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Assessment of Nutrient Emissions and Loads Discharged into the Black Sea

1. Introduction

The Danube River Protection Convention, created in the framework of the ECE-Convention for the protection of trans-boundary waters (Helsinki Convention 1992), became with its entry into force on 22 October 1998 the overall legal instrument for co-operation and trans-boundary water management in the Danube River Basin. The overall objective of the DRPC is to achieve and maintain the sustainable development and use of water resources in the Danube River Basin. The Contracting Parties are recommended to aim at an intensified regional co-operation, a due balance between ecology and economy, an integrated implementation as well as goal-oriented policies and strategies, executive structures and tools. In order to achieve substantial progress in the protection and sustainable use of the water resources, the following overall strategic goals and targets are defined:

- to maintain and improve the status of water resources as to quality and quantity;
- to prevent, reduce and control water pollution, including accidental pollution, in particular where hazardous substances and nutrients are involved;
- to improve the aquatic ecosystems and biodiversity;
- to contribute to the protection of the Black Sea from land-based pollution.

National and regional policies are based on common principles related to the protection and use of natural resources, in particular on the Precautionary and the Polluter Pays Principles, the best available technology (BAT) and the best environmental practice (BEP). The same applies to the Convention. Most of the Contracting Parties have developed a water management policy as part of their national policy. Sector policies for reducing point sources of pollution are mostly in place whereas specific policies for reducing diffuse sources of pollution are partly under development; policies regarding wetland rehabilitation are emerging.

The protection of the Black Sea and its ecosystems from land-based pollution constitutes a multifaceted regional framework objective. Its realisation depends to a considerable degree on the implementation of relevant objectives and policies in the Danube River Basin, in particular regarding eutrophication caused by nutrient discharges. Hence, the Commissions responsible for the protection of the Danube River (ICPDR) and the protection of the Black Sea (ICPBS) jointly declare their policies and willingness to co-operate for achieving common strategic goals as specified in a “Memorandum of Understanding” which shall be adopted in the year 2000. These goals particularly address assessment and urgent control measures regarding nutrients and hazardous substances. A defined ecological status is intended to be maintained and in the long term recovered through ensuring appropriate practices and measures.

In the frame of the Danube Environmental Programme, the UNDP through the Global Environment Facility and the EU through its Phare and Tacis programs, have since 1992 provided international assistance to develop appropriate mechanisms and planning tools for the implementation of the Danube River Protection Convention. In the particular context of the Pollution Reduction Programme, the causes and the effects of water pollution have been analysed and policy guidelines, strategies, and projects for pollution reduction and water management have been developed. The project considers root causes for “Inadequate Management of Water Resources”, referring primarily to the middle and lower Danube countries, taking into account problems related to socio-political transition, reforms and general economic recession; war and displacement of population; absence of national strategies for water management and inefficient environmental management, enforcement and compliance.

Concerning direct causes, important sources of pollution or priority “hot spots” have been identified for the municipal, industrial and agricultural sectors. 51 “Significant Impact Areas” have been identified in the Danube River Basin, which are in particular affected by industrial pollution, COD and toxic materials as well as by excessive nutrient loads. Special consideration was also given to the nutrient transports to the Black Sea, indicating a total of 552 kilotons of Nitrate and 48,9 kilotons of Phosphorus annually reaching the Black Sea.
In the frame of the “Five Year Nutrient Reduction Programme”, elaborated under the PDF-B activities, over 240 projects have been developed, responding generally to “hot spots” or point sources of emission, representing national priorities and taking equally into account the obligation to mitigate trans-boundary effects. Particular attention was given to the identification of sites for wetland restoration, which play an important role not only as natural habitats, but also as nutrient sinks.

The total investment required to respond to the priority projects is estimated to be about 4.4 billion US$, covering the following sectors:

- Municipal waste water collection and treatment plants
- Industrial waste water treatment
- Agricultural projects and land use
- Rehabilitation of wetlands

The expected results of the implementation of the Five Year Nutrient Reduction Plan show a considerable decrease of pollution in terms of COD/BOD, respectively in terms of N and P. The implementation of the proposed priority projects in the municipal, industrial and agricultural sectors will lead to an annual reduction of about 118,576 tons of N and 16,156 tons of P. The latter has a direct influence on the Black Sea and will contribute to achieving common Danube and Black Sea goals to restore marine ecosystems in the north-western shelf.

2. The Danube Water Quality Model

The Danube Water Quality Model (DWQM) was developed in the frame of the Danube Pollution Reduction Programme to simulate the actual in-stream nutrient load. Simulations have been conducted to support the Trans-boundary Analysis as well as to support the definition of priority measures of the Pollution Reduction Programme demonstrating nutrient reduction through the implementation of the projects and policy measures. Details about the work can be found in the related report (GEF, 1999).

2.1 System description

The Danube Water Quality Model (DWQM) describes the fate of the nutrients nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) in the Danube catchment. These nutrients are discharged in the aquatic environment due to human activities and natural processes. The model contains a schematisation of the Danube River and its main tributaries, derived from (Vituki, 1996) and the National Reviews (GEF, 1998), called “the network” as presented in Fig. 1.
With the DWQM’s objectives in mind, the catchment has been subdivided over the 13 principal Danube countries. Studies conducted to assess nutrient loads in different river basins have show the narrow context between water discharges/weather conditions and nutrient loads. For that reason it was important to assess and to show the mean shares of the Danube countries to the mean water flow of Danube as the largest contributor of freshwater to the Black Sea.

Fig. 2: Longitudinal profile of the annual water volume in the Danube in 1000 m³/a, by countries of origin.

2.2 Conceptual model

The conceptual model of the DWQM is shown in Fig. 3. The emissions are split into two parts: the emissions directly to the river network and the retained emissions, which refer to any process effectively removing nutrients from the catchment. Seasonal cycles of uptake and release are not considered retention. Relevant retention processes of nitrogen therefore include: (a) denitrification in the ground water and the surface water, (b) long-term accumulation of nitrogen in the ground water.

Retention processes of phosphorus include net storage in the sediments of lakes, flood plains and wetlands. The part of the remaining emissions not retained in the catchment reaches the network as effective emissions to the river. The final result is the in-stream transport of nutrients which is equal to the trans-boundary nutrient loads at the borders between the Danube countries.

Fig. 3: Systems diagram

2.3 Implementation

The total emissions have been computed for all the Danube countries based on the “materials accounting method” (University of Vienna ea., 1997). The emissions estimates were originally made for the years

---

Footnote:

1 The subject of retention of nutrients in the aquatic cycles of river catchments has been described in detail by many authors, e.g. Tonderski (1997), de Wit (1999).
1988/1989 and 1992, but were later updated (University of Vienna, 1999) to 1994-1997 based on data collected in the National Reviews (GEF, 1998), see Fig. 4 and Fig. 5. Large individual point sources of N and P discharging directly to the river network were identified based on the EMIS inventory (Mehlhorn, 1998) and the National Reviews (GEF, 1998). The remaining emissions (Fig. 3) were computed by subtracting these emissions directly to the river from the total emissions discussed above.

Fig. 4: Subdivision of N emissions.

The retention in the catchment is represented by an empirically derived “immission/emission-ratio”. High (95% probability) and low (5% probability) estimates for these factors for N and P, as a function of the area specific run-off, were derived from Behrendt et al. (1999). The values for N range from 5-36% (low runoff) to 59-88% (high runoff), while the values for P range from 5-36% (low) to 72-100% (high).

Based on an analysis of the available data, two processes were identified as having the potential to cause a non-negligible retention in the river: denitrification (N) and net sedimentation in the backwater area of the Iron Gates dams on the Yugoslavian-Romanian border (P).

3. Results

3.1 The Trans-boundary Analysis

The Danube Water Quality model has been used to support the Trans-Boundary Analysis (TBA). To this end, a computation was carried out for a situation somewhere between the high and low estimates.

Fig. 5: Subdivision of P emissions.

The precise definition of the computation was made by matching in-stream loads with the best available load data derived from observed nutrient concentrations and water discharges. The overall computation was split into 13 different segments: each one of them with the emissions from one individual country. The results of the 13 computations were
superimposed to obtain the overall result. Because all equations in the DWQM were strictly linear, this was a mathematically valid procedure.

The results are presented in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7. Both figures present the nutrient loads (vertical axis) as a function of the distance along the river (horizontal axis).

Fig. 6 shows the gradual increase of the in-stream nitrogen load from the source of the Danube up to the middle Danube area, where it increases very rapidly due to the inflows of the Drava, Tisza and Sava tributaries. The gradual increase continues up to the outflow.

The country contributions show a gradual or jump-wise build-up, similar to the build-up of their catchment and flow contributions (see Fig 2). Downstream, the country nitrogen load contributions decrease gradually. This is the result of in-stream denitrification.

Fig. 7 shows a similar picture for phosphorus. In this case, however, the in-stream removal is not distributed over the whole river as with nitrogen.

Phosphorus is only removed from the river in the Iron Gates lakes area, downstream of the inflows of the Drava, Tisza and Sava tributaries. Therefore, the in-stream load sharply decreases just downstream of the strong increase at the locations of these tributaries.

### 3.2 The Five Year Nutrient Reduction Action Plan

Taking into account the implementation of all projects of the Five Year Nutrient Reduction Action Plan (5YNRAP) and other pollution reduction measures in the Danube River Basin countries, the expected pollution reduction in terms of N is presented per country and sector in Fig 8 and summarised for N and P per sector in Fig. 9.

Fig. 8: Expected pollution reduction of N from proposed and ongoing national projects and policy measures per country and per sector.
The presentation shows the particular importance of N and P reduction through municipal waste water treatment facilities and through the restoration or rehabilitation of wetlands functioning as nutrient sinks.

Concerning the comparatively high reduction from the agricultural sector, it should be noted, that agricultural projects refer mainly to point sources of pollution (animal farms). The largest share of the nutrient pollution in the agricultural sector, which is caused by diffuse emissions from fertiliser application, will be reduced through a change of agricultural practices and new policy instruments, which will be developed during the new GEF Regional Project.

The positive impacts on the Black Sea concerning the reduction of nitrogen and phosphorus load are indicated in Fig 10 and Fig. 11.

Altogether the reduction of nutrient load discharged into the Black Sea is expected to reach the amount of 119,000 t/y (22%) for nitrogen and 16,000 t/y (33%) for phosphorus after the implementation of the proposed projects for municipal, industrial, agricultural waste water treatment plants, wetland restoration and reduction from agricultural non-point sources of pollution through the application of EU Nitrate Directive and consequent change of agricultural practices.
Implementation of the program will reduce the nutrient loads to the Black Sea below the 1997 level and will thus be in compliance with the strategic goals of the Memorandum of Understanding between the ICPDR and ICPBS.

The highest concentration of hot spots is in the middle but also in the lower part of the Danube River Basin. As the DWQM results show that P reduction in respect to the Black Sea might be more effective closer to the Black Sea, whereas N reduction does not appear to be so distance related, emphasis should be given to projects in the middle and lower Danube to reduce loads to the Black Sea. These considerations should be balanced with the responsibility of all countries that contribute nutrients to the Danube to take action (Polluter Pays Principle).

The analysis of the effects of emission reductions per sector (see Fig. 10 and 11) shows clearly the importance of actions to be undertaken in the central and downstream countries of the Danube River Basin. Projects developed for the urban sector (population) are leading to a considerable decrease of nutrient emissions in particular phosphorus, which reflects the result of important investments in this sector. The industrial sector seems insignificant in terms of nutrient emissions, but could have a devastating effect if in downstream countries old industries with outdated technologies would be put back into operation. The agricultural sector accounts for the highest contribution of the nutrient load and proposed measures will in fact show more important results after 2005, when all policy measures for nutrient reduction have been implemented.

In the downstream countries, the reduction of nutrients is merely due to the rehabilitation of wetlands then to the reduction of use of fertilisers and pesticides. The most attention should therefore be paid to policy reforms and changes of agricultural practices, which is the main focus of the present GEF Regional Project.
### Annex: Estimation of Nutrient Load and Expected Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Emissions (DWQM)</th>
<th>Five Year Nutrient Reduction Plan</th>
<th>Total Expected Load Reduction</th>
<th>Remaining Pollution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Agriculture*</td>
<td>Wetlands**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,620</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,455</td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>5,053</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia -Herzegovina</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia***</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>3,644</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova***</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>552,000</td>
<td>48,900</td>
<td>33,311</td>
<td>5,497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Agriculture = agricultural industries and diffuse sources

** Wetlands = in-stream reduction

*** Data adjusted: YU - Municipalities; MD - Wetlands
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1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Summary Report is to provide an overview and assessment of the existing and planned inter-ministerial mechanisms related to pollution abatement with particular attention to nutrient control and reduction in the Danube River Basin countries.

The Summary Report is an integral component for the preparation of the GEF/UNDP funded project entitled "Strengthening Implementation of Nutrient Reduction Measures and Transboundary Co-operation in the Danube River Basin". The basic task of this preparatory work is to prepare a qualified material basis for the elaboration of a complete Danube Regional Project for submission to the GEF Council.

The GEF/UNDP funded project aims to promote (i) a basin wide approach to the development of national policies and legal instruments to improve water quality, (ii) integration of nutrient control and reduction measures into environmental policies, (iii) institutional strengthening and capacity building to assure compliance and enforcement, and (iv) awareness raising for active involvement in transboundary pollution control and environmental protection.

The underlying problem causing unsustainable water use practices leading to an increased nutrient content in the Danube River is that nutrient control and reduction measures are often not determined and implemented as part of water resources management policies or environmental protection strategies. For some countries, such as the Czech Republic, nutrient control and reduction measures are part of the water and environmental protection strategy.

This Summary Report represents an assessment for all DRB countries, respectively particular categories of DRB countries and the country presentation on existing and planned inter-ministerial structures relating to nutrient control and reduction, based on reports from national consultants for each of the DRB countries. The contributions delivered by the consultants differ in terms of depth, completeness and totality of the presentations.

The structure of the Country Report follows the structure of the "national reports", and provides both particular information and data for each of the DRB countries. Country-specific information is structured as follows:

(1) Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction
   - Organization, duties, responsibilities, rules of procedure and results
   - Co-operation between governments and local communities/ non-governmental organizations in relation to nutrient reduction concerns
   - Description of main problems

(2) Guidelines for the improvement/creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms
   - Recommendations for improvement of the existing national inter-ministerial mechanisms to respond to nutrient reduction concerns
   - Suggestions for the creation of new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

(3) Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms
   - Legal and institutional barriers
   - Financial barriers

(4) Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms
   - Institutional and legal framework
   - Schedule for implementation

(5) Main country-specific features and conclusions
2 ASSESSMENT OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

2.1 Analysis of the existing national inter-ministerial mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

Not all Danube countries place sufficient emphasis on cooperation between environmental and agricultural authorities or industrial enterprises, farmers and local communities as a substitute for the traditional systems based on fragmented decision making process. For most of the countries, especially for those in transition, the idea of a national inter-ministerial mechanism for pollution control and nutrient reduction does not represent a priority. However, the governments are aware of the potential such a mechanism carries in terms of reducing nutrients in the Danube River Basin and the Black Sea. The diversity of views and proposals and the biases built into modern EU Directives concepts create a precondition encouraging the countries to create a new inter-ministerial mechanism or improve the existing structures by charging them with nutrient reduction and pollution control responsibilities.

There is a substantial need in the Danube River Basin countries for the creation of nutrient reduction and pollution control mechanisms. Among the accession countries in particular, there is a large potential and willingness to implement nutrient reduction measures.

Based on the findings of the national contributions, the countries can be divided into three groups. The first group includes EU member countries such as Germany and Austria, whose existing national inter-ministerial and ministerial structures allow an effective performance of nutrient reduction and control tasks. The second group includes countries where specific mechanisms for nutrient reduction do not exist. However, there are several relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for water pollution abatement and environmental protection. Most of these structures also deal with diffuse pollution, implementing pollution reduction measures or approving new investments in the water sector. This group comprises the Czech Republic, Romania and Bulgaria. Finally, in the rest of the Danube countries, nutrient reduction and pollution control is not high on the policy makers’ agenda.

The existing national inter-ministerial and ministerial mechanisms include central environmental authorities, water companies, agricultural, forestry, industry, finance and health authorities.
2.2 Guidelines for the improvement / creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

Proposals for the improvement or creation of inter-ministerial mechanisms capable to respond to nutrient reduction concerns have been developed by all countries.

These proposals refer to both legal and institutional frameworks and include: (i) the implementation of nutrient-related legislation based on EU Directives and ratified International Conventions, (ii) the development of instruments for diffuse pollution characterization and control, (iii) the creation of rules for good farming practices and good practices in drinking water protection zones, and (iv) the application of an integrated approach to the management of water resources on the river basin level.

The Danube countries believe that cooperation between governments and local communities/ non-governmental organizations with respect to nutrient reduction issues is very important. Nutrient reduction is directly or indirectly included in the duties and responsibilities of several ministries, local authorities, farmers, new owners of industrial plants, environmental NGOs and researchers.

The majority of DRB countries have proposed the creation of national pollution control and nutrient reduction mechanisms.

Very good examples for cooperation between the governments, the inter-ministerial mechanisms and the local communities and NGOs are shown by the majority of the countries through the establishment of the river basin authorities.

However, there are limitations to the identified mechanisms of the middle and lower Danube countries, including: restricted financial resources, inadequate legal and institutional frameworks, and low priority placed on nutrient reduction compared to other water quality or environment-related problems.

2.3 Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms

There are several legal and institutional barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms dealing with nutrient reduction and pollution control.

These measures are mainly referring to the (i) lack of adequate environmental legislation and institutional frame, (ii) fragmentation of responsibilities among the water, environmental and agricultural authorities, and (iii) limited integration of environmental requirements into economic development policies. In addition, transition countries are faced with financial barriers related to reduced financial resources.
2.4 Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms

The proposals - formulated mainly by the transition countries - for the improvement or creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms for nutrient reduction and pollution control are related to both legal and institutional framework and cover:

(i) harmonization of the existing legislation with the EU requirements, including the implementation of nutrient-related legislation based on EU Directives and ratified international conventions and agreements,

(ii) the creation of rules for good agricultural practices, and

(iii) the introduction of an integrated water management approach on the river basin level, including the creation of river basin committees.

The majority of the Danube River Basin countries do have the potential and the willingness for the creation of national pollution control and nutrient reduction mechanisms.
### 2.5 Inter-ministerial Mechanisms for Nutrient Reduction in the Danube River Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Improvement of existing structures</th>
<th>Creation of new structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Institutional framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Institutional framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1. Germany (incl. Bavaria)

1. **Co-ordination of legalisation on federal and state level**
   - 1. LAWA* and federal ministries
   - 1. Implementation of EU-directives, federal regulations and acts; set minimum requirements for municipalities and industries

2. **Coordination groups for legal regulations and planning**
   - 2. State ministries
   - 3. State ministries for environment and agriculture
   - 4. Relevant social groups including municipalities
   - 5. State office for water management, Geological survey, state offices for agriculture
   - 6. LAWA and ATV-DVWK
   - 2. Bavarian water act, State development program
   - 4. Regional plans (18 Regions)
   - 5. Regulations for protected areas for drinking water, program for water quality in rural areas, projects for water quality protection in catchment areas of lakes and reservoirs
   - 6. Investigations and reviews concerning agricultural impacts on water quality

3. **Intensify the use of the existing mechanism**
   - 1. Intensify the use of the existing mechanism
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing inter-ministerial mechanisms</th>
<th>Proposed inter-ministerial mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Improvement of existing structures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Legal framework</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
<td>1. Policy setting and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problems</strong></td>
<td>1. By combining the former Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and the former Ministry of the Environment (Youth and Family) co-operation and co-ordination has further improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal framework</strong></td>
<td>1. By combining the former Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and the former Ministry of the Environment (Youth and Family) co-operation and co-ordination has further improved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Austria

1. The main competencies for protection of waters are allocated to the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management.
2. Work based on inter-ministerial co-operative mechanism was done on a case by case basis:
   - Former Elaboration of Austria’s National Environmental Plan (in cooperation with different ministries, stakeholders and NGO’s)
   - Former Elaboration of Austria’s National Environmental Health Action Plan within the frame of UN-ECE Water and Health.

