

STØTTET AF

Promilleafgiftsfonden for landbrug

Mid-term report and review for WP2 and WP 4 – MAY 31, 2020

Case Areas level (CA)

CA Leaders

No.	Name	Leader
1.	Kutno county case area, Poland	Katarzyna Izydorczyk
2.	Zuvintas reserve and agriculture case area, Lithuania	Elvyra Miksyte
2.	Gurjevsk case area, Kaliningrad, Russia	Irina Popova
3.	Jelgava case area, Latvia	Ingars Rozitis
4.	Põltsamaa case area, Estonia	Kaja Peterson
5.	Ljuga River case area, Leningrad, Russia	Michail Ponomarev
6.	Southern Finland drainage case area, Finland	Mikko Ortamalo
7.	Result-based payments scheme case area, Sweden	Emma Svensson
8.	Västervik case area, Sweden	Gun Lindberg
9.	Odense case area, Denmark	Anne Sloth

Name of CA and location

Žuvintas Biosphere Reserve and agriculture case area, Lithuania

Name of CA leader and rapporteur:

Elvyra Mikšytė

Names of contributors:

Justas Gulbinas, Audronė Alijošiutė – Paulauskienė

Status of report

In-progress or finalized and date for finalization.

Report:

1. What is the CA objective? (max 2000)

1. Facilitate stakeholder dialogue in the case area about water management and pollution reduction measures in the case area
2. Carry out water quality monitoring in the case area to identify the level of potential agricultural impact or other pollution sources
3. Develop water quality monitoring recommendations for further monitoring in the case area in order to pin down the pollution levels and sources
4. Facilitate participatory stakeholder engagement to identify policy and measure gaps resulting in low farmer engagement in voluntary measures which hinders water quality improvement in the catchment area
5. Facilitate cross-sectoral stakeholder dialogue to identify policy and compensation measure opportunities empowering rural communities to act in a way which could result in water quality improvements
6. Develop recommendations for the water management and policy in the case area and on the national level
7. Facilitate cross-sector dialogue on implementation of best-practice water management in the case area and on the national level

2. Describe the key elements of your CA and progress of work until end of P3. (max 6000)

Progress until end of P3 (as of May 15):

1. Carried out case area and stakeholder research, identification and analysis
2. Carried out national policy and policy gaps and bottlenecks research and analysis
3. Developed case area and success story reports
4. At least 18 separate meetings regarding case area and water management with case area and national stakeholders such as:
 - Experts, Žuvintas BR Directorate, municipalities, ministries, people with experience and knowledge in the case area, Meteliai Regional Park Directorate, etc.
5. Networking for allies and communities in the case area working with the case area and having potential interest in water management and pollution reduction
6. Connections made with Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture and dialogue established on water protection measures in CAP
7. Developed water quality monitoring strategy and started water quality measurements (**carried out 4 monthly measurements so far**)
8. Communicated with and participated in meetings and workshops with project partners, lead partner and group of activity leaders
9. Organised and hosted a partnership meeting in Lithuania
10. Communicated with and contributed to PCT meetings and planning activities
11. Participation in discussions with DESIRE project team on synergies for policy recommendations.
12. Contributed to Newsletter preparation and design

13. Carried out a focus group meeting with farmers and other stakeholders
14. Carried out a survey of municipalities and farmers on water management priorities
15. Developed national water management policy recommendations

3. Describe the final CA output like (focus groups, implementation plans, investment plans and other). (max 6000)

1. Initiated dialogue on water management between CA and national stakeholders
2. Focus groups and reports
3. Water quality monitoring programme and recommendations for further data collection and pollution source identification in the case area
4. Contribution to development of participatory toolbox
5. Contribution to report and policy briefs on policy gaps and bottlenecks for smarter water management in agricultural landscapes
6. Case area report on policy integration, implementation and financing
7. Recommendations for national policy makers to improve water management in the case area or on the national level

4. What are the five most important experiences from your CA so far that you would like to share within the Baltic Sea Region? (max 3000)

1. Lack of focus on local water management in the country, especially local water management and water pollution reduction measure implementation
2. Most measures relating to water quality are indirect (relating to farming practices) and are supported by the government through RDP agri-environmental measures, however, the uptake of these measures is very low.
3. The populations in the surrounding rural areas are declining and aging, and there is a lack of leaders and people who would have the interest, knowledge, skills and resources to engage in water management activities. All water management measures are being implemented sporadically during pilot projects and do not have a continuity. Other involvement is depended on personal motivation and resources, which is critically low.
4. Lack of effective national and local water quality monitoring data collection and interpretation
5. Ineffective control of pollution sources

5. What makes your CA unique in relation to the other Cas we have in Waterdrive?

The CA is unique due to Žuvintas Biosphere Reserve, which is a very sensitive place for biodiversity and protected species. A lot of species found in the area are in the Birds Directive Annex 1 and the Habitats Directive Annex 1 and 2. A part of the reserve is protected by the RAMSAR convention since 1993 and in 2011 the reserve was enlisted into UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere Programme.

In 19th and 20th century, land reclamation and wetland drainage projects were carried out in order to expand agricultural lands and make most of fertile lands in the Dovine river basin. Therefore, the natural hydrological cycle was interrupted, many wetlands were drained and meliorated to provide space for agricultural lands.

Currently, most of the surrounding areas are productive agricultural lands (productivity is higher than the average of the country). The forest cover is scarce, i.e. approximately 16 % of the area (the average in Lithuania – 33%). As a result, the water quality in the lakes within the Dovine river catchment, is remarkably deteriorating and results in eutrophication of the water bodies within the catchment. Žuvintas lake in particular and the whole wetland system in the reserve is under heavy pressure of leaching of nutrients mostly from agricultural activity in the basin, which is degrading the ecosystems and their values.

