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Introduction

- Who’s who?
- Why a snapshot report?
- Status of the report.
Who’s who?
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Why a snapshot report?

- WFD = cornerstone
- NGO’s support WFD
- Keep a close eye on transposition and implementation
Status of the snapshot report

- Information from NGO’s
- “soft evidence”
- General conclusions and suggestions
Quality of Water Framework Directive transposition

- General objective: good ecological status
- Prevention of further status deterioration
- Competent authorities
- Public participation
Good ecological status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General WFD Objective in Transposition Law</th>
<th>Stated</th>
<th>Ambiguous</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
<th>No info and/or transposition process not finished yet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT, BE (Fl.), DE, FR, HU, ROM, SE, UK, UK (Eng. &amp; Wales and Scotl.)</td>
<td>BE (Wal.), DK, EE, EL, ES</td>
<td>IE, NL, PT, UK (North.IE)</td>
<td>FI, IT, NOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prevention of deterioration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention of Further Deterioration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting by 2003 latest and interim measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT, ROM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Smiley face** indicates plans are in place by 2003 or earlier with interim measures.
- **Sad face** indicates plans are in place after 2003 or no interim measures.
- **Frowny face** indicates no stated plans or completion information.

### Countries:
- **AT, ROM**: Austria and Romania.
- **BE (Fl. &Wal.)**: Belgium (Flanders and Wallonia).
- **DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, HU, NL, PT, SE, UK (Scotl.)**: Germany, Denmark, Estonia, Spain, Finland, France, Hungary, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom (Scotland).
- **EL, IE, UK (Eng. & Wales and North. IE)**: Greece, Ireland, and Scotland.
- **IT, NOR**: Italy and Norway.
**Competent authorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competent Authorities</th>
<th>Country Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One authority per River Basin District, with strong powers</td>
<td>FI, IE, ROM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One authority per River Basin District, with weak powers (or competences not clear yet)</td>
<td>DE, DK, EE, FR, PT, SE, NOR, UK (Eng. &amp; Wales, Scotl., North.IE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordination between existing authorities</td>
<td>AT, BE (FI. &amp; Wal.), EL, NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No info and/or transposition process not finished yet</td>
<td>ES, HU, IT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROVISIONS</th>
<th>(FROM WFD’S ARTICLE 14) IN TRANSPOSITION LAW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🧐</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All WFD public participation provisions in law</td>
<td>Public participation provisions in law, but no procedures for encouragement of active involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE(FI.), IE, NL, UK (Eng &amp; Wales and Scot)</td>
<td>AT, DE, EE, ES, FI, HU, UK (North.IE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Public participation
Quality of Water Framework Directive implementation

- Public Participation in practice
- First analyses and characterisation of River Basin Districts
- Intercalibration
Public Participation in practice

- Attitude is improving
- Real public participation = pro-active
- Many countries still long way to go
Public Participation in practice
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Analyses and characterisation

- Involvement NGO’s problematic
  - Difficult making an assessment
  - Capacity problem

- Economic analysis
  - Importance
  - Problems: environmental costs, cost-effectiveness
Inter calibration

- Making the national assessment systems comparable and consistent
- Low NGO involvement
- Transparency problem (improving)
- Where are the fish?
Conclusions and the way forward

- High expectations
- Quality of transposition and implementation is low
- Insufficient NGO capacity
- Governments reluctant to value NGO participation
High expectations

- NGO’s have high expectations
- Member states should
  - Improve management of expectations
  - Explain socio-economic benefits
Quality of transposition and implementation is low

- Minimalist legal approach
- Member states should
  - Make further progress in PP
  - Create a sense of urgency
  - Increase investments in WFD
Insufficient NGO capacity

- NGO’s could help, but lack capacity
- Member states should
  - Increase information
  - Increase funding
  - Especially in regions with a structurally low level of civil society organisation
Governments reluctant to value NGO participation

- Technical exercises or open management?
- PP is crucial for success of WFD
- Member states should
  - Train staff to deal with non-technical aspects of their work