### Czech Republic

1. Ad-hoc WG on various subjects
2. WGs on harmonisation of legislature with EU
3. No specific mechanism on nutrient reduction
4. Central and local authorities dealing with environment, water and agriculture
5. Water and environmental protection
6. Drafting new laws
7. Harmonization with EU regulations
8. Division of main tasks in water management between two ministries
9. Lack of funds
10. Finalization of the new Water Act
11. Intensified research regarding EU Directive on Nitrates requirements
12. Approval of new Water Act and of a set of laws regarding state administration
13. EU Directive on Nitrates implementation
14. Improved co-operation between responsible ministries in the form of WGs on specific subjects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Improvement of existing structures</th>
<th>Creation of new structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Institutional framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Slovakia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No specific mechanism on nutrient reduction set up but with initial elements in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Hungary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. No specific mechanism</td>
<td>Central authorities for environment, agriculture, regional development, health, transport, water In the intersectoral bodies, NGOs and the commercial sector are represented</td>
<td>1. Water and environmental protection, according to the National Environmental Protection Programme, including nutrient reduction</td>
<td>1. Slow development process</td>
<td>1. Incorporate more explicitly nutrient reduction concerns into the existing legislation</td>
<td>1. Improve operation of National Environmental Council 2. Establish institutional mechanism for the implementation of WFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>Improvement of existing structures</td>
<td>Creation of new structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Institutional framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Institutional framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Slovenia
1. Inter-ministerial ad-hoc groups responsible for environment and physical planning, industry, agriculture, public health, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Improvement of existing structures</th>
<th>Creation of new structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Institutional framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Institutional framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Improvement of existing structures
1. Set up government body for sustainable development

#### 3. Creation of new structures
1. Implement Water Framework Directive

### 7. Croatia
1. National Water Council cooperating with other bodies
2. No specific mechanism on nutrient reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Improvement of existing structures</th>
<th>Creation of new structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Institutional framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Institutional framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Improvement of National Water Council

#### 3. Creation of a special Co-ordination Body for nutrient reduction

### 8. Bosnia-Herzegovina
1. Environmental Steering Committee
2. Commission for Water Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Improvement of existing structures</th>
<th>Creation of new structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Institutional framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Institutional framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Improve local level Agenda 21 body for sustainable development

#### 3. Implement Water Framework Directive

#### 4. Develop pollution register

#### 5. WG co-ordinated by the Environmental Steering Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Improvement of existing structures</th>
<th>Creation of new structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Institutional framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Yugoslavia

1. WG on various subjects
2. No specific mechanism on nutrient reduction


### 10. Bulgaria

1. Inter-ministerial Expert Group for Implementation of NEHAP
2. National Environmental Protection Fund
3. Supreme Environmental Experts Council
4. WG on various subjects
5. National Commission for Sustainable Development
6. Advisory Council of MOEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Improvement of existing structures</th>
<th>Creation of new structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Institutional framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Romania</td>
<td>1. Inter-ministerial committee for environmental development 2. Various structures (WG, Task Force) co-operating on environmental and water issues</td>
<td>Central, basin-level and local authorities dealing with water, environment, forestry, agriculture, food, industry, trade, land planning, consumer protection, health</td>
<td>1. Multipurpose water management approach, integrated land and water management plans, environmental audit, mechanisms for control of nutrient application 2. Pollution abatement, design of economic instruments</td>
<td>1. Lack of logical framework approach matrix for long/short terms 2. Unclear developed objectives</td>
<td>1. Implement BEP and BAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Moldova</td>
<td>1. National Committee 2. Inter-ministerial committees 3. No specific nutrient reduction mechanism</td>
<td>Central and local authorities dealing with environment, industry, foreign affairs, civil defense, health, water and forest companies, institutes for hydro-meteo, geography ecology, zoology</td>
<td>Water and environmental protection</td>
<td>1. Division of responsibilities 2. Too many organizations 3. Lack of collaboration at the central level</td>
<td>1. Intensified collaboration 2. Integration of environmental concerns into sectoral policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Existing and Planned Inter-ministerial Coordination Mechanisms Relating to Nutrient Control and Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing inter-ministerial mechanisms</th>
<th>Proposed inter-ministerial mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Improvement of existing structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues</strong></td>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Ukraine</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX COUNTRY REPORTS

1. GERMANY
2. AUSTRIA
3. CZECH REPUBLIC
4. SLOVAKIA
5. HUNGARY
6. SLOVENIA
7. CROATIA
8. BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA
9. YUGOSLAVIA
10. BULGARIA
11. ROMANIA
12. MOLDOVA
13. UKRAINE
1 GERMANY

1.1 Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction

In Germany, inter-ministerial cooperation takes place on both federal and state levels. First, on the federal level, there is inter-ministerial coordination in the frame of legislative procedures, e.g. plant protection act, nutrient-application regulation, implementation of EU-directives, development of minimum requirements for point sources for municipalities as well as industrial branches. Second, coordination and cooperation between the federal and the state levels exist for the establishment of legislative procedures through a joint water commission of the states (LAWA). Third, at the state level (Bavaria), there are inter-ministerial coordination groups for legal regulations and planning on state level, e.g. Bavarian water act and state development program. Finally, there is bilateral cooperation in cases of inter-ministerial concern. Examples of cooperation of the state ministries for environment and agriculture include "Stickstoff 2000", “Gülle Programm”, “Kultur-Landschafts-Programm” programmes involving the development of rules for good farming practices.

In most of the states, nutrient control and reduction is under the responsibility of the ministries of the environment and the ministries of agriculture. The implementation of the relevant legal regulations belongs to the responsibilities of the state administrations. The nitrate directive and the requirements for drinking water supply from groundwater are controlled by the agricultural as well as by the water administration. Groundwater protection and in this context the role of agriculture as the main non-point source of pollution are of major importance for the policy makers.

In Bavaria, on the state level, in all water plans prepared until now, the relevant topics concerning nutrients and pesticides have been developed in cooperation with the agricultural administration. Further, inter-ministerial activities on the administrative level include the development of recommendations for good practices in drinking water protection zones.

There is cooperation between governments and local communities / non-governmental organizations in relation to nutrient reduction concerns. In the preparation phase of all laws in general, the federal and state ministries usually arrange hearings with relevant experts and, in particular, with the technical and scientific associations (ATV-DVWK).

On the federal level, working groups are organized, with participants coming from state institutions as well as from industries, universities and private consultant enterprises.

In Bavaria, forums for different environmental aspects are established, and one of them relates to environment and agriculture. The participants come from different governmental, economic, social and private institutions and organizations.

Agricultural associations are usually represented in the state development and regional planning councils. Intensive negotiations take place between water supply companies and municipalities on the one side and farmers in the catchment area of the groundwater abstraction locations on the other side, based on the recommendations developed by the state administration.

Germany has suggested that cooperation between the water and the agricultural administration should be intensified in the sense that the measures regarding farming practices and agricultural methodologies should to a large extent be placed under the responsibility of the agricultural administrations and associations. The first steps have already been taken and the necessary negotiations on the inter-ministerial level are have been embarked on.
1.2 Guidelines for the improvement / creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

(1) Recommendations for improvement of the existing national inter-ministerial mechanisms to respond to nutrient reduction concerns.

For Germany, the development of nutrient control mechanisms should be based on (i) legal regulations and mandatory objectives for ground and surface water quality, (ii) instruments of execution which include emission standards, water quality standards for users and ecological requirements and regulations or standards for a good and ecologically sustainable practice, and (iii) enforcement through licensing, command and control measures, economic instruments or action programs.

Therefore, Germany has proposed improvements of the legal instruments on diffuse sources, which are less developed. On the emission side, regulations exist for fertilizers and their application, which were originally not designed with a view to meeting the EU-Nitrate-Directive. The execution of these regulations is difficult and requires strong cooperation between water and agricultural administrations. Positive steps have already been taken through the implementation of several programs initiated by the agricultural and environmental administrations.

(2) Suggestions for the creation of new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

Additional mechanisms of inter-ministerial coordination might be necessary if the responsibilities are spread over more than one ministry or distributed between the federal and state administrations. Especially for the control of pollution from non-point sources, new and efficient mechanisms have to be developed through joint efforts of the agricultural and water administrations.

1.3 Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Legal and institutional barriers

The main barrier to progress in nutrient control is set by the difficult economic situation in agriculture. A profitable agricultural production implies application of intensive farming methods with high rates of fertilizers, which contravene the environmental requirements.

(2) Financial barriers

The high cost of preparing arable land for a switch to extensive production methods or for reduction of cattle density per ha could be considered as financial impediments. Since arable land is private property, income reductions have to be compensated by incentives, such as subsidies.

1.4 Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Institutional and legal framework

In Germany, both the existing institutional and legal frameworks allow the creation of new inter-ministerial structures according to requirements mainly imposed by nutrient reduction and control from diffuse sources of pollution. There is a specific concern that fully developed methods, which have proved their efficiency in practical tests, may be implemented on small-scale applications as well as to larger catchment areas.

(2) Schedule for implementation

Germany considers that a stepwise approach seems to be the only way of ensuring development and application of regionally differentiated rules for best farming practice, teaching and education of farmers and implementation of methods for minimization of fertilizer input based on a regional balance. The whole process is expected to take five years.
1.5 Main country-specific features and conclusions

Germany is one of the few countries in the Danube River Basin where cooperation between the environmental and agricultural authorities through inter-ministerial mechanism on nutrient reduction and control issues is significant. One specific feature involves the existence of two levels of cooperation, the federal and state levels. Other features of Germany are related to (1) intensified activities leading to the development and implementation of rules for good farming practices and good practices in drinking water protection zones, (2) the importance placed by the policy makers on groundwater protection issues and the role of agriculture as the main non-point pollution source, and (3) active co-operation between governments and local communities/non-governmental organizations regarding nutrient reduction concerns.

Like other Danube countries, Germany considers that there is a need to enhance cooperation between the water and agricultural administrations. Positive steps are already taken through the implementation of several programs initiated by the agricultural and environmental administrations.

Germany believes that additional mechanisms of inter-ministerial coordination might be necessary, especially for the control of pollution from non-point sources through joint efforts of both agricultural and water administrations.
2 AUSTRIA

2.1 Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction

In Austria, the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry formulates the agricultural and water protection policies. Therefore, competencies and responsibilities for implementing nutrient control and reduction measures belong to the same authority.

There were in the past examples of overall environmental policy formulation which also involved the Ministry of the Environment.

With the changes the new Austrian government introduced in spring 2000, the former Ministries of Agriculture and Forestry and the Ministry of the Environment (previously responsible for overall environmental policy affairs) were merged and now constitute a single Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management.

2.2 Guidelines for the improvement / creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

(1) Recommendations for improvements of the existing national inter/ministerial mechanisms to respond to nutrient reduction concerns

Austria considers that the implementation of agricultural and water policies through the newly created central authority is a way to assure that responsibilities related to nutrient reduction are efficiently carried out.

(2) Suggestions for the creation of new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

Austria considers that an inter-ministerial mechanism for co-operation on nutrient reduction measures is not necessary as long as the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry efficiently performs the tasks related to pollution control and nutrient reduction concerns.

2.3 Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Legal and institutional barriers

There are no institutional or legal barriers that might impede a clear functioning of the new ministry as a mechanism able to perform pollution control and nutrient reduction tasks.

(2) Current financial barriers

Austria considers that also, there are no significant financial barriers.

2.4 Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Institutional and legal framework

No inter-ministerial mechanism is needed in the future as all environmental competencies, including those related to nutrient reduction, have recently been assigned to a single ministry.

2.5 Main country-specific features and conclusions

The most outstanding feature is related to the fact that Austria is the only one country in the Danube River Basin that has one competent central authority that can function as an inter-ministerial mechanism on nutrient reduction and control problems. Therefore, the country considers that an inter-ministerial mechanism for co-operation on nutrient reduction measures is not necessary as long as the Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, the Environment and Water Management efficiently performs, among its other responsibilities, the tasks related to nutrient reduction and control concerns.

Significant efforts are being made by the policy makers to reduce and control nutrients from both types of pollution sources, diffuse and point sources.
3 CZECH REPUBLIC

3.1 Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction

The Czech Republic is actively preoccupied with the requirements related to the expected accession to the European Union. Most of its environmental policy and legislation is geared towards preparing the Czech Republic for membership in the European Union, which is the government’s first priority.

In the Czech Republic, nutrient control and reduction concerns are an integral component of comprehensive water resources management activities.

Two ministries share the main responsibilities for water and environmental protection in the Czech Republic: Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Agriculture.

Ad-hoc working groups have been created to fulfill the tasks emerging especially from the need to develop new laws and other regulations.

There is also a Working Committee for the Realization of the European Agreement, which co-ordinates the activities of all central authorities to meet the targets related to the EU accession.

Based on the decision of the Working Committee, 23 working groups have been established. In some of these groups, in co-operation with all interested ministries, water quality-related issues are addressed together with some broader environmental problems.

The Czech Republic considers that a well-informed public is a powerful tool for implementing government policy in environmental protection, with NGOs playing the main role. This legal tool allows the public to be actively involved in the decision making process.

Although the Czech Republic, unlike most Danube countries, has reported good results in water protection actions and in water management planning, nutrient removal in wastewater treatment plants was neglected in the past. The new economic and political situation since 1990 has brought about new challenges, which are supposed to be solved in the next few years, especially those related to the (i) completion of the legislative arrangement and its approximation to EU regulations, (ii) need to change the public administration structure, and (iii) clarification of duties and responsibilities in relation to water management problems.

3.2 Guidelines for the improvement / creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

(1) Recommendations for improvements of the existing national inter-ministerial structures to answer to the nutrient reduction concerns

The Czech Republic considers that the main frame-guidelines for water quality improvement are provided by the 1999 updated version of the State Environmental Policy.

New principles have been incorporated in these guidelines, relating to (i) sustainable development, (ii) harmonization of the Czech legislation with EU regulations, (iii) shift from the traditional command and control approach to market-based instruments, and (iv) introduction of voluntary compliance.

In addition, the regulations establish parameters and their limits for municipal, industrial and agricultural point sources of pollution. Moreover, immission limits for two categories of surface waters are also defined.

The Czech Republic has also introduced a flexible and incentive system of charges for wastewater discharge into surface water. Emissions exceeding the limited amount or concentration of COD, dissolved matters, suspended solids, nutrients, specific organic compounds and some heavy metals are chargeable.

One significant initiative of the country is reflected in the Voluntary Agreement the Ministry of the Environment concluded with the Association of Soap and Detergents Producers on the reduction of environmental impact of their products. The producers are bound by the
agreement to ensure that their products do not exceed a 5% limit on phosphorus content, while the production of detergents without phosphorus is encouraged. The Czech Republic proposes recommendations for expanding cooperation between the involved authorities within the work performed by WGs to incorporate specific nutrient reduction tasks.

As nutrient control and reduction measures are viewed as an integral part of water protection in general, the Czech Republic does not make any additional proposals for mechanism for nutrient reduction and control. The new Water Act will bring positive changes in terms of incorporating modern principles and strict permitting procedures. The new law on water supply and sewage systems will also contribute to the improvement of the existing legal framework, by setting severe limits on discharges to the municipal sewage systems.

(2) Suggestions for the creation of new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

As for the Czech Republic, nutrient reduction and control measures are perceived as an integral part of water protection measures. The suggestions include the creation of a special working group to carry out tasks related to nutrient reduction and control while at the same time avoiding an unnecessary increase in the number of working groups and commissions of this type.

### 3.3 Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Legal and institutional barriers

The Czech Republic recognizes the need to update the current legal framework to better respond to the actual needs, especially related to the EU harmonization process. One particular example is the Water Act of 1973, which has already been revised and is in the stage of approval.

In the field of water management and protection, preparations for entry in the EU are complicated and require both a large investment and respective organizational measures.

(2) Financial barriers

There is a need to ensure the necessary funds for the improvement of water-related infrastructure in small municipalities. In addition, there is little experience with co-financing on municipal level. Finally, there is not a sufficient level of willingness on the part of small municipalities to form associations in order to solve wastewater problems.

### 3.4 Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Institutional and legal framework

The Czech Republic will create inter-ministerial working groups and specify their responsibilities according to the actual need. The ad-hoc working group set up to design the new Water Act is an example of such a mechanism.

(2) Schedule for implementation

The schedule for harmonization of the Czech laws with EU regulations is provided in the Approximation Strategy. Priority is given to EU directives 91/271/EEC, 91/676/EEC, and 75/440/EEC, which relate to water protection against nutrients and their control. The Czech Republic will create working groups on other specific concerns according to the actual need.
3.5 Main country-specific features and conclusions

Like some other Danube countries, the Czech Republic, too, is actively involved with the requirements related to the expected accession to the European Union.

A specific feature of the country’s legal framework is the application of an integrated approach to the management of water resources, in which nutrient reduction already occupies an important place. The responsible bodies for water and environmental protection include Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Agriculture.

Ad-hoc working groups have been created to fulfil tasks emerging especially from the need to develop new laws and regulations.

There is also a Working Committee for the Realization of the European Agreement, which co-ordinates the activities of all central authorities in order to fulfill the targets related to the EU accession.

The Czech Republic believes that a well-informed public is a powerful tool in the government’s environmental policy and that NGOs have a major role to play in this respect.

Unlike most Danube countries, the Czech Republic has reported good results in its efforts to improve water quality. One significant initiative of the country is reflected in the Voluntary Agreement which the Ministry of the Environment concluded with the Association of Soap and Detergents Producers regarding the reduction of environmental impact of their products. The producers are bound by the agreement not to exceed the 5% limit on the content of phosphorus in their products while the production of detergents without phosphorus is encouraged.

The Czech Republic has made recommendations for expanding cooperation between the involved authorities within the work performed by WGs to incorporate specific nutrient reduction tasks.

In addition, the country has pointed to the need to create a new working group, with experts from various organizations, able to implement nutrient reduction and control tasks in line with the EU Association Agreement.
4 SLOVAKIA

4.1 Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction

In the Slovak Republic, competencies related to water management are shared between the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) and Ministry of Soil Management (MSM). In addition, state administration of the regions is carried out by eight Regional Offices and 79 District Offices with their Environmental Departments established under the Ministry of the Interior. The operation and maintenance of drinking water systems, public sewerage and WWTPs, as well as agricultural activities, are under the scope of activities of MSM.

For the time being, there are no established inter-ministerial environmental committees, which should have a responsibility for the coordination of activities related to control and reduction of nutrient content in surface waters. However, coordination of these activities does exist and elements of inter-ministerial mechanisms designed to protect surface water quality can be considered as existing on different levels.

In the case of control of nutrient input into surface waters from point sources of pollution, there is a governmental decree that sets maximum permissible pollution levels (including N and P) in both discharged waste waters and in receiving surface water.

Slovakia is among the few countries that have designed a Law on Fertilizers. The new Law on Fertilizers establishes conditions for the registration, stocking, and utilization of both artificial fertilizers and manure.

An example of cooperation between the government, local communities and NGOs in the development of legislative material is the preparation of National Environmental Action Plan II, which defines the priorities, principles, objectives of the state environmental policy and measures to be realized to fulfill the set objectives.

4.2 Guidelines for the improvement / creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

(1) Recommendations for improvements of the existing national inter-ministerial structures to respond to nutrient reduction concerns

First improvements related to the clarification of duties and responsibilities between the relevant sectors will be reflected in the new Water Law expected to come into force in 2001. Second, transposition of the EU water legislation in the national legislation is seen as a major contribution towards water pollution abatement and control mechanisms.

As regards the control of quality of wastewater discharged into surface waters, the content of N and P is not measured for all relevant polluters. This makes it difficult to calculate the nutrient input from point sources of pollution, although such information is very important for the state administration to set quantitative targets, plan measures for the protection of waters, and monitor improvements. It is suggested that this activity should be coordinated from one organization/institution of MOE, in order to ensure a unified approach.

The other recommendation refers to the need to involve the Ministry of Finance in solving the problem of compensation of financial losses to agricultural companies, which would result from limitation of their activities in the areas of special land regime.

(2) Suggestions for the creation of new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

One suggestion made by Slovakia involves the creation of mechanisms for decreasing the use of P-free detergents. The process should involve Ministry of the Environment, Ministry of Soil Management, Ministry of Economics and the Finance Ministry.

Another suggestion involves the creation of economic tools for applying ecological soil management.
4.3 Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Legal and institutional barriers

The only legal or institutional barriers to be considered for the operation of a future inter-ministerial structure on nutrient reduction issues are those related to the completeness of the existing legislation, with required pieces of laws and rules for pollution abatement, in particular for nutrient reduction.

(2) Financial barriers

The available financial sources are a limiting factor in the process of reduction of nutrients input into waters. Funding is necessary for the construction of sewerage, waste water treatment plants, technological changes in the manufacturing process, building of suitable storage capacities for manure, etc. This problem is a real concern for Slovakia.

4.4 Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Institutional and legal framework

In the national inter-ministerial mechanisms for nutrient reduction and control to be created in the future, the Ministry of the Environment, Ministry of Soil Management, Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of Economics and the Finance Ministry should be involved as core sectors.

The general objective should refer to the reduction of nitrogen and phosphorus.

In order to ensure an effective reduction in nitrogen and phosphorus content in waters, actions and measures need to be taken by all involved ministries, which should closely co-operate from the very start, i.e. in defining the targets and measures. The targets and measures need to be achievable and realistic in terms of the current economic situation in the country.

(2) Schedule for implementation

The proposed inter-ministerial mechanism may be created during the coming three-year period.

4.5 Main country-specific features and conclusions

Since the Slovak Republic is in the process of accession to the EU, transposition and implementation of EU Directives, including those related to control and reduction of nutrients in water, are the government’s priorities. Therefore, it is expected that important legislation regarding the reduction and control of nutrients will come into force in the coming few years.

As a result of the country’s economic transformation, the amount of used fertilizers and the amount of produced manure have rapidly decreased, and the reduction of nutrient input from fertilizers/manure does not seem to be a priority. As it is expected that the amount of fertilizers/manure will be continuously increasing in the future, it is necessary to prepare proper legislation regarding good agricultural practice, in order to minimize the input of nutrients into waters from soil management.

Slovakia proposes the creation of mechanisms for decreasing the use of P-free detergents. Moreover, the introduction and use of economic instruments to control soil management is also seen as an immediate priority.
5  HUNGARY

5.1 Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction

In Hungary, the regulation of inter-ministerial mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction is part of the general provisions of the environmental legislation. There are no mechanisms addressing exclusively nutrient control and reduction.

However, there are some inter-ministerial structures dealing with nutrient control, which include (1) Inter-ministerial Committee on Central Environmental Fund chaired by MoE, (2) Inter-ministerial Committee on Water Management Fund chaired by MTWM, and (3) Inter-ministerial Steering Committee for the Implementation of Water Framework Directive, also chaired by MTWM.

There are, in addition, other inter-sectoral coordinating bodies dealing with nutrient reduction, including the National Environmental Council and the National Regional Development Council.

Finally, Hungary has several ongoing governmental programmes related to nutrient control, in which the decision of the government determines the required inter-ministerial mechanism for their implementation. These programs are related to the water management development program for Lake Balaton, the national programme for the protection of other lakes, and a programme for the rehabilitation of oxbows and floodplains of the Tisza river.

5.2 Guidelines for the improvement / creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

(1) Recommendations for improvements of the existing national inter-ministerial structures to respond to nutrient reduction concerns

Hungary believes that the development of inter-ministerial mechanisms for nutrient reduction should be correlated with the provisions of the draft Water Framework Directive (WFD). Proposals are currently being drafted and the process is controlled by an inter-ministerial Steering Committee.

(2) Suggestions for the creation of new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

Hungary has proposed an inter-ministerial mechanism on nutrient reduction to be developed in accordance with the provisions of the Water Framework Directive (WFD). This exercise is already initiated and coordinated by an inter-ministerial Steering Committee. In addition, Hungary has suggested that the performance of this inter-ministerial mechanisms for nutrient-reduction should be synchronized with the administrative arrangements within the river basin districts.

It is expected that the implementation of WFD will require a global co-ordination mechanism for all water management issues, both at the river basin and ministerial levels. The nutrient reduction problems that cannot be handled at the river basin level will be solved through inter-ministerial mechanisms.

