficult to implement, since the legislation does not allow enough flexibility. Thus, more flexibility in the planning of action plans as well as a high involvement of the respective land users and land owners may not only reduce the gaps in the stakeholders' daily operations, but also increase the acceptance and lower the overall costs.

As a possible solution to increase the resilience against the expected increase of drought events, the stakeholders propose the implementation of a cooperation in irrigation management and smart irrigation systems.

Generally, all participants agreed on the fact that ,communication' and ,cooperation' between the stakeholders related to (water)resources protection are of major importance to decrease the existing gaps. Moreover, more long-term consistency, flexibility and transparency in legislation can further enhance the acceptance of different measures and lower the costs of the implementation of resources-friendly management actions.