6. List some unexpected outcomes from the Waterdrive cooperation so far. (max 3000)

- | |
|---|
| 1. Lack of data, awareness and knowledge on water pollution issues sources in the CA, lack of understanding of the importance and willingness to act |
| 2. Different national approaches to local water management, e.g. catchment officers in most of EE countries are bottom-up based, while in WE countries it is top-down |

7. Estimate how the workload in your CA is distributed over time by estimating work done so-far (until P3) in % of total workload anticipated until P5? (max 1000)

Workload estimation in P1-P3: 40%
Workload estimation until P5: 60%

1. List and motivate any changes required in P4 and P5 compared to descriptions in the original application. (max 3000)

Change desired	Motivation
Main focus on involvement of decision-making stakeholders	Landowners will be involved but not at the level we expected due to lack of incentives from national and local governments, low awareness of the problem and low motivation to engage

2. List partners/persons and their roles/responsibilities in completing the CA outputs.

Persons/Partners	Roles/Responsibilities
Elvyra Mikšytė	Project coordinator, environmental specialist
Audronė Alijošiutė – Paulauskienė	Stakeholder and policy expert
Justas Gulbinas	Environmental specialist

3. Up-date the CA workplan for P4 and P5 by completing the below table/workplan.

Activities, bench-marks, deliverables, outputs	Deadline
1. Continue water quality monitoring in the CA.	01-01-2021
2. Carry out a meeting with local communities and stakeholders on the results of the monitoring from the data collected up to that point in autumn. Discuss problems detected and potential implementation of water management solutions in the CA.	15-10-2020
3. Carry out meetings and discussions (possibly online) about implementation of Waterdrive recommendations with stakeholders in decision making and policy making such as representatives from ministries, municipalities, environmental agency, etc. Involve Waterdrive partners to share their best practice examples and discuss the potential of implementation in Lithuania.	30-09-2020
4. Meet community groups to discuss potential LEADER or other project implementation on water management	30-09-2020
5. Continue meeting separate stakeholders involved or interested in the water management to discuss their experience and water management challenges	01-01-2021
6. Develop a water monitoring programme and recommendations for further water quality monitoring post-Waterdrive to continue data collection and identify water pollution sources in the CA	30-03-2021

4. Perform a SWOT analysis for the CA process as a management support for planning P4 and P5. List at least five considerations for each category.

Category	Considerations
Strengths	1. Identified local and national stakeholders in water management and CA

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Involvement of three local authorities in CA process 3. Support from key stakeholder of CA (Žuvintas Biosphere Reserve Directorate) 4. Dialogue initiated among CA stakeholders (1st focus group meeting) 5. Our experience with stakeholder engagement 6. Our connections with national policy-makers
Weaknesses	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of attention to local water management especially from local authorities 2. Lack of awareness of local communities and stakeholders, the problem or water quality is not obvious and not directly experienced/ felt by stakeholders and local communities 3. No local leadership to initiate and implement water management measures or initiated changes needed in the water management system 4. Lack of data to identify the problem
Threats	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low engagement from farmers 2. Disruption of focus group meeting possibilities due to quarantine restrictions for COVID-19 3. If the project results will not be embedded in case area water management structure and practice, the continuity of the results is threatened
Opportunities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interest from decision makers to see good examples of local stakeholder engagement and water management solutions 2. Best practice experience from Waterdrive partners 3. Possibility to improve local water management in the country, in case of successful result from CA

5. List the most important cooperation initiatives with Waterdrive groups of activities. (max 3000)

Group of activities	Type of cooperation
2.1	Participatory toolbox

2.2	Leadership manual
2.3	New services
3.1	Catalogue of measures
3.2	Digital Multiscale Decision Support System
4.2	Policy recommendations
4.3	Policy recommendations and strategies
5.1	Recommendation on water management
5.2	Comprehensive water management training and education package
5.3	Development of large technical investment projects

6. List the target groups most relevant for your CA results communication. (max 1000)

Target groups
Žuvintas Biosphere Reserve Directorate – Arūnas Pranaitis
Ministry of Agriculture – Agnė Prakapienė, Jolanta Lapinskienė
Ministry of Environment – Agnė Kniežaitė – Gofmanė
Case area municipalities, Agriculture, Spacial Planning or Environment departments: Alytus District municipality, Lazdijai District Municipality, Marijampolė Municipality
Hydrology experts – Julius Taminskas, Arvydas Povilaitis
Reasercher at Kaunas Technology University - Jolanta Dvarionienė

7. List the five most important ingredients in a participatory toolbox to support strong local action. (max 2000)

1. Methods to motivate and engage stakeholders and foster their participation
2. Facilitation methods
3. Conflict resolution methods
4. Living labs methodology

8. List the five most important considerations when it comes to leadership and coordination to support strong local action. (max 2000)

1. A need to identify and communicate local problems to local communities and stakeholders
2. Need for funding for local water management projects
3. Need to support the development of local actor working with water management and stakeholders (such as catchment officers)
4. Difficult to identify and develop CA leaders

9. List the five most important policy recommendations to support strong local action. (max 3000)

1. Lack of funding for local projects, development of leadership skills and water management competences
--

2. See national specifications of Waterdrive recommendations
--

10. Any other comments or issues?

--

Add attachments:

1. Add a PPP with max 10 slides for presentations of the CA during P4 and P5. The PPP should be understandable for the target groups. Use the Waterdrive presentation template.
2. Add any other material supporting mid-term review and reporting as you wish.