5.3 Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Legal and institutional barriers

Hungary believes that, from the legal and institutional point of view, there are no detectable barriers to the functioning of the existing mechanisms.

(2) Financial barriers

The creation of a national inter-ministerial mechanism for nutrient control is not only a financial issue; rather, it depends on governmental priorities in environmental protection.
5.4 Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Institutional and legal framework

Hungary has proposed the creation of two major structures at the ministerial level: Water Framework Committee and River Basin Planning Committee. Clarification of duties and responsibilities has not yet been achieved. A Nutrient Reduction Working Group could be set up as a subdivision to the Water Framework Committee.

(2) Schedule for implementation

The schedule for the implementation of the proposed inter-ministerial mechanism is directly influenced by (i) date of entering into force of the WFD and (ii) the country's preparation programme for EU membership. According to the Government Programme, Hungary has to fulfill all the legal approximation by December 31, 2001.

5.5 Main country-specific features and conclusions

Like other countries of the Danube River Basin, Hungary has embarked on an ambitious program leading to EU accession.

One obvious particularity of Hungary is the current reduced interest in nutrient reduction concerns on the part of policy makers. However, this may be taken into consideration and further developed within the framework of the future proposed committees.

The proposals refer to the creation of inter-ministerial committees that will deal with the Water Framework Directive and with the implementation of river basin planning approach through the creation of river basin councils. The created bodies will also undertake tasks related to nutrient reduction and control measures.
6 SLOVENIA

6.1 Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction

Like other Danube countries, Slovenia is rapidly approaching the EU – regarding the adoption of the EU legislation, restructuring of the economy and government administration, building democracy, etc.

Inter-ministerial cooperation and coordination is still developing, with occasional problems related to intra-ministerial coordination. Still, a number of bodies and working groups have been established to ease the cooperation and coordination between different sectors and ministries.

Vertical cooperation is to some extent obstructed by two distinct levels of administration, i.e. the state government and the local government. In this respect, Slovenia will have to introduce an intermediate level – a regional (basin wide) level.

As regards nutrient control and reduction or removal measures, Slovenia has already adopted some key EU directives, such as the Nitrates Directive, the Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive, the Quality of Water for Human Consumption and is preparing to accept Water Framework Directive through the Water Law (Water Act), which is currently being debated in Parliament.

Environmental considerations are being integrated into the policies of five key sectors - industry, energy sector, agriculture and forestry, traffic and tourism. The aim of the integration of environmental policy into individual activities/sectors is primarily linked to the harmonization process with the requirements of Agenda 21, the Environmental Protection Act and EU policy in individual areas.

Coordination between different ministries during the phase of preparation of legal instruments, such as national programmes, strategies, action plans, laws and implementing regulations is informal. Formally, these instruments are coordinated at the cabinet level by at least one of the three existing standing governmental committees.

Cooperation is mainly established through many NGOs, which take an active part in public life and in ministerial affairs. Ministries are keen to invite public and NGOs to workshops and other public presentations or working bodies for diverse projects.

Slovenian NGOs have participated in the preparation of initiatives and demands concerning motorway construction and in the preparation of the document “Agenda 21 for Slovenia”. NGOs also play an important role in the promotion of sustainable agriculture and nature conservation (in the process of the adoption of agricultural reform, e.g. PHARE pilot project on Dravsko polje) and in the field of energy efficiency (example: the construction of a new facility - thermal power plant Trbovlje 3).

6.2 Guidelines for the improvement / creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

(1) Develop recommendations for improvement of the existing national inter-ministerial structures with the revision of their responsibilities to respond to nutrient reduction concerns

By signing the Europe Agreement, Slovenia accepted the foundations of the environmental protection policy of the EU and committed itself to establishing and using new instruments for its enforcement. This calls for (1) active monitoring of the adoption of new environmental protection requirements within the EU, and (2) incorporation of these requirements into the Slovenian legal system in all sectors. It also requires an upgrading of the institutional system for putting these requirements into practice.

(2) Suggestions for new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

Slovenia is willing to propose a new inter-ministerial mechanism charged with nutrient reduction tasks. The ongoing pre-accession programs (e.g. twinning, TAIEX, PHARE) will help develop the needed mechanisms for better inter- as well as intra-ministerial cooperation and coordination. The task of establishing an intermediate level of government (at the basin level) will also stipulate cooperation between ministries. More active involvement of the public and NGOs will also be needed.
6.3 **Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms**

(1) Legal and institutional barriers

Slovenia recognizes the presence of some barriers which include: (I) conflict of interests – environmental protection hinders the implementation of certain sectoral policies (i.e. agriculture/nature; energy sector/environment), (ii) political opposition, (iii) lack of legal, administrative and institutional capabilities, (iv) lack of qualified staff.

(2) Financial barriers

The integration of environmental considerations into sectoral policies demands substantial financial resources which the economy is reluctant to commit due to a lack of money.

6.4 **Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms**

(1) Institutional and legal framework

Slovenia is willing to create a new inter-ministerial structure based on a detailed analysis. The Ministry of Environmental and Spatial Planning is willing to harmonize all the relevant environmental legislation within a short period of time of approx. 2-3 years. The involvement of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food, which is already performing tasks related to nutrient reduction, is essential for the efficiency of nutrient reduction and control measures implementation phase.

(2) Schedule for implementation

An implementation period of 2-3 years is anticipated. However, a common agreement between the main players (the two ministries) is needed in order to ensure an effective nutrient reduction and an efficient nutrient control.

6.5 **Main country-specific features and conclusions**

Slovenia believes that - in spite of a certain lack of administrative and institutional capabilities - one must recognize the already existing large administration in a relatively small country. Thus, a very special program of professional education of key ministerial personnel will be of utmost importance.

Slovenia hopes for more flexibility on the policy makers’ side to facilitate the implementation of new water pollution measures, including those related to nutrient reduction.
7 CROATIA

7.1 Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction

Croatia has identified two coordination bodies subordinated to the government: Governmental Coordination for Environment and Governmental Coordination for the Economy, which usually deal with water issues.

In accordance with the provisions of the Water Act, another officially created mechanism is in existence, i.e. the National Water Council, established for carrying out water management activities, coordination of various needs and interests, and proposing measures for the development and improvement of the water system in the Republic of Croatia.

There are two main organizations with responsibilities in relation to nutrient control and reduction:

- The State Water Directorate is responsible for the protection of water and sea from land-based sources, for planning and harmonizing the development and construction of water supply and waste water systems of national importance and for water management inspection. The State Water Directorate is established as the leading body in all nutrient control and reduction issues
- “Hrvatske vode” – Croatian Waters – is an institution dealing with water resources management and operates under the supervision of the State Water Directorate.

Other responsible ministries are: Ministry of the Environment and Physical Planning, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Ministry of Health, Ministry for Public Works, Reconstruction and Construction.

However, in any debate related to nutrient control and reduction, the Ministry of Economics, Ministry of Tourism and the Finance Ministry can make important contributions to the nutrient issue dialogue.

Cooperation between the government and local communities/ non-governmental organizations in relation to the nutrient reduction concerns usually takes place at the rule-making stage.

However, there are limitations associated with the identified mechanisms, including: limited time allocated, reduced financial resources, inadequate legal framework and low priority placed on nutrient reduction concern against other water quality or environment-related problems.

7.2 Guidelines for the improvement / creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

(1) Recommendations for improvements of the existing national inter-ministerial structures to respond to nutrient reduction concerns

Croatia’s first recommendation is that the National Water Council, as an already existing body, should become fully operational. This mechanism can play an important role in promoting environmental protection, integrated water management and nutrient control and reduction. The second recommendation is related to the need to improve cooperation between the ministries and state directorates not only during the design but also during the rule implementation stage.

There is currently ongoing cooperation between the State Water Directorate and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry on problems related to nutrient pollution from diffuse sources.

(2) Suggestions for the creation of new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

One suggestion for the creation of new mechanisms is linked to the proposal of establishing a coordinating body for the implementation of measures for nutrient control and reduction within the National Water Pollution Control Plan. This coordinating body would be responsible for the implementation of the National Water Pollution Control Plan, especially for nutrient control and reduction measures. The responsible bodies for the implementation according to the mentioned plan would be the State Water Directorate, Hrvatske vode, industries, municipalities, and other potential water pollution. Effective harmonization and
close collaboration between the responsible bodies would be necessary to facilitate the
implementation of this plan under the coordination of the State Water Directorate.

The government of the Republic of Croatia has already been informed about the preparation of
this project and the future need for national inter-ministerial mechanism. Strong emphasis is
placed on full participation of other responsible ministries and institutions and their possible
financial support. Information about the specific implementation schedule cannot yet be
provided at this stage.

7.3 Main barriers to the creation of the national inter-ministerial
mechanisms

(1) Legal and institutional barriers

Croatia believes that once the design of the National Water Pollution Control Plan has been
finalized and its main implementing bodies have been nominated, the success of the performed
nutrient reduction and control tasks will depend only on the current institutional capabilities of
the main involved stakeholders.

(2) Financial barriers

The creation of a new mechanism (coordinating body, working group, etc) would require
some funding. This can be considered as a serious constraint towards a smooth
implementation of the nutrient reduction measures.

7.4 Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanism

(1) Institutional and legal framework

Croatia’s proposal refers to the creation of a new mechanism closely related to the new
structure within the National Water Pollution Control Plan, i.e. the Coordination Body for the
Implementation of Measures for Nutrient Control and Reduction. The State Water Directorate
shall ensure its coordination. The preparation of a National Nutrient Reduction Action Plan
represents the main initial task of this inter-ministerial mechanism.

(2) Schedule for implementation

The National Water Pollution Control Plan has incorporated deadlines for its implementation
schedule based on long periods of time: short-2005, medium-2010 and long terms-2025.

7.5 Main country-specific features and conclusions

Croatia is one of the few Danube countries that has the privilege to initially benefit from both institutional
and legal capabilities to perform water pollution control, and nutrient reduction tasks in particular. This is
facilitated by the existing structures that include the State Water Directorate and the Croatian Waters,
institutions dealing mainly with issues related to the management of water resources. Moreover, the
development of the National Water Pollution Control Plan ensures an initial legal background for carrying
out these activities.

The proposed structure, i.e. the Coordination Body for the Implementation of Measures for Nutrient Control
and Reduction within the National Water Pollution Control Plan” under direct supervision of the State Water
Directorate, may perform tasks such as those related to the preparation of National Nutrient Reduction
Action Plan.

However, financial constraints might impede the progress of the proposed structure.

Finally, the country is willing to promote any necessary measure to implement nutrient reduction actions
within its share of the Danube basin.
8 BOSNIA – HERZEGOVINA

8.1 Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction

According to the provisions of the Dayton Peace Accord, environmental issues represent a common concern for both The Federation of B&H and Republic of Srpska.

F B&H and RS have a separate system of organisation of the environmental sector. The Federal Ministry of Physical Planning and the Environment is the relevant ministry in the F B&H, while the relevant ministry in RS is Ministry of Urbanism, Physical Planning, Construction and the Environment. In both F B&H and RS, the Ministry of Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry (MoAWF of F B&H and MoAWF of RS) plays the main role in the water sector. The ministries are responsible for water strategy and policy, including the setting of standards and regulations as well as the enforcement of laws and regulations through licensing and inspections.

At present, national inter-ministerial mechanisms for water quality and particularly for nutrient control and reduction do not exist. Control of nutrients is included in water quality control that is organized by Public Companies for the Watershed Area of the Sava river (in F B&H) and by Hydrometeorological Institute of RS (in RS). There is no harmonized monitoring and control of surface and ground waters of B&H. In addition, the Water Law does not contain sufficient provisions on permitting procedures, legal procedures, international standards or conditions for rational water use.

However, during the last few years, international programs have supported the development of new legislative and institutional structures dealing with environmental protection and water quality control. Another very important issue has been the improvement and strengthening of co-operation between the two entities, F B&H and RS, in dealing with environmental protection issues.

In spite of the currently large number of citizens associations and professional organizations engaged in environmental protection actions, there is a lack of co-operation between governments and non-governmental communities. Vertical co-ordination in F B&H is weak (at all levels: local, cantonal, federal), with responsibilities overlapping between different government levels and departments. Inter-entity institutional co-ordination is also poor.

Moreover, there is a lack of encouragement to improve environmental practices while in some cases experts are independently employed in developing projects aimed at improving agricultural practices or raising public awareness.

The main problems of the current mechanisms are linked to (i) institutional and human resources problems and, (ii) water quality issues.

First, a lack of adequate co-operation on the national level and inappropriate institutional capacity building to implement the legislation represent the main constraints which impede a satisfactory performance of environmental and water quality tasks.

Second, the absence of sufficient and coordinated environmental databases, together with a lack of monitoring, restrain the enforcement of and compliance with environmental legislation. In extension, there is ineffective co-ordination between the various sectors at both local and national levels in performing water management tasks; low priority is awarded to nutrient reduction issues at the government level and limited funds are consequently earmarked for the purpose.
8.2 Guidelines for the improvement / creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

(1) Recommendations for improvements of the existing national inter/ministerial mechanisms to respond to nutrient reduction concerns

B&H believes that the implementation of integrated approach to the management of water resources on the river basin level, with strong horizontal and vertical co-operation, is the most appropriate recommendation for improving the existing environmental and water quality mechanisms to perform water pollution reduction tasks. The other recommendation is related to the urgent need to facilitate the implementation of the EU Directive on nitrates, i.e. the Framework Water Directive.

(2) Suggestions for the creation of new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

There are proposals directed to the creation of new structures able to carry out tasks related to nutrient control and reduction measures, including: (i) the establishment of a surface and ground water quality data base within an adequate water quality control (including nitrates, phosphorus), (ii) the creation of mechanisms providing access to relevant data on groundwater quality, monitored by public water supply companies, according to the provisions of the Water Law, and (iii) the establishment of a register of point sources of pollution.

8.3 Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Legal and institutional barriers include:
- Fragmentation of responsibilities as the principle of integrated water resources management on river basin level has not yet been implemented
- Environmental legislation and policy has not yet been harmonized with the EU legislation
- Water management issues are not integrated in environmental management concerns.

(2) The current financial barriers are related to the following deficiencies:
- Poor social and economic conditions hampering an adequate development of environmental policy
- Economic instruments are not yet introduced
- Reduced financial resources as the reconstruction of the country and ongoing process of privatization consumed most of the government’s financial funds.

8.4 Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Institutional and legal framework

A key institutional proposal - also suggested in a previous EU-developed project - refers to the need of integration of environmental and water administrations in a new structure called the Ministry of Environment and Water Management (MoEWM) for F B&H and RS.

This body would be responsible for (i) developing water policies and environmental strategies, (ii) drafting legislation and, (iii) issuing regulations. The Ministry would apply its policy through a network of seven new River Basin Steering Committees (RBSC) in the respective River Basin Bodies, in both FB&H and RS.

In addition, working groups need to be established, with members drawn from all involved ministries, to deal with nutrient control and reduction issues. These working groups should be co-ordinated by the Environmental Steering Committee (on both levels - river basin and national) on items related to nutrient control and reduction, particularly on actions that include: (i) participation in the implementation of water-management plans for catchment basins, (ii) developing codes of good agricultural practice for the training of farmers, (iii) establishing and implementing action programs for vulnerable zones, and (iv) periodically reviewing designations and effectiveness of the action programs.
Schedule for implementation

1st September 2000 represents the date for the implementation of Terms of Reference for the preparation of environmental legislation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, within the EU Environmental Program for B&H as well as the date for the implementation of the Water Sector Institutional Strengthening in both F B&H and RS.

8.5 Main country-specific features and conclusions

One significant particularity of B&H is related to the actual institutional framework dealing with water and environmental issues, which is fragmented between the two entities F B&H and RS.

Recognizing the need to (i) strengthen the institutional system, (ii) develop and implement EU-harmonized legislation, (iii) incorporate market-based instruments in water and environmental policies, and (iv) enhance the understanding of both government and local communities on the necessity to urgently consolidate the link between them, the country embarked on an ambitious program of legal and institutional reform. This action will also include tasks related to the improvement of water quality, pollution abatement and the implementation of nutrient control and reduction measures.

Recommendations for the improvement of the existing inter-ministerial mechanisms to respond to nutrient reduction concerns include (i) the application of water resources integrated man integrated approach to the management of water resources on the river basin level, with effective horizontal and vertical co-operation and (ii) the implementation of the Directive on Nitrates, i.e. the Framework Water Directive.
9 YUGOSLAVIA

9.1 Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction

There is no specific inter-ministerial mechanism responsible for nutrient control and reduction. However, Yugoslavia believes that such a structure could operate through the Federal Government as well as through the Republican Governments Ministries responsible for environmental and water protection the implementation of any proposal concerning nutrient control and reduction.

Those responsible for water-related issues directly or indirectly connected with nutrient control and reduction include (i) at the Federal Level – the Federal Ministry for Development, Science and the Environment, the Federal Ministry of Agriculture, the Federal Ministry of Health and Social Affairs and the Federal Ministry of Economics, and (ii) at the Republican Level – the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Resources Management, the Ministry for the Protection of the Environment, the Ministry of Civil Works, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Economics.

All departments of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Resources Management are directly or indirectly responsible for nutrient control and reduction.

Cooperation between the governments and local communities/non-governmental organizations in relation to nutrient reduction concerns can not be judged properly as there has not been any important request by local communities/NGOs in that direction. Nevertheless, the government(s) are open for cooperation and support various activities of NGOs. Representatives of NGOs participate in meetings organized by ministries while the ministries responsible for environmental and water protection disseminate relevant information and support the organizing of workshops, conferences and other appropriate activities of NGOs, particularly those dealing with the presentation of research results.

9.2 Guidelines for the improvement / creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

(1) Develop recommendations for improvement of the existing national inter-ministerial structures with the revision of their responsibilities to answer to the nutrient reduction concerns

Yugoslavia believes that the existing environmental legal and institutional framework needs to be revised. In addition, it is necessary to strengthen the enforcement of and compliance with the environmental requirements.

(2) Suggestions for the new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

Since it is recognized that there is a certain lack of knowledge concerning nutrient control and removal, it has been suggested that the country would benefit from a timely and serious deployment of national scientific and research potentials in order to improve knowledge about nutrient control and removal, through cooperation with the relevant international research and consulting centers.

Other suggestions refer to the necessity to construct new wastewater treatment plants for municipalities and industries in Yugoslavia as measures to reduce and control pollution.

9.3 Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Legal and institutional barriers

There are no legal or institutional barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms. The Government(s) allow(s) enough room for inter-ministerial cooperation for any initiative coming from the ministries responsible for environmental issues.

Lack of adequate legislation related to nutrient reduction is one of the main constraints recognized by Yugoslavia.
(2) Financial barriers

Financing is the driving force behind any improvement in the field of water pollution control and in nutrient control and reduction. The economy of FR of Yugoslavia is weak in this moment and is, therefore, not able to provide funds for serious investment in water pollution control. Yugoslavia needs financial support to be able to carry out specific tasks related to nutrient reduction issues.

9.4 Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Institutional and legal framework

There is no special proposal for national inter-ministerial mechanism. It may be created at any when and if the need arises.

(2) Schedule for implementation

Yugoslavia will provide this information during project development stage.

9.5 Main country-specific features and conclusions

Yugoslavia is as willing to create an inter-ministerial mechanism dealing with nutrient reduction issues as its neighboring Danube countries.

Besides, the country already possesses the conditions necessary for the creation and operation of such a structure. The main constraint is related to the limited financial resources to translate into practice any water pollution abatement measure.
10 BULGARIA

10.1 Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction

Bulgaria has identified several relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for water pollution abatement and environmental protection. Most of these structures also deal with diffuse-source pollution, implementing pollution reduction measures or approving new investments in the water sector.

Among them, the Supreme Environmental Experts Council (within the Ministry of the Environment and Water), the Supreme Technical Experts Council (within the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works) or the existing Expert Working Groups within the Ministry of the Environment and Water are viewed as the existing structures that can easily incorporate tasks related to nutrient control and reduction.

To exemplify, the Supreme Environmental Experts Council is a current inter-ministerial body, established on a national level, with representatives of different ministries, such as the MRDPW, MoAF, MoH, MoE, MT, MoF, National Electrical Company and representatives of BAS and other experts. The SEEC is chaired by the Deputy Minister of Environment and Water. The main duties of the Council are to discuss EIA Reports and to decide on issuing permits for the construction/rehabilitation of WWTP’s. This would also reflect the reduction of nutrient pollution load from the municipalities and from the industry by the introduction of best environment-friendly technologies.

Bulgaria believes that the future adoption and enforcement of (i) the Regulation on the Protection of Water from Pollution with Nitrates of Agricultural Origin, (ii) the Regulation on the Emission Norms for Admissible Content of Harmful and Dangerous Substances in Wastewater Discharged into Natural Receivers, (iii) the Regulation on Issuing Permits for Wastewater Discharges in Water Bodies and, (iv) the setting of individual emission limits on point sources of pollution should have a significant positive impact on nutrient reduction.

In order to facilitate water management at the national level (according to Article (9) of the Water Law), a Supreme Consultative Water Council will be established within the MOEW. The SCWC will include representatives of the MOEW, MRDPW, MoAF, MoE, MoT, MoH, MoF, Civil Defense, the State Agency for Energy and Energy Resources, the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, the municipalities, non-governmental organizations directly related with waters etc. The Minister of the Environment and Waters will issue a Regulation defining the structure and activities of the Supreme Consultative Water Council.

The management at basin level within one or several watersheds will be implemented by basin water management bodies, such as the Basin Directorates under MOEW and Basin Councils (according to Art. 153 of the Water Law). The Basin Council will be a state public consultative commission responsible for supporting the activities of the Basin Directorate. The Basin Council will include representatives of the state administration, municipal administration, water users and environmental organizations within the range of the basin as well as representatives of the scientific organizations connected with water-related issues.

An analysis of the relevant, existing national inter-ministerial mechanisms shows that these councils, expert working groups and commissions have, to a certain level, duties and responsibilities in relation to nutrient reduction and control or other similar tasks related to fertilizers, nitrates and/or phosphorus use and control. However, none of these structures has direct duties or responsibilities in relation to nutrient reduction and control.

