



Evaluation Summary

WORKSHOP ON INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN TRANSBOUNDARY WATER COOPERATION

8-10 June 2005

Hotel Pribaltijskaya, St. Petersburg, Russian Federation

This summary is based on the 43 evaluations received.

PLEASE INDICATE THE DEGREE OF USEFULNESS OF THE EVENT TO YOU IN TERMS OF: (Number of responses is indicated)

<i>Please rate on scale: 1 (not useful), 2 (somewhat useful), 3 (useful), 4 (very useful), 5 (extremely useful):</i>	1	2	3	4	5
1. Relevance of subject to your work/area of expertise:			11	16	16
2. Knowledge and skills obtained for your future work:		1	20	10	12
3. Providing a forum for exchange of information with other participants:		1	11	20	11
4. Providing an opportunity to establish new useful contacts:			9	20	14
5. Identification of good practices and lessons learned:		1	13	17	12

HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE EVENT IN TERMS OF:

<i>Please rate on scale: 1 (poor), 2 (below average), 3 (good), 4 (very good), 5 (excellent):</i>	1	2	3	4	5
6. Clarity of presentations:		1	20	12	10
7. Quality of written material circulated by the organizers:		3	6	20	14
8. Organizational arrangements for and during the event:		2	17	10	14

The objective of the event is to: **FOSTER NETWORKING AND EXCHANGE OF EXPERIENCE AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW JOINT ACTIVITIES**

(Number of responses is indicated)

To what extent do you think this event has met its objective as stated above?

0 (Not met at all) **1** (Insufficiently met) **1** (Partially met) **31** (Mostly met) **11** (Fully met)

What is your overall impression of the event? 0 (Not satisfactory) 27 (Good) 16 (Excellent)

If your answer is “Not satisfactory”, please, comment

- Not enough time for presentations.
- Little time for discussions and working groups.
- More efficient moderation of working groups needed.

Relevant to transboundary water management, what were the 1-3 most important things you learned during the workshop?

General

- General picture of the situation, especially in the countries of Caucasus and Central Asia. Diversity of problems.
- Finnish – Russian cooperation, Russian-Estonian.
- There are good models from Western countries that are adaptable to East.
- Information of Environment structure in Russia.
- Establishment of the contact network for cooperation
- Caspian programme on environmental protection.
- Institutions working in the field. Some new international agencies for funding.
- Importance of good transboundary legal framework in perfect situation in the region.
- Development of the potential of water organizations.
- Transboundary cooperation needs time.
- Institutional and legal aspects of water management in a transboundary context.

Information management

- Ensuring collection and processing of water resources-related data
- Developing and maintaining the mechanism of information exchange with the neighbouring countries
- Important to assess info-needs before gathering information.
- Complexity of info-management in different cultures.
- Transboundary cooperation and information management experience in the Danube basin.
- Information management with use of IT is efficient.
- Information management basic theoretical schemes used in the analysis.
- Interstate database on the Dnepr River.
- Timmerman’s presentation on specializing information in transboundary water management
- Hannan’s on Basin water information centers in Kazakhstan.

Public participation

- The Aarhus Convention as the legal basis for public participation.
- Public participation instruments and methodology
- It is important to identify, educate and involve different interest groups, so environment education program is important.
- Understanding and misunderstanding of the public’s role in management and participation in decision-making.
- Involvement of SMEs, local authorities and others.
- Establishment, possible set-ups and responsibilities of basin councils.
- Stakeholder analysis.
- Importance of joint vision of all participants.
- Difficult roles of NGOs in EECCA.

After you return to your “home office,” what 1-3 things do you expect to do differently as a result of what you learned at this workshop regarding

A. Information Management in Transboundary Waters Management

- Widening the possibilities of the Aarhus centers.
- To organize a discussion in the Committee of the Parliament.
- Improving capacities of information management and exchange.
- Using new methods of information exchange.
- Improving cooperation with other NGOs in transboundary context.
- Development of information systems for transboundary monitoring (in the basins of Western Bug, Dnepr, Dvina/Daugava, Neman).
- Check the state of databases in Estonia (in general we have good strong databases, but they look quite modest).
- Check the state and accessibility of databases in Russia, start preparations of a joint database development.
- To use the analysis guidelines proposed in the workshops.
- Develop more comprehensively our transboundary waters information database, webpage, as local information is available
- Building of water portal for the Caucasus.
- Promoting establishment of “KURA watch”.
- Building public environment information centers (PEIC).
- Use information management for IWRM plan in Kazakhstan.
- Improve water network supported by Kazakhstan Water Partnership (KWP).
- Link website of KWP to mentioned projects.
- Contact workshop participants for more detailed information.
- Redevelop aspects of the information plan for Kazakhstan/Central Asia.
- Tailoring information to users’ needs (tools)/info needs.
- Good quality monitoring.
- Exchange of environmental information between the agencies.
- Improvement of monitoring on Dnepr and strengthening of the potential of information exchange.
- More reasons to realize access of public to information.
- Necessity of River Commission to collect information.
- Necessity of GIS.
- Attention to already existing agreements.
- Exchange of timely hydrological information.
- Exchange of information in network of water organisations in the Aral Sea basin.
- Improvement of the Dnepr project website.
- Improvement of institutional basis for international information exchange.
- Focus on Assessment of Information Needs as a first step.
- Incorporating information management challenges and opportunities highlighted during the workshop into the GEF/UNDP MSP proposal we are drafting (Best Practices Registry).