Bulgaria believes that cooperation between governments and local communities/ non-governmental organizations in relation to nutrient reduction is very important. Nutrient reduction is included - directly or indirectly - in the duties and responsibilities of several ministries, local authorities, farmers, new owners of industrial plants, environmental NGOs and researchers.

One very good example of cooperation between the governments, inter-ministerial mechanisms and the local communities and NGOs is the establishment of the pilot Yantra River Basin Council. The main purpose in establishing the Council was to experiment with the implementation of integrated water resources management in Bulgaria and was to some extent related to nutrient reduction. Another example of ongoing cooperation between the governments, inter-ministerial mechanisms and local communities/NGOs in relation to general pollution reduction concerns is provided by the public discussions of EIA reports. Yet another
example is – to some extent - the existing Group 22. Finally, the preparation of the project for wetland rehabilitation in Kalimok and Belene in relation to nutrient reduction and biodiversity preservation is also worth mentioning in this context.

Even now, some of the inter-ministerial structures could be used for co-ordination of the development of a National Nutrients Reduction Strategy and the co-ordination of the implementation of the NNRAp. However, the main problems are due to the limitations of the duties and responsibilities of the already identified structures.

10.2 Guidelines for the improvement / creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

(1) Recommendations for improvements of the existing national inter-ministerial mechanisms to respond to the nutrient reduction concerns

The recommendations are not oriented to the improvements of the existing national inter-ministerial mechanisms to respond to nutrient reduction concerns because of their status duties and responsibilities. Nevertheless, at this stage a revision of the responsibilities of the SEEC at the MOEW to answer to the nutrient reduction concerns as a temporary measure could be considered as the most appropriate recommendation.

(2) Suggestions for the creation of new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

Bulgaria has proposed the creation of a new mechanism for nutrient control and reduction. First, there are two possibilities on the national level: the creation of a separate inter-ministerial body or the creation of a commission in the future Supreme Consultative Water Council. Second, on the basin level it will be possible to use the future Basin Council.

10.3 Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Legal and institutional barriers

Inter-ministerial co-ordination and co-operation for the implementation of nutrient reduction and control measures depends to a great extent on the need to enhance the understanding of policy makers. The main barriers are related to the (i) limited number of staff at the ministries (ii) lack of a clear division of duties and responsibilities between different ministries, and (iii) absence of adequate legislation. However, new legislation is in the process of being developed.

(2) Financial barriers

Effective nutrient control and reduction requires a huge amount of investment. Absence of financial support could be one of the main barriers.

10.4 Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Institutional and legal framework

Bulgaria has proposed the establishment of a new national, interim inter-ministerial commission on an expert level, within the MOEW, with full commitment of the other interested ministries. Based on the rule of procedures proposed by the Minister of the Environment and Waters, the commission will initially have a limited mandate until an adequate commission is created under the future Supreme Consultative Water Council. The main duties of the Commission should be (i) to provide support to the MOEW for the development of a National Nutrient Pollution Reduction Strategy and the implementation of the Action Plan and, (ii) to coordinate the activities of the different institutions for better nutrient control and reduction actions.
(2) Schedule for implementation

Such an inter-ministerial structure is currently being established in order to support the preparation of the 5-year draft Nutrient Reduction Action Plan for the Black Sea catchment area. Under the new Water law, Bulgaria will have four Expert Groups (EG) for its four river basin regions. Therefore, four national commissions can be established where each EG will be responsible for coordinating the activities in one of the four basin regions. The proposed schedule for implementation of a new inter-ministerial mechanism able to carry out the tasks related to nutrient reduction and control starts in May 2000 and will last for the next 5 years. The new Four River Basin Councils could be created within this period of time.

10.5 Main country-specific features and conclusions

Bulgaria is one of the few countries of the Danube River Basin which benefits from the results of many identified national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for water pollution abatement and environmental protection. Most of these structures are also dealing with diffuse pollution, implementing pollution reduction measures or approving new investments in the water sector.

The Supreme Environmental Experts Council is a current inter-ministerial body, established on a national level, with representatives of different ministries, such as the MRDPW, MoAF, MoH, MoE, MT, MoF, National Electrical Company and representatives of BAS and other experts. The SEEC is chaired by the Deputy Minister of Environment and Water. The main duties of the Council are to discuss EIA Reports and to decide on issuing permits for construction/rehabilitation of WWTP’s. This would also reflect on the reduction of nutrient pollution load from the municipalities and from the industry by the introduction of best environment-friendly technologies.

Bulgaria believes that the future adoption and enforcement of the (i) Regulation on the Protection of Water from Pollution with Nitrates of Agricultural Origin, (ii) Regulation on Emission Norms for Admissible Content of Harmful and Dangerous Substances in Wastewater Discharged into Natural Receivers, (iii) Regulation on Issuing Permits for Wastewater Discharges in Water Bodies and, (iv) determination of individual emission limitations of point sources of pollution should have a significant positive impact on nutrient reduction.

Within the MOEW, a Supreme Consultative Water Council will be created.

Bulgaria believes that cooperation between governments and local communities/ non-governmental organizations in relation to nutrient reduction concerns is very important. Nutrient reduction issues are included, directly or indirectly, in the duties and responsibilities of several ministries, local authorities, farmers, new owners of industrial plants, environmental NGOs and researchers.

A very good example of cooperation between the governments, the inter-ministerial mechanisms and the local communities and NGOs is the establishment of the pilot Yantra River Basin Council.

Some inter-ministerial structures could be charged with coordinating the development of a National Nutrients Reduction Strategy and the implementation of the NNRAP. However, the main problems are due to the too narrowly defined scope of the duties and responsibilities of the already identified structures.

Bulgaria has proposed the creation of a new mechanism for nutrient control and reduction. First, there are two possibilities on the national level: the creation of a separate inter-ministerial body or the creation of a commission in the future Supreme Consultative Water Council. Second, on the basin level it will be possible to use the future Basin Council.
11 ROMANIA

11.1 Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction

Inter-ministerial co-ordination mechanisms for environmental problems, particularly relating to nutrient control and reduction, are in Romania based on a special Committee which is mainly responsible for (i) providing a general framework for the development of environmental strategy taking into consideration sectoral strategies, (ii) creating an operational frame for the implementation of a National Environmental Action Plan (NAEP), and (iii) improving public participation – in the sense of access to information and involvement.

There is no special committee for nutrient control and reduction but there is an inter-ministerial working group for environmental development. In the case of water-related problems, including nutrients, the most relevant institutions involved include: the Ministry of Waters, Forests and Environmental Protection, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Industry, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Public Works and Land Planning, National Water Company Apele Romane, Consumer Protection Office, NGOs and some donor organizations.

The specific tasks related to nutrients include (1) implementation of nutrient-related legislation based on EU Directives and International Conventions ratified by Romania, (2) carrying out international programmes in which Romania is involved, (3) periodical assessment of the PSIR cycle (pressure/stress/impact/reaction) and control of relationships functions between priority pollutants/target group/environmental functions/environmental themes, (4) assessment of national nutrient balance, (5) development of instruments for diffuse pollution characterization and control (risk assessment and management).

Apart from some general barriers (lack of legislation, management tools, and infrastructure), there are other specific constrains related to the agricultural sector in particular (lack of logical framework Approach Matrix (LFA), absence of clear objectives, etc).

11.2 Guidelines for the improvement of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

(1) Recommendations for improvements of the existing national inter-ministerial structures to answer nutrient reduction concerns

Romania has developed several recommendations aimed at improving cooperation between various representatives within the existing inter-ministerial mechanism.

(2) Suggestions for the creation of new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

A special Working Group for Nutrient Control and Reduction Action Plan (NCRAP) should be created in the ICIM. Based on the already started process of approximation to the EU legislation, the Working Group will focus on nutrient-related topics addressed by: EWFD (COM 98/76), IPPC Directive (96/161/EEC), Urban Waste Directive (91/271/EEC, 98/15/EEC), Nitrate Directive (91/679/EEC) etc. In addition, one of the Group’s main tasks would be the establishment of mechanism to control nutrient application.

11.3 Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanism

(1) Legal and institutional barriers

There are not any major legal or institutional barriers to be considered in the operation of the inter-ministerial structure on nutrient reduction issues. The current legal framework facilitates the creation and functioning of such a mechanism while its host, ICIM, could provide the institutional arrangements.

(2) Financial barriers

Romania believes the current limited financial resources to represent one of the most relevant constraints.
11.4 Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Institutional and legal framework

The proposed specific WG dealing with nutrient reduction and control problems needs to be created within the ICIM. This WG will take measures to facilitate the development and implementation of the Nutrient Reduction and Control Action Plan.

(2) Schedule for implementation

As Romania is already committed to the implementation of nutrient reduction measures, the time schedule is very tight and the WG is due to be set up during this year.

11.5 Main country-specific features and conclusions

Romania is one of the Danube countries for which nutrient reduction and control represents a main concern. This is why the country has already created an inter-ministerial mechanism to address broader environmental topics, but with environmental and agricultural authorities already involved. Moreover, Romania is willing to improve this structure with an additional WG, designated only for nutrient reduction and control issues.

Another specific characteristic of Romania is related to the continuous support the government provides to environmental authorities for their institutional strengthening and capacity building, for reinforcing environmental research, improving exchange of information and public involvement, and for intensifying regional cooperation on the implementing nutrient reduction measures.
12 MOLDOVA

12.1 Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction

In Moldova, there is a National Committee established in 1996 and responsible for supervising the implementation of the provisions of a number of international agreements, including those related to pollution control and reduction. Several relevant sub-committees and inter-ministerial committees were established, charged with environment-related responsibilities. However, cooperation between these entities is weak.

There is no example of nutrient-related cooperation between governmental organizations and local communities and non-governmental organizations. This is due to two reasons. Firstly, there is a reduced interest in nutrient reduction issues on the part of policy makers. Secondly, there is a general absence of good cooperation in relation to environmental issues.

However, Moldova believes that - for the time being - there is no need to establish specific committees dealing with nutrient control and reduction issues since this problem is not on the country’s priority list given that it is faced with more acute problems affecting its economy.

The division of responsibilities between the Ministry of the Environment and Territorial Development and the Ministry of Health, set out in a 1992 agreement between the two entities, provides for a clear division of tasks in relation to water. The Department of Environmental Protection is responsible for water quality and pollution control, rational use, restoration and protection of water, promotion of best available technologies for water use and treatment, etc. The same agreement clarified the allocation of tasks between the Ministry of Environment and Territorial Development and the former Ministry of Agriculture and Alimentation on the promoting the strict regime of water resources in Moldova.

The role of local communities in the decision-making process is very small, mainly due to a lack of public access to environmental information and – in the participation process – failure to recognize their importance.

12.2 Guidelines for the improvement / creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

(1) Recommendations for improvement of the existing national inter-ministerial structures to answer nutrient reduction concerns

Moldova has made several recommendations aimed at (i) improving the current structure of the Ministry of the Environment and Territorial Development, (ii) strengthening the inter-ministerial mechanism in order to incorporate environmental considerations into the economic development programme, (iii) decentralizing tasks and, (iv) raising public awareness and public participation in the decision-making process.

(2) Suggestions for the creation of new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

Moldova has not yet considered the option of creating a new inter-ministerial mechanism.
12.3 Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Legal and institutional barriers
   Moldova sees the following barriers:
   - Inadequate legal framework dealing with issues related to water quality management, including pollution control in Moldova
   - Lack of qualified staff dealing with water quality issues within the Ministry of the Environment and Territorial Development
   - Insufficient cooperation between organizations, including government and NGOs
   - Lack of adequate staff training programs

(2) Financial barriers
   - Lack of financial support to facilitate the creation of a possible inter-ministerial mechanism.

12.4 Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Institutional and legal framework
   Moldova has suggested various mechanisms, which are mainly geared towards pollution control.
   This list includes (i) revision of the National Economic Development Program to meet the integration requirements with a view to incorporating environmental impacts of macro and sectoral policies into the economic development programmes, (ii) development of interim emissions limits and a compliance schedule, (iii) creation of an effective permitting systems, and (iv) implementing charge schemes.

(2) Schedule for implementation
   Moldova has not yet proposed any deadlines for the implementation of the suggested measures.

12.5 Main country-specific features and conclusions

Moldova has several authorities involved in water and environmental protection activities. In addition, the existing National Committee has the task to supervise the implementation of the provisions of the different international agreements, including those related to pollution control and reduction. Several relevant sub-committees and inter-ministerial committees were established with environment-related responsibilities. However, cooperation between these entities is weak.

There is no example of cooperation between governmental organizations and local communities and non-governmental organizations in relation to nutrient reduction problems. One particularity of Moldova is related to the reduced interest in nutrient reduction issues on the part of policy makers. In addition, Moldova considers that - for the time being - there is no need to establish specific committees dealing with nutrient control and reduction issues since this problem is not on the country’s priority list given that it is faced with more acute problems affecting its economy.
13 UKRAINE

13.1 Description of the relevant national inter-ministerial mechanisms with responsibilities for nutrient control and reduction

The establishment of inter-sectoral committees and working groups for co-operation between different sectors of the economy and social groups is a common practice in Ukraine.

Legislation on nutrient reduction is part of a broader body of legislation on pollution control and protection against pollution. Ukraine believes that the future development of legislative measures in this field will depend on progress made in economic reform.

The legislative acts provide some tools for decision making in the rational use of natural resources and environmental protection, but do not address nutrient reduction in particular.

The Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources of Ukraine performs functions related to the management and control of water use and protection and renewal of water resources.

Based on these responsibilities, the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources co-ordinates environmentally important issues related to different sectors.

A typical example of an inter-ministerial Committee is the Council on Environmental Problems of the Dnipro River Basin and Drinking Water Quality, established to facilitate the implementation of the State Program on Rehabilitation of the Environment and Improvement of Drinking Water Quality in the Dnipro River Basin. Co-ordination of the environmental policy for the use of nature and environmental protection in the Dnipro river basin was set forth by a 1999 Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers.

13.2 Guidelines for the improvement / creation of national inter-ministerial nutrient control and reduction mechanisms

(1) Develop recommendations for improvement of the existing national inter-ministerial structures with the revision of their responsibilities to answer to the nutrient reduction concerns

Ukraine believes that a reorganization of the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources would contribute towards strengthening inter-sectoral co-ordination.

The improvement of economic conditions and the introduction of economic incentives for involved institutions and organizations in Ukraine will result in improved inter-sectoral co-operation and more efficient work of the intersectoral bodies.

(2) Suggestions for new mechanisms for nutrient control and reduction

Ukraine believes that the Cabinet of Ministers may create inter-ministerial mechanism charged with nutrient reduction tasks. Currently, the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources is drafting ministerial orders for the establishment of the Black Sea and the Danube Committees, whose agenda may involve tasks related to nutrient reduction in the Black Sea basin.

A typical arrangement would be to establish working groups within the inter-ministerial mechanism to address the more specific issues within the scope of its general objectives.

13.3 Main barriers to the creation of national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Legal and institutional barriers

Although the current legislative framework and the previous experience with inter-sectoral co-operation seem to be successful, there are some important limitations affecting the work of inter-sectoral committees.

The decision to develop nutrient reduction program will depend on the legal approval by the Cabinet of Ministers.
(2) Financial barriers
The most important barrier concerns the lack of financial resources to cover operational costs for members of inter-sectoral committees, secretarial work, office equipment and/or office space for the important programs. Insufficient funding and human resources impair the efficiency of the Inter-sectoral Committee. Within the ongoing administrative reform designed – among other things – to downsize the ministries, many tasks assigned to inter-ministerial committees will create an additional burden for the ministerial personnel. Since inter-sectoral committees and working groups operate on a non-paid basis, the members’ motivation is very low and participation becomes very formal. Moreover, due to very limited financial resources for implementing the programs, projects, proposals, the agency that initiates the activities tends to dominate and control the financial resources with all resulting drawbacks such as poor information exchange, lack of ideas sharing, etc.

13.4 Proposed national inter-ministerial mechanisms

(1) Institutional and legal framework
Ukraine has proposed several measures leading to the creation of a national inter-ministerial mechanism to address nutrient reduction concerns, including (i) strengthening river basin management, (ii) creating river basin authorities, (iii) developing environmental protection programmes. Once these programmes have been approved, inter-sectoral bodies will be created. Part of these bodies will be working groups charged with nutrient reduction and control tasks.

(2) Schedule for implementation
In the 2001-2015 period, several significant programs will be implemented in Ukraine. Firstly, the protection and rehabilitation of the Azov Sea and the Black Sea are the objectives of the main program to be implemented between 2001 and 2010. Secondly, the development and approval of the state program for environmental protection of the Danube River Basin is also scheduled for the 2002-2012 period.

13.5 Main country-specific features and conclusions
Like many other countries in the Danube River Basin, Ukraine is committed to performing nutrient reduction tasks within the existing committee or through a new mechanism. A particularity of Ukraine is the fact that the country’s legislation does not yet contain any specific provisions on nutrient reduction and control issues. Moreover, even the notion of nutrient as a pollutant is incorporated into the broad definition of a pollutant.

However, Ukraine has incorporated modern principles in environmental and water management, including integrated water resources management approach, the use of economic instruments and the polluter pays principle.

Like other countries, Ukraine is facing severe budgetary constraints that might obstruct a good performance of the prospective inter-ministerial mechanisms.
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1 INTRODUCTION

This Summary Report is an integral component for the preparation of the GEF/UNDP funded project entitled “Strengthening Implementation of Nutrient Reduction Measures and Transboundary Cooperation in the Danube River Basin”. The basic task of this preparatory work is to prepare a qualified material basis for the elaboration of a complete “Danube Regional Project” to be submitted to the GEF Council.

The purpose of this Summary Report is to provide an assessment for all DRB countries, respectively particular categories of DRB countries and the country presentations on of the existing and planned national policies and the status and reform requirements of legislation related to pollution reduction with particular attention to nutrient control and reduction in the Danube River Basin countries.

The structure of the Country Report follows the structure of the “national reports”, and provides a “country profile” for each of the Danube River Basin countries. The “county profiles” are structured as follows:

(1) Policy objectives, priorities and principles for nutrient control / reduction
   ➢ General policy objectives, priorities, principles
   ➢ Policy objectives and programmes by sectors
   ➢ Policy objectives and programmes by short, medium, long term
   ➢ Status of nutrient related international conventions, declarations, etc.

(2) Status of legislation dealing with nutrient control / reduction
   ➢ Relevant laws and regulations currently in force
   ➢ Relevant laws and regulations in the pipeline
   ➢ Present status regarding out-phasing of phosphate-containing detergents
   ➢ Main deficiencies

(3) Main barriers to policy and legal reforms

(4) Proposed / envisaged changes of nutrient-related legislation
   ➢ Out-phasing of phosphate-containing detergents

(5) Approximation of national legislation to EU legislation in terms of pollution control, particularly nutrient control / reduction / removal
2 ASSESSMENT OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

2.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and General Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

All DRB countries currently have a more or less comprehensive system of environmental and water sector-related policies and strategies, which usually reflects:

- the capability of the country to contribute to the solution of transboundary problems;
- the significance and evidence of country-specific environmental problems;
- the significance and evidence of environment-related health hazards;
- the economic development and potential of the country.

In this context, all countries have developed a hierarchic system of short, medium and long-term objectives and principles which usually reflect the key environmental problems and sector priorities on national and regional level.

Long-term objectives are usually very general and often not related to any time frame for implementation or solution. In addition, there is usually no assessment of the overall long-term funding requirements. In the DRB countries, long-term objectives of environmental policy mainly focus on:

- Protection of climate and ozone layers;
- Preservation of a sound environment for the future generations;
- Protection of biological diversity;
- Protection of drinking water resources.

Objectives for water pollution and especially nutrient reduction are usually incorporated as sub-components of higher objectives. However, most countries have established a system of priorities for nutrient reduction, usually defining the sequence of construction, extension, or improvement of treatment standards for WWTPs, which are usually

- differentiated by sector (municipal / industrial);
- classified by plant capacity (small / medium / large) and treatment standards;
- differentiated by sensitivity of area (vulnerable areas / significant impact areas).

Despite the diversity of problems, interests and priorities across the DRB, the Danube countries share certain values and principles relating to the environment and the conservation of natural resources. The most essential principles, also relevant for water pollution, respectively nutrient reduction, include:

- The precautionary principle: under certain circumstances it is better to be on the safe side, even if firm evidence is lacking, than to be actually wrong;
- Best available technology (BAT) - best environmental practice (BEP);
- Control of pollution at the source: it is usually less expensive to prevent the creation of harmful wastes or pollution through cleaner technologies and processes than to cure and repair the damage to the environment afterwards;
- The polluter pays principle and the related user pays principle.
- The principle of integrated approach;
- The principle of shared responsibilities, respectively the principle of subsidiarity.

In the meantime, all DRB countries have - at least theoretically - recognized that the adoption of these principles is indispensable for appropriate prioritization and implementation of environment-related measures.

None of the DRB countries presently disposes of an explicitly formulated nutrient reduction programme. Measures and activities with relevance to nutrient reduction are usually sub-components of or to a large extent incorporated in other programmes.
In all DRB countries, the main ongoing programmes regarding nutrient reduction are investment programmes for new construction, extension, rehabilitation or improvement of effluent standards (biological treatment, N+P elimination) of municipal WWTPs. Involved are occasionally the provision of guidelines for selection of priority projects, country-specific effluent standards depending on plant capacity, and technical and operational standards.

The status of nutrient-related policy and programmes in the particular DRB countries can be assessed in general terms as follows:

Table 2.1-1: Status of Nutrient-Related Policy and Programmes in the DRB Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Explicitly formulated policy objectives for nutrient control / reduction</th>
<th>Programmes especially dealing with nutrient control / reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Appropriate system of policy objectives</td>
<td>Programme for the implementation of buffer zones to surface waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Appropriate system of policy objectives</td>
<td>Programme of environment-friendly agriculture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Appropriate system of policy objectives</td>
<td>Programme for adequate implementation of municipal WWTPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Satisfactory system of policy objectives</td>
<td>Codex of Good Agricultural Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>Appropriate system of policy objectives</td>
<td>National waste water collection and treatment programme;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National agro-environmental protection programme;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other programmes (lake, oxbow lake, low land, etc.);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Satisfactory system of policy objectives</td>
<td>No explicit programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>Satisfactory system of policy objectives</td>
<td>No explicit programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;H</td>
<td>No explicit policy objectives</td>
<td>No explicit programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUG</td>
<td>Satisfactory system of policy objectives</td>
<td>No explicit programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUL</td>
<td>Satisfactory system of policy objectives</td>
<td>Programme for construction of municipal WWTPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Satisfactory system of policy objectives</td>
<td>A series of nutrient-related programmes to be carried out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>during the forthcoming period 2000-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL</td>
<td>No explicit policy objectives regarding nutrient emissions or loads</td>
<td>No explicit programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Satisfactory system of policy objectives</td>
<td>No explicit programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control and Reduction

Except for Germany and Austria, the adequacy of the legal framework for sound environmental management of water resources has to be viewed against the background of political, economic, administrative and social changes which have taken place in the particular DRB countries during the previous years of transition.

In all DRB countries the legal framework for environmental management of water resources and ecosystems consists of a hierarchic system of decrees, laws, directives, ordinances, regulations and standards on different administrative levels.

The international agreements and conventions signed or ratified by the particular countries constitute a kind of orientation framework for the national environmental policies and legislation of the member countries.

In a number of countries, numerous laws and regulations were adopted a long time ago, have been frequently amended during the previous years of transition and need a fundamental revision.

The environmental efforts in the Danube countries will be dominated by the need to confirm to European standards, less by domestic priorities and not decisively by agreements within the framework of the DRPC. The EU member countries are obliged to adopt the EU directives and transform them into national legislation. The EU candidates are in process of adoption to insure the obligations of harmonization. Other Danube countries follow the same line and transform their national regulations according to EU directives.
Indeed, in most DRB countries, the relevant legislation is currently in the phase of substantial reform and modernization. Due to the complexity of this task it can be anticipated that the completion of the ongoing reform process will take several years before the relevant legislation has reached an acceptable level of compliance with international requirements.

Countries in which the legal framework for environmental management of water resources and ecosystems has to be considered as fully adequate and in consistence with international requirements are Germany and Austria.

Countries in which the legal framework for environmental management of water resources and ecosystems has to be considered as generally appropriate, respectively satisfactory, are Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovenia and Slovakia.

In the other countries, the current environmental and water-related legislation cannot be considered as adequate regarding sound and sustainable environmental management of water resources and ecosystems; there are still essential deficits and problems that can be summarized as follows:

- in some countries the environmental and water-related legislation is still based to a certain extent on historical structures, with the consequence that the various changes, adjustments and modifications have led to critical inconsistencies;
- some countries are currently in the process of establishing new environmental and water-related legislation, whose practical applicability and effectiveness has not yet been proven;
- some countries have developed relatively sophisticated systems of environmental and water-related legislation, which can at present not really be enforced due to critical social and economic issues in the country.

Common deficiencies and needs for improvement regarding the water sector-related legislation in the DRB countries can be summarized as follows:

- restructuring and adjustment of relevant legislation to the requirements of modern environment-oriented market economy;
- streamlining, simplification and elimination of inconsistent components, basically resulting from ad-hoc changes during the previous transition period;
- ensuring utmost compatibility of interacting legislation on the various administrative levels;
- specification of efficient implementing regulations and enforcement mechanisms; elimination of all kinds of unjustified exemptions;
- further harmonization of national legislation with EU regulations and standards.

The status of nutrient-related legislation (and standards of nutrient control and reduction) in the particular DRB countries can be assessed in general terms as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Explicitly formulated legal provisions for nutrient control / reduction</th>
<th>Explicitly defined standards regarding nutrient control / reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Fully appropriate legislation</td>
<td>Appropriate system of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Fully appropriate legislation</td>
<td>Appropriate system of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>In general appropriate legislation</td>
<td>In general satisfactory system of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>In general appropriate legislation</td>
<td>In general satisfactory system of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>In general appropriate legislation</td>
<td>In general satisfactory system of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>In general appropriate legislation</td>
<td>In general satisfactory system of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>Legislation not fully satisfactory (mainly focusing on point sources);</td>
<td>No fully satisfactory system of standards:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Water quality standards by water classes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Standards on hazardous substances;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Effluent standards: maximum allowed concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of hazardous substances in waste water;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;H</td>
<td>No explicit legal provisions</td>
<td>No satisfactory system of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUG</td>
<td>Legislation not fully satisfactory</td>
<td>No fully satisfactory system of standards:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- no effluent standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUL</td>
<td>Legislation not fully satisfactory</td>
<td>No fully satisfactory system of standards:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, it can be concluded that in none of the DRB countries (except for Germany and Austria) nutrient-related legislation is presently on a fully adequate level from the international point of view. This indicates that the improvement of the respective legislation is an essential prerequisite and constitutes a substantial potential for future nutrient reduction in the majority of the DRB countries.

2.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

Based on the information provided by the national contributions, the main barriers to policy and legal reform can be categorized as outlined below.

The assessment for the particular DRB countries (** = “high relevance”; * = “low relevance”) has to be considered as provisional and should in the first place serve for a formalized identification of country-specific areas for improvement.

(1) Historical issues

- Outdated legal structures
- Outdated administrative structures
- Outdated business structures / methods
- Inappropriate agricultural structures and practices
- Inappropriate industrial structures / production / production methods
- Unsolved ownership situation - public sector
- Unsolved ownership situation - private sector
- Inappropriate attitude of population (wastage of water, etc)

Provisional assessment of the relevance of historical issues for the particular DRB county:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B&amp;H</th>
<th>BUL</th>
<th>CRO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>HUN</th>
<th>MOL</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>UA</th>
<th>YUG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Economic issues

- Deteriorated economic capacities
- Decreased industrial production
- Decreased agricultural production
- Decreased export opportunities
- Decreased international tourism
- Decreased livestock farming
- Inadequate status of privatization
- Inappropriate public infrastructure (waste water collection systems, WWTP)
Provisional assessment of the relevance of economic issues in the particular DRB country:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>B&amp;H</th>
<th>BUL</th>
<th>CRO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>HUN</th>
<th>MOL</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>UA</th>
<th>YUG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Socio-economic issues

- Low private (per capita) income
- Low living standard
- High portion of low-income population
- High unemployment

Provisional assessment of the relevance of socio-economic issues in the DRB countries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>B&amp;H</th>
<th>BUL</th>
<th>CRO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>HUN</th>
<th>MOL</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>UA</th>
<th>YUG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Financial issues

- Lack of domestic public funds for environmental issues
- Lack of international funds at favorable terms
- Lack of adequate funding mechanisms
- Lack of adequate funding tools (incentives, charges)
- Low purchasing power of the population

Provisional assessment of the relevance of financial issues in the particular DRB county:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>B&amp;H</th>
<th>BUL</th>
<th>CRO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>HUN</th>
<th>MOL</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>UA</th>
<th>YUG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Institutional / administrative issues

- Inadequate personnel capability
- Inadequate personnel qualification
- Inadequate technical equipment
- Inadequate structure of administration
- Inadequate allocation of responsibilities (gaps, overlaps, not defined)
- Lack of adequate vertical and horizontal coordination
- Lack of adequate cooperation within public administration
- Lack of adequate cooperation between public administration and private sector
- Lack of adequate tools for enforcement of legislation
- Lack of adequate data basis
- Lack of adequate monitoring systems and methods
- Lack of scientific knowledge
- Lack of private sector participation (investment, management)

Provisional assessment of the relevance of institutional issues in the particular DRB county:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>B&amp;H</th>
<th>BUL</th>
<th>CRO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>HUN</th>
<th>MOL</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>UA</th>
<th>YUG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) **Participatory issues**
- Lack of public awareness (regarding environmental issues)
- Lack of adequate awareness of decision makers (regarding environmental issues)
- Lack of public interest in solving environmental deficiencies / problems
- Lack of organizational capability (inadequate representation of NGOs)
- Lack of information / knowledge
- Lack of private sector participation (investment, management)

Provisional assessment of the relevance of participatory issues in the particular DRB county:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B&amp;H</th>
<th>BUL</th>
<th>CRO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>HUN</th>
<th>MOL</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>UA</th>
<th>YUG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) **Natural / environmental issues**
- Degradation of ecosystem
- Loss of adequate biodiversity
- Inadequately high concentration of nutrients in agricultural areas
- Uncontrolled flood risk
- Inadequate utilization of water resources
- Uncontrolled discharge of waste water (in the past / ongoing)
- Unsanitary disposal of solid wastes and hazardous wastes (in the past / ongoing)
- Inadequate agricultural practices (in the past / ongoing)
- Inadequate utilization of fertilizers, pesticides, etc. (in the past / ongoing)

Provisional assessment of the relevance of natural issues in the particular DRB county:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B&amp;H</th>
<th>BUL</th>
<th>CRO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>HUN</th>
<th>MOL</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>UA</th>
<th>YUG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 **Envisaged Changes of Nutrient-Related Legislation**

Most DRB countries do not envisage any substantial changes of nutrient-related legislation besides the changes they will carry out within the process of harmonization of national legislation with EU legislation. These changes are dealt with in Section 2.5.

Only some countries are currently in the process of updating and adjusting particular laws or regulations that are directly or indirectly related to nutrient-related issues.

The need for improvement of nutrient-related legislation in the particular DRB countries can be assessed in general terms as follows:

The EU regulations with respect to nutrient emissions require a great effort in introducing new measures, new technologies, and upgrade existing facilities.
Table 2.4-1: Needs for Improvement of Nutrient Related Legislation in the DRB Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Needs for improvement of legislation</th>
<th>Needs for improvement / adjustment of nutrient related standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>No need for new legislation</td>
<td>No requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No need for new legislation</td>
<td>No requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Need for adjustment of legislation in line with established schedule for approximation of national legislation to EU legislation</td>
<td>Need for adjustment of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Need for adjustment of legislation in line with established schedule for approximation of national legislation to EU legislation</td>
<td>Need for adjustment of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>Need for adjustment of legislation in line with established schedule for approximation of national legislation to EU legislation</td>
<td>Need for adjustment of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Need for adjustment of legislation in line with established schedule for approximation of national legislation to EU legislation</td>
<td>Need for adjustment of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>Need for improvement of legislation</td>
<td>Need for completion and adjustment of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;H</td>
<td>Substantial need for improvement of legislation</td>
<td>Substantial need for completion and adjustment of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUG</td>
<td>Need for improvement of legislation</td>
<td>Need for completion and adjustment of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUL</td>
<td>Need for adjustment of legislation in line with established schedule for approximation of national legislation to EU legislation</td>
<td>Need for completion and adjustment of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Need for adjustment of legislation in line with established schedule for approximation of national legislation to EU legislation</td>
<td>Need for completion and adjustment of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL</td>
<td>Substantial need for improvement of legislation</td>
<td>Need for completion and adjustment of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Need for adjustment of legislation in line with established schedule for approximation of national legislation to EU legislation</td>
<td>Need for completion and adjustment of standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the particular issue of control, respectively out-phasing of Phosphate-containing detergents, the situation in the particular DRB countries is compiled in Table 2.4-2.
The replacement of phosphates in detergents is cost-effective strategy leading to pollution reduction.

Table 2.4-2: Present Status and Proposed Actions Regarding Phosphate-containing Detergents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Present Situation</th>
<th>Planned / Proposed Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Satisfactorily regulated by respective law and ordinances</td>
<td>No requirements for changes in national legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Issues of detergents in washing powders are regulated by the Act on Chemicals and the Ordinance on the Degradability of Certain Detergents, which are in compliance with the respective EU Directives 73/404/ECC, 73/405/ECC and 82/243/ECC</td>
<td>No requirements for changes in national legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Voluntary agreement between the MOE and the Association of Soup and Detergents Producers on reduction of environmental impact of their products</td>
<td>New arrangement envisaged, form currently in discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>No explicit legal provision or regulation</td>
<td>There are plans to prepare by the end of 2000 a proposal on methods of control of biological degradability of active substance detergents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>State standard: Pulverous synthetic detergents (MSZ 14604-86)</td>
<td>No plan or schedule for changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>No explicit legal provision or regulation; EU-market conditions forced industry to abandon use of phosphate; Less than 1/3 of all detergents sold is supposed to still have phosphate contents;</td>
<td>No explicit plan or schedule for control or out-phasing of P-containing detergents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>No explicit legal provision or regulation</td>
<td>No explicit plan or schedule for control or out-phasing of P-containing detergents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;H</td>
<td>No explicit legal provision or regulation, Present production on zeolite basis</td>
<td>No explicit plan or schedule for control or out-phasing of P-containing detergents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUG</td>
<td>No explicit legal provision or regulation; It is left to the producers to decide what kind of detergents they produce</td>
<td>No explicit plan or schedule for control or out-phasing of P-containing detergents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUL</td>
<td>No explicit legal provision or regulation</td>
<td>Plan regarding P-containing detergents currently under preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>No explicit legal provision or regulation</td>
<td>Introduction of P-free detergents in discussion, estimated cost ~ EUR 50 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL</td>
<td>No explicit legal provision or regulation; Problem not relevant;</td>
<td>No explicit plan or schedule for control or out-phasing of P-containing detergents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>No explicit legal provision or regulation</td>
<td>No explicit plan or schedule for control or out-phasing of P-containing detergents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information provided by the national reports indicates that there is a substantial potential for Phosphorus reduction in the majority of the DRB countries. Therefore, this issue should be followed up.
2.5 Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

With the exception of Germany and Austria, all other DRB countries consider the harmonization of national environment and water-related legislation with the EU legislation as the most essential prerequisite for long-term sustainable nutrient control and reduction in their countries.

In the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria this harmonization is incorporated in an ongoing programme and considered as a short-term task.

Romania, Slovenia (and Ukraine) plan to reach a harmonization of particular national laws with EU legislation or standards in the short, respectively mid-term (2001 to 2005).

For both categories of countries, the final implementation of the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive will require relatively long adjustment periods of at least 10 to 20 years.

For the other countries, Moldova and the war-impacted countries Croatia, B&H and Yugoslavia, the time frame for the approximation of national legislation to EU legislation is determined by the currently not fully satisfactory status of water sector legislation and the economic capability and potential of the particular country. For these countries the approximation process has to be considered as a medium to long-term task.

Table 2.5-1 shows a schedule for the envisaged approximation of the national legislation to the EU legislation (regarding selected EU Directives which are directly or indirectly related to the issue of pollution control, in particular to nutrient control / reduction).
Table 2.5-1: Planned Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
<td>Full compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>-- -- -- -- -- -- -- --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;H</td>
<td>-- -- -- -- -- -- -- --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUG</td>
<td>-- -- -- -- -- -- -- --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL</td>
<td>-- -- -- -- -- -- -- --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: First date = proposed year of transposition / second date = anticipated year of full implementation

(*) Full compliance after the envisaged transition periods of 2 to 6 years
ANNEX COUNTRY REPORTS

1. GERMANY
2. AUSTRIA
3. CZECH REPUBLIC
4. SLOVAKIA
5. HUNGARY
6. SLOVENIA
7. CROATIA
8. BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA
9. YUGOSLAVIA
10. BULGARIA
11. ROMANIA
12. MOLDOVA
13. UKRAINE
1 GERMANY

1.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

During the previous decades, Germany has established a comprehensive hierarchic system of objectives, principles and priorities for pollution reduction both on the national level and - due to the distinct federal structure of the country – supplementary ones on the state level. Regarding pollution reduction, the policy objectives and principles are fully in compliance with international standards.

Nutrients in surface waters result from point sources and diffuse sources (mainly nutrient emissions from the agricultural sector and nitrogenous substances from the transport and industrial sector).

(1) Control of point sources

Regarding point sources, the basic principle is that nutrient load of waste water discharged from treatment plants is to be kept as low as possible according to the “best available techniques”. The particular minimum requirements regarding nutrient elimination have been laid down in the waste water emission ordinances and their annexes.

Through a strict application of the emission principle, a significant nutrient elimination could be achieved in the surface waters.

For discharge of waste water, a waste water charge is to be paid, also in the case the legal requirements are fulfilled. This waste water charge can be set off against investment cost for reduction of nutrient load; thus this regulation fulfills an essential incentive function.

The legal prescriptions regarding content of phosphorus components in washing powders and detergents have to be considered as satisfactory and have contributed to a significant reduction of phosphorus levels in surface waters.

(2) Control of non-point sources

In Germany, the impact of nutrients on both surface and ground waters has been increasingly coming from diffuse rather than point sources. The essential diffuse sources are agricultural animal keeping and land use (utilization of fertilizers) as well as nitrogenous substances from the air (e.g. from traffic, industry and agriculture).

From these diffuse sources, both soil and surface and ground water are still significantly impacted by nutrients. Attempts have been made to counteract this development by legal regulations (Water Act, Fertilizer Act, Fertilizer Ordinance, etc). A reduction is, for example, expected to be achieved by a restriction of nutrient content in fertilizers as well as by provisions regulating the utilization of fertilizers (e.g. appropriate buffer zones to surface waters, restrictions on the periods when manure may be spread, etc.).

Germany currently spends about one million EUR per annum for measures and actions aimed at nutrient reduction from diffuse sources in the DRB area of Germany.

1.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control and Reduction

Legislation related to pollution, respectively nutrient reduction, is in full compliance with the requirements of EU legislation and the relevant international conventions signed by Germany.

The national legislation is composed of a comprehensive set of laws, regulations and ordinances on the national level and a relatively high number of laws and regulations on state level. The Water Resources Policy Act provides sets framework conditions for water management and water control on the national level; the federal states have their own water acts.
In fulfilling the requirements of the relevant EU Directives and the requirements of the national legislation, a multitude of projects, measures and activities related to nutrient reduction have been implemented over a long period of time and have actually led to exceptionally high standards of the relevant infrastructure and administrative and institutional framework by international comparison.

Pollution originating from non-point sources, mainly from agriculture remains a matter of concern.

1.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

In Germany, the crucial problem is currently not the status of legislation, but the difficulties with the appropriate transposition of the legal regulations.

Non-point source emissions result from a variety of emitters that are partly outside the direct influence sphere of the relevant water sector authorities, which hampers protection measures.

As diffuse emissions can often not be remedied by technical measures, the nutrient emissions have to be controlled or reduced at the source. The solution to these problems requires strategies which both support awareness raising of and provide incentives for the main target groups of emitters.

However, another prerequisite is that adequate legal provisions be established and necessary technical means provided.

1.4 Proposed / Envisaged Changes of Nutrient-Related Legislation

The emission into the air of nitrogenous substances from the transport sector and the agricultural sector calls for particular measures since conventional water protection measures and regulations are in this case not efficient. Essential measures to be considered include:

- development and introduction of emission reducing technologies and techniques;
- intensification of public awareness raising and consultation;
- reduction of emissions into the air as an integral component of an overall environment protection strategy (as laid down in respective international conventions);
- environment-friendly utilization of resources (materials, energy);
- environment-friendly forms of land use;
- systematic survey of emission development,
- exchange of pertinent knowledge and experience;
- environmental impact assessment.

Reduction of phosphorous does not need to be additionally regulated in Germany.

1.5 Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

Being an EU Member State implies the obligatory compliance with nutrient and waste water-relevant EU Directives.

As EU legislation provisions have been incorporated in the national laws, regulations and ordinances, the national legislation is basically in line with the requirements of the relevant EU Directives and will - where required – be gradually adjusted with regard to nutrient control and reduction.
2 AUSTRIA

2.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

In the course of the past decades the Austrian Government has undertaken ambitious efforts to reduce pressures arising from households, industry and agriculture in order to protect and maintain the water resources and their sustainable use. The present water quality monitoring results, which are published on a regular basis, prove that those efforts have been very efficient and successful.

The main principles of the Austrian Water Protection Policy with regard to nutrient control are enshrined in the Austrian Water Act in order:

- to safeguard sustainable use of water for all different purposes (households, industry, agriculture, recreation, fish life, etc);
- to protect resources against pollution that can be harmful to human health and animals;
- to safeguard water as drinking water resource;
- to maintain the natural physical, chemical and biological status of all water bodies.

The key elements for nutrient control and reduction in Austria are:

- Control of point sources via a combined approach;
- Reduction of impacts from diffuse sources.

The progressive combined approach is also enshrined in the future EU Water Framework Directive, which will come into force in the second half of the year 2000. Within this approach both the quality objectives of the receiving waters and the stringent limit values set for discharges have to be respected. Those limit values are set for all major sectors and are based on best available techniques.

The legislation in Austria is harmonised with the requirements of EU legislation for discharges and does not - in general – differentiate between short, medium or long-term measures.

2.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction

(a) Control of point sources

Under the Austrian Water Act, every impact on water (abstractions as well as discharges) that is above the level of insignificance has to be licensed by governmental water authorities. The license is granted for a limited period only. Adaptations due to changing circumstances can be requested by the authorities. Violations of the licenses are fined and in severe cases lead to loss of the permit. The licenses for waste water discharges are based on the combined approach.

Based on the Austrian 1990 Water Act, stringent requirements have been set for waste water discharges, based on best available techniques. 53 sector-specific waste water emission ordinances are currently in force. They determine the relevant sectors and specific parameters and limit concentrations or set maximum loads according to the best available techniques. These standards are part of the license issued by the authority. For waste water producers or for parameters not found in the sector-specific ordinances, the General Ordinance on Waste Water Emission with basic principles and provisions, last amended in 1996, has to be observed.

(b) Phosphorous containing detergents

There are a few legal restrictions in Austria specifically addressing the reduction of detergents in washing powders. The basic act is the Austrian Act on Chemicals BGBI. 53/1997, which requires according to §§ 32 and 33 that the ingredients of washing powder fulfil certain degradability criteria and that harmful substances be replaced by those less harmful to the environment on the basis of best available technique. Further requirements dealing with degradability are fixed in the Ordinance on the Degradability of Certain Detergents BGBI. Nr. 639/1989 as well as in the EU Directives 73/404/EEC, 73/405/EEC and 82/243/EEC.
These three EU directives are currently being reworked with a view to stipulating more ambitious levels of degradability.

Since 1987 phosphorous-containing detergents in washing powders have been reduced to a minimum, in line with the provisions of the Washing Powder Act BGBl. 300/1984, amendment in Annex 1, 1987.

Input of phosphorous in urban waste water has been reduced by more than 50% resulting in significantly reduced P-concentrations in surface waters.