B. Public Participation in Transboundary Waters Management

- Coordination of projects in the Caucasus region including pulling together all the data.
- Public participation methods.
- By organizing discussions in the Parliamentary committee.

- Establishment of a more coordinated basis for a systematic process of public participation in decision-making.
- Develop tools (establish a web site, analyze stakeholders and their capacities in Belarus).
- Continue institutional activities of NGO network and to fit the NGO activities to the donor priorities (since this seems to be required).
- Involving interested and qualified representatives of the public in solving issues of and in other activities on transboundary waters.
- To go deeper in the analysis of the perception of the need for public participation of different stakeholders.
- To find out more about the theoretical background of PP.
- In future to involve public more from the beginning of different projects, programs.
- To find more balance between wishes and economical possibilities with social effects.
- Propose new tools to improve PP through the IWRM plan.
- Reconsider our approach to public participation in River Basin Councils in Kazakhstan.
- Development of public participation using synergies between conventions (Aarhus, Espoo, Ramsar, Desertification, Transboundary waters)
- Necessity to raise funds for strengthening of NGO networks related to river basins.
- Stronger cooperation with agencies, other than environment ministries.
- To work more on local level.
- Develop a project on stakeholder analysis in Dnestr basin.
- Apply the experience of stakeholder analysis in the World Bank project.
- Development of public participation strategy for implementation of Dnepr strategic action plan.
- Development of legal basis on public participation in decision-making by adapting provisions of the Aarhus Convention to the local conditions.
- Raise awareness on importance and positive impacts of PP.
- Importance of websites.
- Implementing training for civil groups.
- “KURA watch”.
- PEICs.
- Incorporating public participation challenges and opportunities highlighted during the workshop into the BEF/UNDP MSP proposal we are drafting (Best Practices Registry).
- Include changes into capacity building plan for Chu-talas project.

Should the duration of sessions be (number of responses is indicated): 2 expanded, 30 about the same, 2 reduced?

Would you be able to use the knowledge obtained in your work and/or to pass it on to other specialists within your country/constituency? 40 (Yes) 0 (No) 3 (Maybe)

Would you recommend that other specialists from your country/profession attend similar events, if they are organized in the future? 34 (Yes) 4 (No) 5 (Maybe)

Did you attend events on a similar topic organized by other organizations? 26 (Yes) 14 (No)

Please give three suggestions on how the next IW:LEARN regional workshops on Information Management and on Public Participation could be improved:

- Ensure contact between states along transboundary water resources.
- Meetings of interested organizations.
- To organize the workshop in a smaller region, e.g. within one water basin.
- To involve to the maximum extent possible the interested institutions of the participating countries within the basins. Where possible to disseminate information to these countries.
- Organize meetings and discussions on the national and regional level, dissemination of the materials among all the interested organizations.
- To receive expert proposals on discussions in advance.
- More practical examples.
- To develop concrete decisions on improving this process. Concrete decision-making within this process.
- Specialists involvement.
- More on experiences in this field.
- Should more clearly distinguish the first and the second parts: information management requires the public authorities to be active, while public participation is a secondary matter of the public authorities. Joint discussion leads to mutual misunderstanding and therefore conflicts. It might be better to start the discussion separately and then have a joint session (but then of course the whole structure of the workshop would be changed).
- Involve also technical information experts in particular those who develop information systems, to establish cooperation.
- Joint participation of structures that develops the information and structures responsible for distribution of information that is of interest for the public.
- Presentation and discussion during a seminar of the most developed information systems for transboundary waters (parameters and volume of information).
- Better participatory approach to be applied in organization of the discussion.
- To pay more attention to other regions, especially CA. To pay more attention to differences in the CA region. To involve national water partnerships in this process.
- Pre-workshop orientation meeting in the home city on the expected results/outcomes.
- More structured organization of the regional group discussions.
- More concrete examples where the public influenced the outcome of the decision-making process.
- Participation of the representatives of the public. Participation of officials responsible for information management.
- Capacities and need in each particular information stream should be assessed prior to discussing information management.
- Financing of river management bodies.
- If they will be organized on River-basin level having in mind real situations.
- To help in exchange programs participation to develop training of trainers capacities of NGOs.
- Sea-basin approach to gather trainees.
- Invite more regional representatives from the region where the seminar is taking place.
- Better balance of participants from different agencies and organizations.
- For Central Asia – involvement of experts from national hydromets because they manage 95% of national hydrological information.
- Involvement of journalists.
- Practical workshops with participation of the stakeholders themselves, aimed at concrete results. Less theory and more practice.