(c) Control of diffuse sources

The main legal instrument to control diffuse sources is based on the EU Nitrates Directive 91/676/EEC (Council Directive covering the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources). A new Austrian Action Programme based on §55b of the Austrian Water Act and in line with the provisions of this directive was launched in September 1999.

The core parts of this Action Programme include:

- restrictions on the period when manure may be spread;
- restrictions in the amount of manure (210 kg nitrogen per hectare at the moment, 170 kg nitrogen per hectare and year after 2002) allowed to be spread;
- provisions for minimum capacities for storage of manure;
- further restrictions on spreading manure along rivers, on slopes etc.

Application of nitrogen (sum of mineral fertiliser and manure) exceeding 210 kg nitrogen per hectare on grassland and 175 kg nitrogen per hectare arable land requires a license according to the provisions of the Austrian Water Act amended in 1990.

In order to avoid an excessive intensification of agriculture “ÖPUL” (Austrian Programme of Environmental Friendly Agriculture) was initiated. This national programme, co-financed by the EC on the basis of regulation agri-environment 2078/91, provides financial incentives for e.g.:

- renunciation of certain fertilisers and pesticides;
- stabilisation of crop rotation;
- bio-farming and integrative production;
- extensification of production;
- maintaining cultivation of extensive grassland (e.g. alpine meadows) and other ecological important areas;
- protection against erosion.

2.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

In fulfilling the requirements of the relevant EU Directives and the requirements of the national legislation a multitude of projects, measures and activities related to nutrient reduction have been implemented and have led to a high standard in the relevant infrastructure and the administrative and institutional framework in international comparison. Thus, there are currently no relevant barriers to policy and legal reforms.

2.4 Envisaged Changes of Nutrient-Related Legislation

In summary, it can be stated that the objective to reduce nutrient input is laid down in various types and sectors of both national and EU legislation. At present, there seems to be no further need for new legislation or special nutrient reduction programme to be designed to address that specific issue.
2.5 Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

Austria disposes of a broad set of legally binding, stringent regulations for point sources as well as for diffuse sources and detergents.

Being an EU Member State implies obligatory compliance with the waste water-relevant EU directives such as the Dangerous Substance Directive (76/464/EEC), the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive (91/271/EEC) and the Integrated Prevention and Pollution Control – IPPC Directive (96/91/EEC) which lays down an integrated pollution prevention and control approach for industrial plants.

Provisions of the EU legislation have been incorporated in the national ordinances, so that Austrian legal norms are completely in line with the requirements of the relevant EU Directives.
3 CZECH REPUBLIC

3.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

The State Environmental Policy of the Czech Republic, approved in 1995 and up-dated 1999, is focused on the strict implementation of sustainable development principles in all sectors and harmonization of the Czech legislation with EU legislation.

In approving the updated SEP, government accepts a number of principles set out in accepted documents of the international community, such as the: (i) precautionary principle, (ii) principle of prevention, (iii) principle of reducing risks at the source, (iv) polluter pays principle, (v) the principle of shared responsibilities, (vi) principle of subsidiarity, (vii) principle of integration, (viii) principle of best available technology, and (ix) principle of substitution.

The acceptance of these internationally approved principles is reflected in the general environmental policy objectives and measures and objectives concerning the hydrosphere as follows:

- Ensure the meeting of international commitments of the Czech Republic in relation to the protection of the watersheds of the Elbe, Morava-Danube and Odra and to co-operation with neighboring countries where waters form the border;
- gradually restore natural water cycles, protect ground waters, increase the retentive ability of the land and ensure the renewable nature of water resources;
- continue with the watercourse rehabilitation programme, renewal of riverbank vegetation and natural meanders and the creation of protective riverbank zones along watercourses and reservoirs;
- for municipal pollution sources, achieve the objective of mechanical and biological treatment of waste water for all settlements with more than 2,000 population equivalents by the year 2010;
- support the application of sludge from wastewater treatment plants in agriculture, especially through limitation of discharges of hazardous substances from industry into public sewers;
- extend monitoring of the quality and quantity of ground and surface waters, including monitoring of the ecological state of waters according to EU requirements, and unify monitoring of rivers and small watercourses;
- prepare and implement action plans for achieving the environmental quality standards set by individual EU Directives in the area of water protection.

The new strategy aims at gradually shifting from normative tools to economic and voluntary ones. Highest priority is given to the protection of surface and ground waters for human consumption, protected areas and wetlands; second priority is given to stretches of watercourses that are classified as heavily polluted.

3.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction

The most essential laws and regulations dealing with nutrient pollution control and prevention are as follows:

- Act No 138/1973 Coll. (Water Act) and its Amendment No 14/1998 Coll., according to which all waters used for human consumption are protected by „protection areas„, where agricultural activities are restricted;
- Government Decree No 82/1999 Coll., establishing parameters and limits of acceptable degree of water pollution (differentiated for municipal, industrial and agricultural waste water discharge) and also immission limits for two categories of surface waters: (i) surface waters for the abstraction of drinking water and (ii) other waters;
- Act No 58/1998 Coll. on charges for waste water discharge to water bodies;
Intimation of the Ministry of Environment No 137/1999 Coll. to the Water Act establishing the list of water reservoirs designated for drinking water production and principles for specification of protected areas of water resources.

### 3.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

The new political orientation launched in 1990 has brought significant changes to all domains of public life. A lot of them have had a favorable impact, especially relating to the environment, and have also influenced organizational and legislative structure of water management.

The main institutional barriers to policy and legal reform include:

- Due to the privatization and removal of the centralized water management, access to needed data has partially been restricted; Law No 123/1998 Coll. regulates access to information on impact on the environment; the prepared law on water supply and sewage will enable access to information on treated and discharged waste water.
- Under the Act on Municipalities, the responsibility for drinking water supply, sewerage system and waste water treatment was assigned to municipalities. Their attitude to the solution of water management problems is weakened by the necessity to solve other problems and low accessibility of financial sources for the construction of sewer systems.
- The transformation of the legal system of the Czech Republic has not yet been accomplished. With the new act, a clear declaration of jurisdiction and responsibilities at all levels of water administration is expected.
- Changes in the structure of the public service and self-government decentralization has not yet been accomplished. The dossier of new laws specifying the responsibilities and cognizance of regions, districts and municipalities is under preparation.
- There are conflicts between environmental protection and economic concerns; lack of finances does not allow sufficient attention to be paid to water-related problems and their solution.

### 3.4 Envisaged Changes of Nutrient-Related Legislation

Only one directive regarding nutrient reduction is missing in the actual legislation of the Czech Republic, the Directive 91/676/EEC concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources.

The most essential laws and regulations currently in the preparation stage include:

- The New Water Act corresponding to EU regulations is on the “legislative schedule” for the year 2000;
- A set of four laws concerning new organizational structure of state administration;
- The adjustment of all laws and regulations required for reaching full compatibility with EU legislation.
3.5 Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

The approximation process is based on the Position Document, the National Programme of the Preparation of the Czech Republic for the EU Membership, and on new Implementation Plans prepared for the individual directives.

The preparation period for the envisaged EU accession has been designated by the Czech Government until January 1, 2003. By this reference date, the EU-condition requiring incorporation of the Acquis Communautaire into the Czech legislature should be fulfilled and relating requirements of its practical application fully implemented.

According to the provided data, the Czech republic requests a transition period for the following issues:

- For the implementation of the Directive 91/676/ECC in connection with implementation of required measures in agriculture (2006);
- For meeting the requirements established by Directive 91/271/EEC for agglomerations between 2000-10000 PE (construction or up-grading of WWTPs) and for more stringent level of treatment required for WWTPs in sensitive areas (2010);
- For the implementation of Directive 76/464/EEC and its daughter directives regarding some heavy metals and organic compounds from industry (2008);
- For attainment limits for the content of some organic compounds and metals in drinking water (2006)

Taking into account the significant improvements achieved during the previous few years, it is expected that the Czech Republic - one of the priority candidates for joining the EU before the year 2005 - can successfully achieve the required harmonization of national environmental legislation with the EU legislation in time; especially if this ambitious task is further supported by international co-funding.
4 SLOVAKIA

4.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

The most recent document in which objectives, priorities and principles of the national environmental policy are defined is the National Environmental Action Plan II (December 1999).

The priorities of the national environmental policy of the Slovak Republic related to the water sector are defined in NEAP II as follows:

- to ensure sufficient amount and quality of drinking water and reduction of pollution of other waters to acceptable level;
- to ensure biological diversity, protection and rational use of natural resources.

The general principles of the national environmental policy are:

- solving environmental problems within the context of the economic development in the society;
- a preference for preventive measures over corrective ones;
- enforcement of environmental policy on all levels and in all sectors, responsible for taking care of the environment, including municipalities, etc;
- solving environmental problems in a synergetic way;
- considering healthy environment as a basic requirement for public health;
- implementing the polluter pays principle;
- assessing the impact of interference related to the environment.

Particular objectives for the water sector are formulated in the NEAP II as follows:

- transposition of EU legislation;
- reduction of polluting substances in waste water discharges to acceptable level by construction of WWTP; use of treatment methods with high efficiency and fulfillment of requirements of EU Directive 91/271;
- realization of measures to support water retention, especially in areas suffering on water deficiency, alleviation of negative effects of flood events;
- introduction of measures to decrease drinking water consumption mainly by reducing losses in waterworks, more reasonable handling by consumers, stricter control of and preventive measures for potential accidents;
- introduction of measures to reduce pollution of watercourses and creation of suitable conditions for their revitalization;
- stricter control and reasonable utilization of water sources;
- protection and rational use of water resources;
- reduction of amount of carcinogenic, teratogenic, mutagenic and other harmful substances in waters below defined acceptable level;
- enforcement of a complex monitoring and information system.
4.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction

The water sector, respectively nutrient-related legislation is formed by the following acts:

**Table 4.2-1: Main Laws and Regulations Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction**

(Actually in Force)

| (1) Law on Water 138/1973 |
| (2) Governmental Decree 242/1993 |
| (3) Regulation 117/1976 on Slovak Water Management Inspection |
| (4) Governmental Decree 31/1975 on fines for violation of obligation in the water management area |
| (5) Governmental Decree 35/1979 on charges in water management area |
| (6) Law 595/1990 on State Administration for Environment |
| (7) Ministerial Order 23/1977 on the protection of surface and ground water quality |
| (8) Ministerial Order 5000/1982 on the protection of water against pollution from agriculture |
| (9) Ministerial Order 5001/1982 on handling and use of manure |
| (10) Law 136/2000 on fertilizers |

Governmental decree 242/1993 has to be used by water management authorities when issuing permits for discharge of waste water; Annex 1, respectively Annex 2 to this decree provide indicators for:
- Maximum permissible pollution level of discharged municipal and industrial waste water;
- Permissible pollution levels in receiving surface water.

Ambient water quality is dealt with in the Slovak Technical Standard STN 757221 Classification of surface water quality, used exclusively for evaluation from the ecological point of view (not for determination of suitability of water for different water uses).

Water sector-related laws currently in progress are:

| (2) Governmental Decree on maximum permissible pollution of waters |

Current environmental legislation, especially regarding effective public participation, has not yet recognized the principles already incorporated in the legislation of western democracies.

4.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

The main barriers fall into two groups: a) those concerning the process of transposition and implementation of the European Union legislation and b) those concerning the implementation and enforcement of the new legislation and regulations.

The first priority is to make a clear definition of the future competencies of the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Soil Management for the water sector. This is the basic prerequisite for the preparation of a new Water Law, which will constitute the basic legal document in the water sector to be accompanied by other laws and regulations.
(1) In order to overcome the deficiencies in institutional and administrative capabilities, the following steps are required:
- Personnel strengthening in the Ministry of the Environment; increase of language capabilities and expertise of personnel to enable adequate transposition of EU Directives into national legislation;
- Personnel strengthening in state administration on regional and district level to support an adequate enforcement of the new legislation;
- Harmonization of monitoring, state statistics and preparation of reporting to the EU Commission;
- Personnel strengthening in the Slovak Environmental Inspection to support adequate enforcement of the existing and new legislation in the environmental sector;
- Personnel strengthening and strengthening of technical capabilities in the Slovak Hydro-meteorological Institute and in the Slovak Environmental Agency.

(2) A very critical issue, it seems, involves the weak enforcement of legislation by the concerned authorities on the national, regional and district level, where the number of employees decreased by 32 % in comparison to year 1996. It is envisaged to reach at least again the level of year 1995. The updated Law on State Administration (planned to be in force by the year 2000) will be very important in this context.

(3) A further critical issue involves the huge financial means required to adjust the national legislation to the EU-Legislation and to secure its implementation. It is estimated that approximately EUR 3.3 - 3.4 billion will be needed in the water sector only, mainly for the implementation of the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive 91/271/EEC.

4.4 Envisaged Changes of Nutrient-Related Legislation

One of the basic priorities of the Government of the Slovak Republic is accession to the EU. In this context, the highest priority regarding nutrient-related legislation is the transposition and implementation of the relevant EU-legislation. Table 4.4-1 contains a list of the planned activities.

Table 4.4-1: List of planned activities in the process of transposition and implementation of EU legislation related to nutrient control and reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Resp.authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Law on sewage</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>MSM SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Governmental Decree setting maximum permissible pollution</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>MOE SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and implementation of requirements of Water Framework Directive from the point of view of legislative and organizational competencies and duties of water management authorities/institutions</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>MOE SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of investment needed to implement UWWT Directive</td>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>MOE SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of technical and investment projects necessary for implementation of measures ensuring good water quality status and their monitoring in accordance with Water Framework Directive</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>MOE SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification and evaluation of areas sensitive to eutrophication processes in accordance with UWWT Directive</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>MOE SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and implementation of the Code of good agricultural practice with the purpose to reduce pollution caused by nitrates</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>MSM SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of criteria for identification of water pollution by nitrates from agricultural sources (in relation to Nitrates Directive)</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>MOE SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of vulnerable areas regarding the Nitrates Directive</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>MoE SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Action Programmes in vulnerable areas to ensure protection of waters against pollution from agriculture (in relation to Nitrates Directive)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>MSM SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of IPPC Directive in water sector (study)</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>MOE SR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding the issue of detergents, a proposal on methods of control of biological degradability of active substances detergents is planned to be prepared by the end of 2000. The Ministry of Economics is responsible for the preparation of this proposal.

### 4.5 Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

The National Programme for Transposition of Acquis Communautaire constitutes the basis for the definition of the envisaged time schedule as outlined in the table below and the financial requirements for the transposition of the EU legislation.

**Table 4.5-1: Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of National Law, Regulation</th>
<th>Related EU Directive / Standard</th>
<th>Proposed Period of Adjustment</th>
<th>Proposed Date of coming In Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Nitrates Directive (Exact name not known)</td>
<td>91/676/EEC</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Full implementation by 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) IPPC Directive</td>
<td>96/61/EEC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full implementation by 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 HUNGARY

5.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

According to the National Environmental Programme (1997-2002) it is an issue of high priority to decrease nitrate and phosphorous load of protected water resources sensitive to nutrients; these areas are priority areas for WWTP with improved (third degree) treatment standards.

According to the EU guidelines wastewater treatment should adequately be solved in settlements with more than 15,000 inhabitants by the year 2000 and in settlements of more than 2,000 inhabitants by the year 2005. The Hungarian national programme of waste water treatment is designed to fulfill these tasks by the year 2010 (due to financing problems).

The long-term objective of the waste water treatment programme is to achieve 67% of sewage collection and treatment all over the country, with a special emphasis on nutrient reduction at vulnerable water resources.

As approximately half of N and P pollution in the country comes from non-point sources, this is clearly recognized as the main area of concern, requiring substantial improvement.

Due to a lack of public subsidies, nutrient pollution from agriculture has dropped substantially and is currently responsible for not more than 15% of total nutrient pollution in the country. Recently, the use of pesticides and artificial fertilizers has became so low that a further reduction seems very difficult; therefore, the basic objective is to maintain the current levels and to prevent an increase in the future.

In October 1999 the Hungarian Government approved the National Agro-Environmental Protection Programme that was elaborated in accordance with Council Regulation 2078/92/EEC on implementation and support of agricultural practices serving protection of environment and safeguarding of landscape values. The programme contains measures planned for the 2000-2006 period, such as:

- Rationally reduced utilization of fertilizers and pesticides;
- Bio-production;
- Extensification;
- Reduction of density;
- Reinforcement of environmentally friendly methods;
- Conservation of landscape;
- Educational programmes and projects.

There is currently no programme on the national scale specifically related to nutrient removal or reduction. The MoE is, however, responsible for programmes that are closely linked to nutrient removal and reduction either for the whole country or for particular regions. The most important programmes are:

- National waste water collection and treatment programme, aimed at the development of adequate waste water treatment capacities of large cities and settlements according to the requirements of EU legislation between 1997 and 2010;
- Programme to improve the water quality and ecological status of Lake Balaton, including the implementation of Phase II of the Kis-Balaton project;
- Programme on Velence Lake;
- A governmental programme is being designed for the implementation of EU nitrate directive.
- Programme on Great Lowland;
- Programme on water supplement of Mid-Danube-Tisza Region;
- Programme on rehabilitation of oxbow lakes.

Hungary has with all its neighbors bilateral, trans-boundary cooperation agreements that also contain nutrient reduction related issues.
5.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction

The most essential acts currently dealing with nutrient pollution reduction and prevention are compiled in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Law, Regulation</th>
<th>Main Subjects</th>
<th>Effective since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)Act no. LIII on General Rules of Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Concept, principles and responsibilities in relation to the environment. Functions and activities of the state and the self-governments. Protection of ground and surface waters.</td>
<td>22 06 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)Act no LVII on water management</td>
<td>Basic rules, functions and principles of water management. Obligations to water and water facilities. Provision on sewer fine. Obligations for the operating of public utilities.</td>
<td>23 06 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)83/1997 Decision of Parliament on National Environmental Programme</td>
<td>Major targets of environmental protection by environmental elements. Tasks to reach the targets planned and proposed programmes.</td>
<td>26 09 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) 2207/1996 (VII.24.) Government Decision on Waste water disposal and treatment programme for Hungarian settlements</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 07 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) 3/1984 Decree of President of National Water Authority on waste water fines</td>
<td>Method of calculation of waste water fines. Definition of damaging pollution and the procedure of imposing and utilization of waste water fines.</td>
<td>00 00 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) 4/1984 Decree of President of National Water Authority on sewerage fines</td>
<td>Prohibits emission of harmful waste water. Regulation of sampling. Method for calculating and paying the charge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) MSZ12749 Hungarian Standard on quality of surface water; quality characteristics and classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)33/2000 Government decree on ground water protection</td>
<td>Protection of ground waters in full accordance with EC 80/68/EEC directive</td>
<td>07.06.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Decree of Minister of Transport, Communication and Water Management on Water management council</td>
<td>Regulation of the tasks, contents and field of activity of WM Councils</td>
<td>00 00 1998.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following eight items, expected to regulate nutrient emissions, are currently in the process of preparation, under the co-ordination of the MoE.
Table 5.2-2: Main Laws and Regulations Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction (Currently in Progress)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Law, Regulation</th>
<th>Main Subjects</th>
<th>Date of Coming in Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Decree of government on surface water pollution control</td>
<td>EU-harmonized regulation; subject outlined in the name of the law.</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Ministerial Decree on waste water emission permits</td>
<td>EU-harmonized regulation; subject outlined in the name of the law.</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Ministerial Decree on sensitivity of surface waters</td>
<td>EU-harmonized regulation; subject outlined in the name of the law.</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Ministerial Decree on water quality classification on ecological basis</td>
<td>EU-harmonized regulation; subject outlined in the name of the law.</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Ministerial Decree on surface water quality objectives</td>
<td>EU-harmonized regulation; subject outlined in the name of the law.</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Ministerial Decree on good agricultural practice</td>
<td>EU-harmonized regulation; subject outlined in the name of the law.</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Ministerial Decree on identification of zones, vulnerable to nitrate pollution, for the protection of ground water</td>
<td>EU-harmonized regulation; subject outlined in the name of the law.</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Governmental Decree on protection of waters against N-pollution from agricultural sources</td>
<td>EU-harmonized regulation; subject outlined in the name of the law.</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If these decrees should come in force as scheduled, Hungary would dispose of a relatively complete and satisfying legal framework for water management and water pollution control.

5.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

The main barrier to policy and legal reforms in Hungary is the slow lawmaking process, which is mainly caused by inappropriate structure of the administrative system. The nutrient issue – including detergents – is dealt with in the following ministries:

- Ministry of the Environment,
- Ministry of Transport and Water Management,
- Ministry of Health,
- Ministry of Agriculture and Regional Development,
- Ministry of Economics.

5.4 Envisaged Changes of Nutrient-Related Legislation

(1) Enforcement of the existing and future legislation concerning N and P removal in waste water treatment in the catchments of sensitive surface and subsurface waters.

(2) Phosphate-free detergents

In 1996, a PHARE programme was completed on phosphorous subject. The Project no: EU/AR/205/97; Contract no. 95-0036.00 Title: Removal of Phosphate from detergents in the Danube basin.
Experts from 12 DRB countries were involved in this project. According to the findings of this project, criteria for the selection of environmentally friendly detergent products should focus on:

- reduction of the load and impact of detergents to the necessary extent (e.g. criteria on dosage, soluble/insoluble inorganic, aerobic/anaerobic biodegradable ingredients);
- preference for those ingredients undergoing quick and ultimate biodegradation and with aquatic impairments as low as possible, which is considered under the criterion: critical dilution volume;
- non-use of ingredients which are known to have adverse effects on the aquatic environment;
- restriction on ingredients having high figures on acute toxicity and on combinations with low biodegradability and/or accumulation potential;
- consumer should be better informed on the environmental impacts of the products.”

According to the above listed issues, Hungary has not introduced the simplified approach of “phosphate free detergents”, but a more careful classification of detergents with State Standard: pulverous synthetic detergents (MSZ 14604-86).

According to this Standard, detergents fall into the following categories:

- pre-wash: loosen the dirt even in cold water, making washing easier
- hand-wash: neutral, or lightly alkaline chemical reaction, suitable for sensitive to heat, alkaline and easy-to-handle textile materials, gentle hand or machine washing at the temperature of up to 60 C.
- regular: produced in the largest volume, light or medium alkaline products, suitable for washing at the temperature of 30-40 C as well as over 60 C.