- Include field trips.
- Include good and bad practices analysis,
- Information exchange in the Aral Sea basin, SIC-ICWC, CAREWIB project, Almaty 2005.
- Organization of a separate workshop (section) for NGOs from EECCA and Western NGOs to exchange experience in public participation in transboundary water management.
- Exchange of experience regarding mass-media techniques and contacts with mass-media to address environmental problems and involve civil society.
- Presentations should be reviewed a priori in order to avoid duplication and to focus each on a new aspect, leads to shorter presentations, leads to more time for (informal) exchange in discussion.
- Stricter management of time. Presenters should be informed timely what the timeframe is and try to be more or less strict in chairing, especially with such a tight programme.
- More time for discussion.
- More literature at info tables.
- Shorten the individual presentations – focus on lessons and special issues, and enforce the shortened time for presentations.

Would you like to receive copies of the final workshop report or future training materials related to this workshop's theme? 43 (Yes) 0 (No)

Give three suggestions on how the next workshops under the project Capacity for Water Cooperation could be improved.

- Strengthen the contact within small groups - by basin
- Presentations should be prepared and distributed in advance
- To organize the workshop in a smaller region.
- Prepare individual country reports.
- Finalize the final version of the workshop materials and discuss it on the national level in advance of the workshop.
- Develop recommendations for donors and governments. Set concrete tasks on solving the problems in this area.
- Demonstrate examples from western countries.
- Use videomaterial.
- Present the history of water sharing on the Mekong River.
- Address issues of harmonization of national legislation with the WFD and other instruments.
- Decrease the number of the transboundary water management issues raised during a seminar, but instead have more detailed presentations and discussions.
- Recommendations from UNECE regarding joint databases, starting from the principles and all the way to concrete technical solutions.
- On lobbying process – bringing the PP ideas and results already reached to the political ground – Advocacy building.
- Practical cooperation of the specialists from the roles of the Basin.
- To pay more attention to Central Asia region.
- To involve national experts from the CA region for the next workshop preparations in advance.
- Longer seminar including solving concrete problems including demonstrating new approaches for your country.
- Country/region teams make some team works to achieve common frame and understanding on purposes of the workshop and their role after the workshop.
- Questionnaire and materials – very good.

- Logistics that does not affect participants' ability to make input at their best (travel, early flights home).
- There needs to be a workshop in which higher level, non-water government officials are exposed to what we are talking about here.
- The questionnaires should be distributed well in advance (2-4 weeks)
- More topics to be discussed in small groups.
- More interactive, less presentations.
- More information of the development of joint action programmes on basin management, the work of joint basin bodies.
- To share best practices of cooperation of Ministries of Environment and Water agencies.
- To promote best practices.
- To advice on fund raising for transboundary cooperation on both government and NGO levels.
- Organize regional workshops that would allow discussing regional and basin aspects and establish constructive cooperation between governmental bodies and NGOs working within the same basin on the same problems (e.g. Caucasus or Central Asia, etc.) with a possibility of using materials developed in broader events.
- Distribute all the presentations and working materials on CD for the participants.
- Forms to be filled in by small groups could be developed on the basis of the questionnaire - common approach to different basins.
- Better facilitation in workshop so that there are real discussions and not just other presentations.
- Invite watchdog NGOs having real success stories.
- Keynote speakers.
- Focus on a sub-region in case study and as a group work through together on an issue like development at a public involvement strategy.

On which specific aspects of monitoring and assessment of transboundary waters should the next CWC workshop in Tbilisi focus?