Classification of detergents on the basis of phosphorus content by Standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$P_2O_5$ - Content (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Environment friendly</td>
<td>less than 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Within safe limit</td>
<td>between 7-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Maximal allowed quantity</td>
<td>maximal 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td>over 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zeolite A is most commonly used for replacing the water softening property of phosphates in P- free detergents The average Zeolite A content is about 20%.

(3) Introduction of good agricultural practice including reduced use of fertilizers in sensitive areas.

5.5 Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

With decision No. 2280/1999. (XI.30.) and amendment No. 2140/2000 (VI.23) the Hungarian government has established a binding schedule for approximation of the national legislation to the EU-legislation, with the end of 2002 set as the deadline for completing the approximation.

Regarding nitrate/phosphorous reduction, the national legislation will be completed with new laws fully in line with the requirements of the respective EU-Directives:
Table 5.5-2: Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of National Law, Regulation</th>
<th>Related EU Directive / Standard</th>
<th>Period of Adjustment</th>
<th>Date of coming In Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) New regulation</td>
<td>EC 91/676/EEC concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources</td>
<td>2000-2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking into account the significant improvements achieved during the previous few years, it is expected that Hungary - one of the priority candidates to join the EU before the year 2005 - can successfully achieve the required harmonization of the national environmental legislation with the EU legislation in time, especially if this ambitious task is further supported by international co-funding.
6 SLOVENIA

6.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

The most recent document in which objectives, priorities and principles of the state environmental policy are defined is the National Environmental Action Plan, and a more detailed action plan, i.e. the National ISPA Strategy of the Republic of Slovenia: Environmental Sector (1999).

From the NEAP, the following main policy principles can be summarized:

- Slovenia has to adapt its environmental protection system to meet the EU requirements;
- The adoption of the EU legal issues regarding the environment is not only an obligation but also an opportunity to solve the environmental problems faster;
- The alignment with EU environmental policy is an opportunity to introduce changes to the production and consumption patterns;
- The expected negative effects of Slovenia’s approximation to the EU have to be controlled;
- Transitional periods and additional funds have to be ensured for certain sectors or tasks, e.g. UWWTD, IPPC, etc.

The main objectives as formulated by the National Water Programme are as follows:

- Formulation of principles for sustainable water management;
- Implementation of integrated water management;
- Creation of regional institutions and enterprises to manage water quality and quantity;
- Development of a financial system to support the water management strategy;
- Development of inspection and control systems;
- Development of an information system on water economy.

6.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction

(1) Relevant laws and regulations currently in force

In the field of pollution reduction, MESP in 1993 drafted the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) which played a major role in the modernization of the perception of the environment by all stakeholders. Nowadays, it needs some amendments that will be passed together with the Water Act (Water Law) which is expected to come into force in summer/autumn this year. Along with these two umbrella laws, a list of subordinated regulation has been made since. The most important ones are: (i) the Slovenian Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive with accompanying sub-directives regarding different types of industries and wastewater, and (ii) the Slovenian Nitrates Directive.
Table 6.2-1: Main Laws and Regulations Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction
(Currently in Force)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Law, Regulation</th>
<th>Authority Responsible</th>
<th>Main Subjects</th>
<th>Effective since</th>
<th>Main Deficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Environmental Protection Act, EPA</td>
<td>MESP</td>
<td>umbrella law for the environment</td>
<td>(OJ RS, 32/93)</td>
<td>needs to be reviewed due to EU WFD and SI Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) National Environmental Action Programme, NEAP</td>
<td>MESP</td>
<td>concrete measures up to 2003, programme up to 2008</td>
<td>September 1999</td>
<td>not specific enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Emission regulations</td>
<td>MESP</td>
<td>limit emissions in terms of concentration and mass load for WWTP’s and diverse industries</td>
<td>Subsequently from 1996</td>
<td>OK, in compliance with Annex III of EU UWWTD 91/271/EEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Water taxation</td>
<td>MESP</td>
<td>taxation for pollution, increases tax each year</td>
<td>Start in 1995</td>
<td>money goes to the state budget rather than to water sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) EIA</td>
<td>MESP</td>
<td>Environmental impact assessment</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Relevant laws and regulations in progress

The most urgent regulation is the Water Act, which was supposed to come into force already two years ago. It is now finally being debated in the Parliament and is expected to come into force in summer/autumn 2000. Similarly, the Slovenian Integrated Pollution Prevention Directive is being prepared; due to the great economic impact on the industry it will probably need an implementation period until the year 2011.

The Decree On Water Pollution Tax is amended each year raising the unit price for pollution. Its progressive rise is an incentive for polluters to take care of their pollution either to reduce it by change of technology or to remove it from waste-water by WWTP.

In agriculture, there is a need to systematically review the agricultural practices in order to reduce nutrients release/washout into the environment.

Table 6.2-2: Main Laws and Regulations Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction
(Currently in Progress)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Law, Regulation</th>
<th>Authority Responsible</th>
<th>Main Subjects</th>
<th>Date of coming In Force</th>
<th>Main Deficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(I) Water Act</td>
<td>MESP</td>
<td>Umbrella law for water, corresponding to EU WFD</td>
<td>Summer 2000</td>
<td>not totally compatible with EU WFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Water Act</td>
<td>MESP</td>
<td>Definition of vulnerable zones</td>
<td>Summer 2000</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Sensitive zones</td>
<td>MESP</td>
<td>Definition of eutrophic zones</td>
<td>Autumn 2000</td>
<td>weak definition in EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Urban agglomerations</td>
<td>MESP</td>
<td>Defines urban agglomerations for UWWTD</td>
<td>Autumn 2000</td>
<td>weak definition in EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) IPPC</td>
<td>MESP</td>
<td>Integrated pollution prevention</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) WFD</td>
<td>MESP</td>
<td>Covers issues from EU WFD</td>
<td>2000, or 2001</td>
<td>regional government is not established yet, no provision for RBM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) Main deficiencies

There are certainly no substantial deficiencies in the newly accepted regulations, although some of them are not fully compatible with the existing or future EU legislation. However, it is to be expected that given its restricted financial resources Slovenia will not be able to fulfill all the requirements of the new legislation by the time of the envisaged accession to the EU.

6.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

Main barriers are listed in the National Environmental Action Programme (NEAP) of 1999.

(1) Main barriers to policy reform:
   - Lack of adequately trained personnel at governmental level;
   - Slow planning and decision making processes;
   - Insufficient binding;
   - Apparent lack of consistency;
   - Excessive administrative apparatus.

(2) Main barriers to legal reform:
   - Lack of adequately trained personnel at governmental level;
   - Slow response to necessary changes;
   - Legal provisions based on threats rather than rewards.

6.4 Envisaged Changes of Nutrient Related Legislation

(1) Proposed changes of relevant laws and regulations

The most urgent changes have basically been done. The UWWTD and the Nitrates Directive were introduced in 1996; the Water Act and amendments to the EPA are now expected to come into force. No explicit changes to nutrient control or reduction are expected, as the decrees already satisfactorily reflect the corresponding EU legislation. Only the agricultural sector has still to provide guidelines and regulations for sustainable agriculture.

(2) Proposed schedule for out-phasing of P-containing detergents

Slovenia is in the favorable position that the EU market has already forced industry to abandon P-containing detergents. The detergents Slovenia imports are also P-free.

6.5 Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

Due to the enormous costs associated with complying with the UWWTD (approximately 50% of all environmental costs!), Slovenia is not able to fulfill the requirements in a short time. As part of integrated water management policy, the Operational Programme for Urban Wastewater Collection and Treatment With the Water Supply Projects Programme (Ur. I. RS, 94/99) has been adopted. It determines the schedule for the implementation of measures (programmes and investments) included in the National Environmental Action Programme. The register of agglomerations - areas where the population and/or economic activities are sufficiently concentrated for urban wastewater to be collected and conducted to a public wastewater treatment plant - has been drawn up, and data on industrial waste water have been collected, as laid down in Annex III to the Directive. The final date for compliance with the EU UWWTD is scheduled for the end of 2015.
### Table 6.5-1: Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of National Law, Regulation</th>
<th>Related EU Directive / Standard</th>
<th>Proposed Period of Adjustment</th>
<th>Date of Coming in Force</th>
<th>Final Status of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) Agricultural practices</td>
<td>2078/92 and the Nitrates Directive</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) IPPC</td>
<td>MESP</td>
<td>Integrated pollution prevention</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>30.09.2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 CROATIA

7.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

According to the National Water Pollution Control Plan of January 1999, the overall objective for water pollution control is to protect the environment and life and health of people by providing adequate water for different purposes of utilization.

The priorities regarding water pollution control and water management are ranked as follows:
- Preservation of water resources which are still clean (i.e. upstream river stretches of quality class I and groundwater) as future drinking water resources;
- Avoidance of further degradation of the current water quality;
- Restoration or removal of sources of pollution concerning existing or planned drinking water resources, as well as other resources where water is used for different human and economic purposes (usually water resources of class II or III);
- Strengthening the monitoring of sources of water pollution or potential accidental emergencies.

The objective of the National Water Pollution Control Plan is that water shall be managed in accordance with the principle of integrity of the river system and the principle of sustainable development.

The National Water Pollution Control Plan includes the following principles: (i) precautionary principle, (ii) the use of BAT, (iii) control of the pollution at source, (iv) the polluter pays principle, and (v) commitment to regional cooperation and shared information among the neighboring countries.

Regarding municipal WWTPs, the priorities are defined as follows:
- WWTPs > 50000 PE: in this category there are 29 WWTPs to be newly constructed or extended for improved treatment standards (biological treatment, N+P elimination);
- WWTPs > 10000 PE in sensitive areas (to be implemented by the year 2005);
- WWTPs > 15000 PE (to be implemented by the year 2010);
- WWTPs between 2000 and 15000 PE (to be implemented by the year 2025).

7.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction

Due to the fact that Croatia has been an independent state only since 1990, its legal and institutional structures are still in the process of transformation, which also applies to the fields of water management and environmental protection. The most essential laws and regulations dealing with nutrient reduction are:
- The Water Act, which provides a framework for new regulations in the fields of water pollution control and water quality control in compliance with the EU regulations and the relevant international conventions;
- Water Management Financing Act (No 10795);
- Ordinance on Water Classification (No 77/98);
- Ordinance on Hazardous Substances in Water (No 78/98);
- Regulations on the issuing of water management consents and permits (No 28/96);
- National Water Pollution Control Plan (8/99);
- Regulation on the discharge of hazardous and other substances into water (No 44/99).

Ordinance No 77/98 on water classification defines: (i) water quality related to maximum allowed values of specific groups of water quality indicators, (ii) methods of sampling and analyzing and methods of defining and presenting water classification, (iii) ambient quality standards.
Ordinance 78/98 on water-related hazardous substances defines, beside others, two groups of substances:

- **Group A** - substances that are forbidden to be discharged into waters;
- **Group B** – substances that can be discharged into waters but only at maximum permissible levels; regarding nutrient reduction in group B are regulated: (i) biological non suspended detergents and other surface active substances; (ii) inorganic phosphorus compounds and elementary phosphorus, and (iii) inorganic nitrogen compounds and elementary nitrogen.

Regulation on maximum allowed concentrations of hazardous substances in waste waters defines effluent standards as follows:

- For total phosphorus, ortho-phosphates, ammonia, nitrites, nitrates, total nitrogen for discharging of waste water in categories II, III, IV, V of planned water classes (discharging of waste water to category I is forbidden);
- For waste water quality from municipal sources (SS, BOD, COD total P, total N) dependent on size of WWTP (PE), and water categorization (planned class), respectively sensitivity of the recipient.

The main deficiency underlying all legislation regarding nutrient control and reduction is that legislation is primarily oriented to point-sources pollution. The issues of diffuse pollution are regulated very generally (only basic principles).


Regarding the out-phasing of P-containing detergents there is no existing or planned regulation. But according to the regulations of the Water Act, water management permits have to be issued for chemicals and their derivatives which get into water after use. That is the only existing mechanism that can be directly used regarding P-containing detergents. The existing mechanisms which can indirectly be used regarding P-containing detergents are ambient quality standards and effluent standards which are regulated in the following ordinances and regulations: (i) Ordinance on water classification, (ii) Ordinance on water related hazardous substances, (iii) Regulation on maximum allowed concentrations of hazardous substances in waste water.

Mechanisms for the implementation of the legislation (especial financial mechanisms) are not completely developed. Regulations for calculation of water pollution charges and definition of charging levels are currently in the status of preparation and are expected to become effective in 2000.

### 7.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

The main barriers to policy and legal reforms can be summarized as follows:

- Environmental protection, respectively water protection is not considered as a top priority in Croatia. As in the past, this issue continues to be neglected and mechanisms for environmental protection are not developed.
- Due to the bad economical situation and due to the basically improved environmental conditions (mainly resulting from decreased industrial and agricultural production) it is difficult to convince the responsible officials about the necessity to spend for environmental protection the money that is urgently needed for other developmental tasks.
- There is a significant lack of administrative and institutional capabilities; particularly regarding local community authorities and particularly in the less developed rural areas. In other words, a task assigned to the authorities of a local community can only be executed with assistance from the state administration.
7.4 Envisaged Changes of Nutrient-related Legislation

Since the Republic of Croatia became an independent country, legislation related to water management/pollution control has been changed. These changes are in the final phase on the state level; the coming task for the state administration will be to assist the local authorities by establishing necessary legislation/regulations on the local level and to improve and develop the mechanisms for the implementation of the legislation.

The main changes that have to be considered in the near future are supposed to result from the approximations of the national legislation to the EU legislation.

There are currently no explicit plans for nutrient-related changes in the legislation. The existing legislation requires particular tasks to be fulfilled which will definitely need changes, respectively the development of new nutrient-related legislation; these tasks are: (i) Revision of the monitoring system, (ii) Water Management Master Plan for Croatia and County Master Plans, (iii) County Water Pollution Control Plans, etc.

There is currently no concrete programme or schedule for control, respectively out-phasing of P-containing detergents.

7.5 Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

Until now the Government of the Republic of Croatia has not yet established a National Programme for EU-accession. In January 1999, the government officially addressed the responsible ministries and state directorates asking them to research the possibilities for approximation of the national legislation to the EU legislation, including water management and control issues. Partial approximation has already been accepted, but there are no systematic plans for fulfilling this crucial task. The actual status can be outlined as follows:

- Water Framework Directive
  * The approach of this Directive seems basically accepted for incorporation into national legislation (river basin approach, river basin districts, river basin management plans, public information and consultations, programme of measures).

- Nitrate Directive
  * This Directive is only accepted as “issue” which has to be taken into consideration, but not in a systematic way.
  * Regulation on the protection of agricultural land against pollution from hazardous substances defines (i) substances that have to be considered as hazardous for agricultural land, (ii) maximum allowed quantities of these substances in the soil, (iii) measures for soil protection in order to protect agricultural land for the production of healthy food.

- Urban Waste Water Directive
  * This Directive is basically accepted; what currently still remains to be fully accepted is a binding time schedule for implementation, strict obligations related to tertiary treatment (only in sensitive areas), and strict standards regarding waste water control (frequency of sampling, methods of analyzing, water quality indicators); issues related to sludge treatment have basically been accepted but not regulated in detail.
  * The national effluent standards take into account the standards of the Urban Waste Water Directive.

There are no explicit plans for a full approximation of nutrient-related national legislation to the respective EU Directives. At the same time, it is obvious that these plans will have to defined within a very short time, but more detailed information can not be provided at this point.
8 BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

8.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

Since the Dayton Peace Agreement of 1995, the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina has consisted of two entities: the Federation of B&H and the Republic Srpska. Both entities have their own policies and legislation regarding the management and protection of water resources, but they share some common principles, i.e.:

- water is a public good;
- water is a limited natural resource which has to be used rationally within the limits of recoverability, both in quantity and quality;
- water management and protection is a joint task of all institutions, companies and individuals dealing with water.

Generally, B&H is faced with big economic and social constraints. In such a situation it is very difficult for policy-makers to develop long-term objectives with priority to environmental protection and management. Lack of coordination and cooperation between the ministries and authorities responsible for environmental issues constitutes the main obstacle to efficient and fast legislative preparation and adoption.

Until now, there have been no explicitly formulated policy objectives, priorities or programmes on water protection in general and on nutrient control / reduction in particular.

8.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction

Since the declaration of the new constitution in 1994, environmental legislation is still in the constitutional phase.

Responsible ministries in both Entities have prepared draft Environmental Laws; as it was recognized that the draft laws were not in accordance with the principles of the EU legislation. OHR terminated their adoption.

Laws on Physical Planning that are currently enforced in both Entities of B&H, address the issues of urban planning, environment protection and land, water and air protection, while the Water Laws, different for both Entities, deal with water management issues.

The Federal Water Law seems to be mainly focused on the establishment and financing of Public Companies for Watershed Areas (PWCAs) for the Sava River and the Adriatic Sea catchment areas. The Water Law does not contain sufficient provisions on permits, legal procedures, international standards and conditions for water use. In consequence, it fails to provide an effective basis for water regulation. The main deficiencies include a strong concentration of the PWCAs and insufficient alignment to EU principles, particularly those relating to an integrated environmental approach to river basin management.

Besides the Regulation on Harmful Substances not to be Discharged into Waters, there are no explicit legal provisions or standards within the current legislative directly or indirectly dealing with nutrient control and reduction.

The existing legislation does not contain any binding provisions on out-phasing P-containing detergents. The only detergent producing factory in B&H is currently using both zeolite and phosphorus components in its products. It is left to the producers to use the ingredients they prefer, but they are advised to use environment-friendly ingredients such as zeolite.
Table 8.2-1: Main Laws and Regulations Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Law, Regulation</th>
<th>Main Subjects</th>
<th>Effective since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Currently in force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Law on Physical Planing</td>
<td>Urban planning, environmental protection and land, water and air protection</td>
<td>April, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Water Law</td>
<td>Water management</td>
<td>May, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Regulation on Hygienic Accuracy of Drinking Water</td>
<td>Drinking water standards</td>
<td>May 1987, rev. 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Regulation on Harmful Substances not to be Discharged into Waters</td>
<td>Threshold values for harmful substances not to be discharged</td>
<td>January, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Regulation on Types, Manner and Scope of Measurement, Investigation of Used and Discharged Polluted Water</td>
<td>Wastewater quality standards, method for analysis and taxation mechanisms</td>
<td>December 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Currently in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Regulation on Threshold Concentrations of Harmful and Dangerous Materials that May be Found in Process Waters</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Regulation on Threshold Concentrations of Harmful and Dangerous Materials that may be Discharged to the Recipient after Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Regulation on Threshold Concentrations of Harmful and Dangerous Materials that may be Discharged onto Agricultural Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

During the previous decade of dramatic changes, no progress was made in the development of the national legal system in general or the legal system for environmental protection in particular. Lack of efficient coordination and cooperation between the two entities’ environmental authorities and poor cooperation between provincial and local authorities responsible for environmental development and planning are considered to be the major barrier to policy and legal reforms. The issue of establishing better cooperation among environmental authorities in B&H has for some time been on the political agenda of B&H and the European Commission representatives in B&H.

The main problems and deficiencies can be summarized as follows:

1. Regulatory and institutional deficiencies/problems
   - environmental legislation and policy is not harmonized and integrated at the country level;
   - framework environmental laws at entity level do not exist;
   - bodies/agencies for integrated coastal and river basin management do not exist;
   - weak vertical co-ordination in the Federation of B&H;
   - weak inter-entities institutional co-operation;
   - shortage of qualified expert staff and education;
   - shortage of basic data on human activities and human resources;
   - inadequate monitoring of water quality and quantity;
   - weak public participation in decision making process.
(2) Environmental deficiencies/problems
  ➢ uncontrolled discharging of municipal and industrial waste water into surface waters;
  ➢ shortage of waste water treatment plants;
  ➢ uncontrolled disposal of solid waste - unsanitary damping sites and illegal landfills;
  ➢ uncontrolled flood risks;
  ➢ ecosystem degradation;
  ➢ loss of biological diversity, endangered species and habitats;
  ➢ shortage of modern intensive agricultural production;
  ➢ inadequate use of available water resources.

(3) Social/economical problems
  ➢ unemployment and low living standard of the population;
  ➢ significant decrease in national and especially international tourism;
  ➢ destroyed industrial facilities,
  ➢ significantly reduced agricultural production and livestock farming.

(4) Public participation
  ➢ public participation in environmental matters is the key to successful implementation of an appropriate environmental strategy;
  ➢ public awareness of environmental problems and interest in solving these problems do not currently exist;
  ➢ active public participation in environmental policies has to be encouraged; non-governmental environmental organizations have to be supported; environmental information and its dissemination through the mass media have to be improved.

8.4 Envisaged Changes of Nutrient-Related Legislation

For the time being, there are no explicit plans for nutrient-related changes in legislation; but the adoption of the new environmental law is urgently awaited.

Since the envisaged harmonization of the national legislation with EU legislation will automatically lead to the elaboration and adoption of laws and regulations on nutrient control and reduction, this procedure is considered as a high priority for the current year.

There are currently no explicit plans for control, respectively out-phasing of P-containing detergents.

8.5 Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

The country as a whole is deeply committed to approaching EU standards, but in order to do so it must first fulfill at least the minimum preconditions required for an appropriate management and monitoring of the environment at the national level.

Drawing up and adopting the Framework Environmental Law is a prerequisite for B&H to establish an efficient environmental management and protection system and to become a member of the EU and other international organizations. During 1999, the Terms of Reference were prepared and the finalization of this Law is expected within the current year.

It is clearly recognized that the existing laws are not harmonized with the EU principles and should therefore be modified. Within the current reforms in the water and environment sector in B&H, the EC will through the EC Environmental Programme for B&H provide technical and financial assistance for the elaboration of Laws on Water Protection, Laws on Solid Waste, Laws on Nature Protection, Laws on Air Protection, and Laws providing a comprehensive framework for environment licensing for both Entities. The drawing up of sector laws will be based on the Framework Environmental Law guidelines and is planned to start within the current year.