- Introduction of new methods, revisions of standards.
- Improving cooperation and information exchange, cooperation on IWRM as well as institutional and legal aspects of WRM, support to the countries in implementing relevant conventions.
- Cooperation on information exchange.
- Preparation of a mechanism for a joint assessment of the state of transboundary waters, including groundwaters.
- Coordinating criteria for water assessment of different countries (how to do?). I have an extensive experience in organizing monitoring, including joint intergovernmental monitoring.
- How the monitoring and assessment should be linked to the IWRM plan (taking example from the Kazakhstan IWRM).
- List technical guidelines for monitoring and assessment as well as on-going pilot projects.
- Link to the Water Convention environmental floods work and other modern concepts of the IWRM.
- Stakeholders participation in M & E of transboundary waters.
- Inter-organizational coordination (within countries).
- Monitoring directly aimed at specific information for specific actions.
- Designing monitoring systems to specific purposes.
- Organization of statistical reporting on the qualitative and quantitative indicators (international experience).
- Mechanisms of collecting and processing monitoring data (international experience).

- Synergies of projects, processes, harmonization of legislation with EC.
- Pressures on environment.
- Development of joint monitoring programmes.
- Methods on the evaluation of polluted waters.
- Best practices of interstate monitoring and assessment structures.
- Software.
- Information of public and access to databases.
- Legal basis of environmental monitoring.
- Experience of WFD implementation in the EU member states, problems and successes.
- Exchange of hydrological information between countries.
- Improving system of early warning between countries and between governmental authorities and the population.
- Procedure for taking samples.
- Sector governance (top-down, bottom-up).
- Organizational and institutional aspects.
- QA/QC comparability of data.
- Sharing of information.
- Application of M & A to project implementation.
- Standardization of M & T.

On which specific topic(s) relevant to your area of work would it be useful to carry out future training and capacity-building activities?

- Ensuring collection and processing of information to establish a database and a state water cadastre, as well as ensuring provision of information.
- Basin management methods.
- Harmonization of legislation on the regional level and introduction of WRM on the regional level in a transboundary context.
- Development of IWRM on the basis of ecosystems.
- Establishment of Basin councils, their legal and institutional aspects, stakeholder participation and specialist training.
- Water sharing on transboundary water systems.
- Improve trust and cooperation between NGOs and public authorities.
- Decreasing the negative influence of agriculture and food processing on water quality.
- Economic aspects of transboundary waters management.
- Good examples of implementation activities of RBM plans on transboundary waters.
- An economic context of the IWRM plan (taking WFD).
- Environmental flow's concept. Ecosystem degradation and environmental needs..
- "More crop per drop" concept.
- Water foot print.
- Strategic planning/integrated WRM planning – participation of the public and stakeholders.
- Water councils/governments – legislations, experiences.
- A session on inter-organisational communication coordination etc. (To try and reduce the gap between "Government" and Technical/Administrative water Managers.)
- Emergency situations in transboundary waters and methods of their elimination.
- Assessment of damages.
- Harmonisation of national legal water acts with the EU Water Framework Directive – approaches to initiate this process.Establishment of step-wise harmonization of the legal acts
- Capacity building of NGO river-basin Association.
- Legal aspects of public participation.
- GIS.
- Efforts on twinning of river basins in EECCA and EU.
- Organize a set of seminars-training events for managers and decision-makers.
- Mechanisms to involve young experts into the work of the environmental authorities.
- Institutional provisions for basin management of water resources: organizations and legal basis, experience of work of the coordinating bodies (secretariats) of the existing basin commissions.
- Practical obstacles to transboundary cooperation and how to overcome them.
- Tools and methods of PP.
- Mechanisms of water policy development.
- Participatory planning.
- Hands-on training. Develop specific plans within a working group consisting of the relevant people for a basin guided by some experts e.g. plan for PP.
- Development of information needs – need time for people to get used to working together.
- Try to find common, complementary and conflicting areas of M & A under the various projects/approaches of donors.
- How to coordinate, how to use synergies.

Any other comments/suggestions

- Organize joint programs and workshops on development of IWRM on the basins principles and support development of their legal and institutional aspects.
- There is a contradiction with regard to NGOs: a short-term support only effective at the moment of providing funding when the public is needed (as a stakeholder) and then it disappears. There is a need for institutional support to the NGOs on a long-term basis. Nobody needs the public in its natural form, only artificially created one for the duration of a project, and it is not functional on a long-term basis.
- If focus to smaller number of topic, maybe we can find more fresh and new recommendations to our future work, but world is still very different and PP is mainly linked with developments in democracy.
- To set up a CWC newsletter, an information exchange etc.
- To link the CWC project to IWRM activity.
- To establish a focal point of the CWC project at the CA region, probably on public base.
- It was a useful workshop, theory and practice combined with discussions to work out recommendations for activities. The workshop demonstrated that much should be done to develop working relationships between stakeholders for making decision-making process inclusive for all stakeholder parties
- Interactive workshops (more work in groups) with explicit outcomes is more effective, in my opinion.
- Accessibility of Internet at workshops.
- I would suggest to take the facilitation of the workshops more seriously and to include good people to do this as well as the reporting back