A concrete time schedule for approximation of national legislation to EU legislation in terms of pollution control / reduction has not yet been established.
9 YUGOSLAVIA

9.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

The general policy objectives, priorities, and principles for nutrient control and reduction are laid down in the Resolution on the Environment Protection Policy adopted by the Federal Government, and can be summarized as follows:

- Creation of a basis for the development of a humane society in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia which will continue to develop on a permanent basis in conformity with nature, bearing in mind the right of the future generations to satisfy their needs on the same or a higher level;
- Creation of conditions for the preservation and rational use of natural resources and prevention of their degradation; prevention of uncontrolled pollution and further degradation of the environment, and elimination of the consequences of earlier pollution and degradation of the environment;
- Management of the environment in a manner conducive to the protection and improvement of human health;
- Development of an integral system of protection and improvement of the environment and quality of life, improvement of the existing system of protection of the environment and provision of an institutional frame for effective operation of that system;
- Gradual enforcement of the polluter pays principle on the basis of regulations applicable to the country as a whole;
- Creation of conditions for the development of pollution control methods suited to the peculiarities of the country and its attained level of development;
- Preservation of a “satisfactory” ecological balance in the country and participation in the protection of the biosphere;
- Prevention of the import and transfer of hazardous matters and so-called “dirty” technologies.

Most of these objectives and principles indirectly relate to nutrient control and reduction.

Concerning water pollution control, the above mentioned objectives are to be reached by the following means:

- further development of integral River Basin Management;
- further development of “polluter pays” principle and strict implementation in the practice;
- further development of market mechanisms in Water Sector;
- implementation of strict regulations;
- construction of new WWTPs;
- renovation of industrial capacities and replacement of old facilities and technologies by environment-friendly ones;
- strengthening of monitoring system and inspection;
- strengthening of research, education and training.

All these measures will not only improve the water quality of recipients in general but also reduce nutrient emission. With the construction of the planned municipal WWTPs based on biological treatment and proper operation, an average removal of Nitrogen and Phosphorous of 15%, respectively 25% can be anticipated.

International cooperation in the field of environmental protection was very intensive and rather successful before sanctions were imposed on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. FR YU has ratified 51 international treaties relating to the issues of the environment thus showing its readiness to cooperate.
9.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction

The legal framework for environmental protection and the protection of water resources and aquatic ecosystems is created by federal and republican regulations. The Federal and Republican constitutions stipulate the responsibilities of the Federal level and the Republican level for environmental protection issues.

The general characteristic of the legal system of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which also exerts influence on environmental protection, is a maladjustment of its elements, i.e. a discrepancy between the republican constitutions and the federal constitution. The system does provide mechanisms for the removal of these discrepancies, but they have not been sufficiently used so far. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that these discrepancies in the system will be regulated in the near future. This calls for coordinated activities between the republics, which fully-developed systems of environmental protection, and the federation, which is authorized to lay down the fundaments of the system of environmental protection. In addition, the federal state, as a legal entity in international law, has the right to sign and ratify international treaties and agreements.

It should be pointed out that numerous regulations relating to water management (especially by-laws) were adopted a long time ago, that they were frequently amended and that it is necessary to revise them.

There are at present no laws or regulations explicitly related to nutrient control and reduction, but there are some appropriate mechanism in use (issuing of Water Consent, approval of Environmental Impact Assessment Studies).

Regarding nitrogen and phosphorus emissions, there is a system of use-related criteria, regulations and standards for recipients. Effluent standards have not yet been established.

Maximum permissible levels for nitrogen (ammonia, nitrates, nitrites) concentration in the recipients are related to different water classes as in other countries and are relatively strict.

Maximum permissible levels for Phosphorous are not regulated in the federal legislation but are indirectly defined by oxygen saturation indicators for the different water classes.

Although the maximum permissible levels for Phosphorous in recipients are not prescribed by regulations, the State Service has been monitoring the concentration of Phosphorous in the rivers for a long period so that it was possible to compute the P-mass balance and changes of P-mass flow in the rivers within the Danube Basin in FR Yugoslavia.

9.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

The main barriers to sector policy reform are:
- unstable economic and political situation;
- lack of funds.

The main barriers to legal reform are in addition:
- Lack of sectoral and regional consensus on the environmental issue;
- Lack of finance to support the urgently required revision of the existing legal framework.

9.4 Proposed Changes of Nutrient-Related Legislation

(1) Proposed changes of relevant laws and regulations

There is currently no new legal document dealing with the issue of water pollution control in general or with nutrient control/reduction in particular.

There is a substantial need to revise the legal framework related to environmental protection in general and to water protection, respectively nutrient control and reduction, in particular, in order to achieve an utmost approximation to the requirements of the EU-Legislation.
A thorough proposal for the required changes of relevant regulations could only be done on the basis of a serious study of this issue.

(2) Out-phasing of P-containing detergents

The consumption of detergents in FR of Yugoslavia is about 52 000 t/y. There is no production of P-free detergents in FR YU. In the past, the main producers have tried to establish a production of detergents based on zeolites (instead of polyphosphates) but no serious improvement was made.

For the time being, there is neither a plan nor a schedule for the out-phasing of P-containing detergents. It is left to the producers to decide what kind of detergents they will produce depending on their capabilities and availability of raw materials under the current circumstances. Therefore, there is also no analyses or estimate of the cost of introduction of P-free detergents.

9.5 Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

Although FR Yugoslavia is not seen as a candidate to access EU in the next decade, there is a general statement of the Federal Government that each new legal document has to be approximated as much as possible to the EU regulations.

Under the current political circumstances there is no real motivation for serious and urgent work for harmonization of the national legislation with EU legislation, which means that this will probably be done case by case under pressure from the need for new regulations.

For the time being, there is no schedule for approximation of the national legislation to the EU-legislation.
10 BULGARIA

10.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

The MOEW carries out the government policy for integrated water management and sustainable water use aimed at meeting the demand and preserving the water resources for future users.

The environmental policy currently implemented by the Ministry of Environment and Waters, includes reduction and prevention of nutrient pollution. It is designated to:

- EC Accession Partnership and Implementation of the National Programme for the Adoption of the Acquis (NPAA);
- Government Programme 2001;
- Environmental Strategy for ISPA;
- National environmental sector strategies and programmes;
- National sector strategies and programmes; and
- fulfilling obligations under the Conventions for the Protection of the Danube River and the Black Sea.

There are several policy documents, but no one especially for nutrient reduction.

The recently developed national programme for Priority Construction of Urban WWTPs in Bulgaria was adopted by the Council of Ministers in 1999.

The objective of this programme is to establish priorities by river basin for the construction of urban WWTPs for all settlement areas in the country with over 10,000 equivalent inhabitants, as well as national short-term priorities until 2002. It includes completion, construction, reconstruction, extension and modernization of the existing urban WWTP, as well as the design and construction of new urban WWTPs. All proposed projects are within the scope and correspond to the requirements of EC Directive 91/271/EEC.

10.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction

The harmonization of the national legislation regarding water and solid waste management, ecology, health and the procedures for environmental impact assessment with international regulations and standards was started in 1990 and is an ongoing process. Up to now, the complex system of environment and water-related legislation has obviously not been made fully compatible and suitable for adequate control and management of the serious environmental problems faced by the country.

As the existing legislation in the water sector does not sufficiently correspond to the requirements of the EU legislation, a specific programme for a harmonization of the national legislation with the EU legislation has been launched.

In July 1999, a new water act was adopted by the parliament and put in force on 28 January, 2000. This water act introduces the guiding requirements of the EU Water Framework Directive and provides the framework for introducing sub-ordinate directives. It provides the basis for an integrated water resources management and sustainable use, including the protection of water from pollution. The Law regulates property rights over waters, water-economic systems, equipment and works. The water management is realized: (i) on the national level by the Council of Ministers and the MOEW, (ii) on the basin level by the River Basin Directorate.

It is expected that - with the introduction of particular laws and regulations – a complete approximation to the relevant EU directives will be achieved in the short term.
Table 10.2-1: Main Laws and Regulations Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Law, Regulation</th>
<th>Main Subjects</th>
<th>Effective since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Currently in force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Environmental Protection Law</td>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Regulation No 4</td>
<td>This Regulation sets certain conditions, procedures and requirements for Environmental Impact Assessments as provided for in the Environment Protection Act</td>
<td>7 July, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Water Law</td>
<td>This Law provides the activities for integrated water resources management and their sustainable use, including the protection of water from pollution. The Law regulates property rights over waters, water-economic systems, equipment and works. The water management is realized: (i) on the national level by the Council of Ministers and MOEW, (ii) on the basin level by the River Basin Directorate.</td>
<td>28 January, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Draft Law for Water Users Associations</td>
<td>It will regulate the establishment and competence of these associations. The law will set the rules for the exploitation of water and the use of drainage systems by the Water Users Association.</td>
<td>Not yet adopted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The currently adopted standards with respect to nutrient control / reduction are laid down in the following regulations:

- Regulation No 7 for the ambient water quality permissible limits;
- Regulation No 8 for the Black Sea water quality permissible limits;
- BDS 2585 - Bulgarian State Standard for drinking water quality.

A particular problem in this context is that the currently adopted ambient water quality permissible limits, which are even stronger than the EU standards, are not achievable.

10.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

The main barriers to policy and legal reforms can be summarized as follows:

- Continuos transition period from planned to market-oriented economy;
- Low economic capabilities and high investment needs for further economic development;
- Lack of adequate funds;
- Social problems, especially in rural areas;
- Lack of a particular National Nutrient Pollution Reduction Strategy;
- Lack of administrative and institutional capabilities for the enforcement of EU principles and implementation of the integrated water management approach;
- Weak enforcement due to insufficient resources (staff numbers, motivation, training, equipment);
- Lack of a concept for tertiary treatment of municipal wastewater as „sensitive areas“ in the sense of the Urban Wastewater Directive have not yet been defined; according to the experts of the MOEW at least the Black Sea WWTPs require tertiary treatment (nutrient removal);
- Good agricultural practices are not pursued due to lack of knowledge, continuos agrarian reform and lack of investment means;
- Lack of control of the use of livestock waste (manure/slurry);
- Lack of public awareness, and support for necessary nutrient control initiatives.
10.4 Envisaged Changes of Nutrient-Related Legislation

Beside the ongoing process of harmonization of the national legislation with the EU legislation, there are currently no concrete plans for changes in nutrient-related legislation.

There is currently no explicit programme or schedule for the control, respectively out-phasing of P-containing detergents; plans are currently in the stage of preparation.

10.5 Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

The proposed schedule for the approximation of the national legislation to the EU legislation in terms of pollution control is in accordance with the state institutions schedule in all sectors. According to the proposed schedule, national nutrient-related legislation is expected to comply by the end of the year 2000 with the following EU Directives: (i) Draft Water Framework Directive, (ii) Nitrates Directive, (iii) Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive, (iv) other directives which are not so relevant with respect to N and P control / reduction. The national laws and regulations are envisaged to be in full compliance with the requirements of the EU Directives after an envisaged transition period of two to six years.

Table 10.5-1: Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of National Law, Regulation</th>
<th>Related EU Directive / Standard</th>
<th>Period and status of adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) Regulation on the quality of fish and shellfish waters</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.12.2000 full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Regulation on issuing permissions for waste water discharges in water objects and determination of individual emission limitations in the point sources of pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.12.2000 full</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 ROMANIA

11.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

In Romania, the Ministry of Waters, Forests and Environmental Protection (1990) plays the leading role in water management. A National Company called Romanian Waters, established in 1999, is responsible for the national strategy of water management implementation. The drinking water supply, waste water treatment, waste disposal and sewerage network are the responsibility of municipalities.

The most relevant objectives for water pollution reduction can be summarized as follows:

- Reducing nitrates, organic substances and pesticides;
- Decreasing the amounts of heavy metals and highly degradable organic compounds in sediments;
- Reducing BOD5, N and P emissions from WWTPs;
- Controlling diffuse pollution.

The strategic directions, which are to be followed up by structural and nonstructural projects and measures proposed for pollution reduction, include:

- Gradual development of municipal waste water treatment capacities;
- Gradual development of waste water treatment in the agricultural sector;
- Gradual development of waste water treatment in the industrial sector;
- Integrated management of water resources;
- Abatement of risks related to accidental pollution and natural calamities;
- Ecological reconstruction.

In the transboundary context, Romania ratified a series of international conventions and declarations, such as: Bucharest Declaration (1985), Protection of the Transboundary Waters Convention (1995), Black Sea Convention (1992), Danube River Protection Convention (1995) and others.

11.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction

Environmental and water-related legislation is currently undergoing a process of transformation. The reorganization of the legislation framework reflects the need to manage all the natural resources as part of an integrated system and strategy, which involves cooperation between all relevant authorities and institutions on the different administrative levels.

The Frame Water Law (107/1966), which provides a framework of technical regulations for water pollution reduction and water management, and the Law on Environmental Protection (137/1995), which comprises special provisions for water protection, are in the process of being upgraded and revised. The same applies to a series of norms and standards.
### Table 11.2-1: Main Laws and Regulations Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction
(Currently in Force)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/ No. Type</th>
<th>Responsible authority</th>
<th>Main subject</th>
<th>Effective since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD 1001/1990</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Unitary system for water management services tariffs</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD 101/1997</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Norms for sanitary protection areas</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD 730/1997</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Norms for waste water discharges in receivers NTPA 001 (concentration)</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD 172/1997</td>
<td>MWSP</td>
<td>National Register of Potentially Toxic Chemicals</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWFEP orders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTPA 002 699</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Conditions for discharging waste water into sewerage</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MWFEP/MH</td>
<td>Procedure and competences for issuing water management permit/authorisation</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Procedure, competences in the case of special monitoring regime in the case of non-compliance with water permit</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MWFEP/MH</td>
<td>Guidelines and norms for producing technical documentations for the obtaining of water permit</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MWSP</td>
<td>Notification procedure</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access mechanism for water management information</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Water users and public participation in the consulting activity</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Water Register Establishment</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11.2-2: Main Laws and Regulations Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction
(Currently in Progress)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Authority responsible</th>
<th>Main subjects</th>
<th>Date of coming in force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Law on the Modification of Environmental Protection Law (137/95)</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Law on the Modification of Water Law (107/96)</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Law on the approval of National Plan for land planning sec.III protected areas</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Law on Integrated Management of Coastal Areas</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Hydrographic Basin Committee Establishment</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Upgrading of NTPA 001/97</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>MWFEP</td>
<td>Approval of frame schemes for management and planning of hydrographic basins</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>MWFEP+MAF</td>
<td>Approval of the Action Plan for water protection against nitrate pollution from agricultural sources</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most relevant deficiencies concerning the water legislation, particularly related to nutrient control, are the following:

- The N,P emissions limits are related to concentration only; there are not any provisions for discharged load except the water permit;
- there are not (yet) any national water quality objectives/targets;
- in the case of the actual STAS 4706/88 – surface waters – quality technical conditions:
  * the limits cover only the water column compartment without considering sediment associated pollution;
  * for some specific pollutants (heavy metals, organic micro-pollutants) the limits are higher in comparison with EU legislation;
- there are (STAS 4706/88) not any provisions concerning nutrient concentration in the Black Sea;
- in the case of total nitrogen and total phosphorus, the current STAS 4706/88 refers to total inorganic N, P concentrations without considering the organic forms;
- there are no laws, regulations or proposals regarding phosphorus-free detergents.

11.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

As regards nutrient-related issues, there are:

- general barriers (lack of adequate legislation, management mechanisms, infrastructure, etc.);
- specific constrains generated by natural resources (surface waters, ground waters, Black Sea, etc.);
- socio-economic system conflict areas (especially related to the agriculture target group).

In this respect, two interrelated issues in particular should be analyzed and followed up:

- promotion of the new legislation; and
- stipulation of specific implementation processes.

11.4 Envisaged Changes of Nutrient-Related Legislation

The proposed new legislation should provide:

- a regulatory framework for dealing efficiently with a variety of environmental problems, particularly nutrient-related ones; and
- a balance between conflicting interests in using the water, as well as between environmental issues and other issues (e.g. economic, employment and social issues).

The required actions are:

- Stepped improvement of standards:
  * integrated approach to immission/emission (point/diffuse) standards, particularly for nutrient reduction;
  * ambient quality standards;
  * effluent standards;
- Introducing an efficient framework for water management;
- Establishing adequate institutional and regulatory framework;
- Introducing Phosphorus-free detergents:
  * improvement of detergent legislation/standards; besides biodegradability, the P content should be decreased and limited in accordance with the EU coming legislation;
  * P-free detergent plan implementation, starting with the technological issues (MIT);
  * marketing study;
  * it is anticipated that the cost of introducing P-free detergent could reach EUR 50 million (provision with new technology).
Explicit proposals for changes of respective legislation are:

- The effluent standards (NTPA 001) will be revised in 2001. There are not any river quality standards (immissions) at the level of the EU, including the ICPDR. In this respect, it is envisaged by order of MWFEP to promote in October 2000 “Water Quality Targets” based on the five classes agreed by the ICPDR which is (more or less) in the light of EWFD.

- EWFD is already in force; the promotion in Romania is expected in 2001 (implementation might take 30-35 years).


### 11.5 Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

In accordance with the National Environmental Action Plan, the following schedule is designed for the approximation process:

- **Short term:**
  - transposition of the Urban Waste Water Directive (91/271/EEC);

- **Medium and long term:**

#### Table 11.5-1: Actions for the approximation of national legislation to EU nutrient legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EU Directive</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.5-2: Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of National Law, Regulations</th>
<th>Related EU Directive</th>
<th>Proposed period of adjustment</th>
<th>Proposed date of coming in force</th>
<th>Final status of compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
12 MOLDOVA

12.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

The most important documents in which the policy objectives on environmental protection are formulated include:

- National Strategic Action Plan for Environmental Protection
- National Environmental Action Plan for the Environment
- The Comprehensive Long-Term Programme for Environmental Protection

The new priorities of environmental protection policy under the new economic situation are:

- The former environmental protection policy, focusing on end-of-pipe technologies for pollution abatement, is becoming unacceptable from the environmental and economic point of view;
- The new economic order calls for the development of market-oriented environmental policy and instruments that support the adoption of low-waste technologies and rational exploitation and use of natural resources.

The national objectives regarding reduction of water pollution are:

- to maintain human health and to eliminate health risk in water resources;
- to provide sources of nutrition and to maintain and restore biodiversity.

This would require the performance of the following tasks:

- Comprehensive evaluation of water resources conditions and elaboration of a concept of protection and rational use of water resources and water balanced systems based on sustainable development approach;
- Elaboration of a scheme for river basins use;
- Development of ecological criteria for assessment of permissible loads into surface waters;
- Development of integrated parameters and criteria for maintaining ecological balance in water bodies;
- Preparation of a profound basis for rehabilitation and maintenance of proper ecological conditions in water bodies for different uses.

There are currently no explicitly formulated policy objectives regarding nutrient emissions or loads; these issues are considered as integral parts of environmental management, waste water treatment programmes, etc.

The Foreign Policy Concept of the Republic of Moldova, approved by Parliament in February 1995, confirms the principles of international law that are of special importance both for Moldova's foreign relations and for its environmental protection.

12.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction

According to the constitution of the Republic of Moldova, the President of the Republic is responsible to the world community for the state of the environment and represents, at the international level, the interests of Moldova related to environmental protection.

Although there is a complex system of environmental legislation (with a high number of decrees, laws and regulations elaborated and amended since 1990), there remains the problem of enforcement due to the problematic economic situation and a lack of professional capability.

The existing legislation, while providing a number of starting points for the implementation of sustainability, pollution and waste reduction, and cleaner technology, is considered to be insufficient for the future.
Currently, there are no laws and regulations in force or in progress, directly dealing with nutrient control and reduction; the existing legal provisions on emission standards, effluent standards and ambient water quality are usually incorporated in overall pollution control and reduction regulations.

12.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

In spite of the fact that there are clearly-determined policy objectives, legal and policy reforms are hampered due to:

- a continuous crisis of the national economy (particularly regarding industry and agricultural production);
- a lack of domestic financial resources;
- improper administrative and institutional cooperation and coordination; and
- lack of professional capability.

12.4 Envisaged Changes of Nutrient-Related Legislation

According to the provisions of the 1995 National Environmental Action Plan, changes of legislation should aim at the introduction of feasible environmental management strategies, and particularly contribute to:

- the revision of the water quality standards (within three years);
- the development and adoption of long-term environmental programme (within one year);
- the provision of a framework to restore and sustain legal reference service (within one year);
- the development of a policy toward harmonization Environmental Standards with those of the EU (within two years);
- the passage of water pollution quality law with new standards (within two years);
- the preparation of a new draft law on self-monitoring by major pollutants (within two years).

For the time being, however, these issues are not being elaborated.

There is currently no legal provision regarding control or out-phasing of P-containing detergents since this problem is not a topical issue in Moldova.

12.5 Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

In June 1998, Moldova ratified the Agreement on Partnership and Cooperation between the EU and Moldova, according to which Moldova is committed to making its legislation gradually compatible with that of the EU in a number of sectors including the environment.

The Agreement calls for a strengthening of environmental cooperation between Moldova and the EU, and states that cooperation programmes shall continue to contribute to strengthening environmental institutions and public awareness. It also states that cooperation shall aim to combat the deterioration of the environment including in particular local, regional and transboundary water pollution and water quality.

Currently, Moldovan legislation does not contain provisions equal or similar to those required by the two nutrient related EU Directives on “Urban Waste Water Treatment” and “Dangerous Substances in the Aquatic Environment”.

There is a general understanding of the necessity to approximate national pollution-related legislation (including nutrient issues) to the respective EU Directives; but at present the statements have mostly declarative character, partly due to lack of appropriate knowledge of the directives themselves and the complexity of appropriate application.
Approximation to EU-legislation would also require new conceptual approaches, which currently do not have any equivalent in the Moldovan legal framework, e.g.:

- Integrated river basin management approach;
- Combined approach for setting standards, which involves setting both discharge limits and quality standards in an integrated way;
- Licensing on the basis of:
  * best technical means available;
  * best available techniques;
  * all technical precautions.

Taking into account the current discrepancies between the national legislation and the EU-requirements and the critical economic situation in the country, it cannot be expected that the harmonization of national and EU-legislation can be achieved in the short or medium term.
13 UKRAINE

13.1 Policy Objectives, Priorities and Principles for Nutrient Control / Reduction

In Ukraine, policy objectives and principles for nutrient reduction are included as sub-components in the overall environmental protection strategy formulated in the Main Directions of State Policy on the Environmental Protection, Utilization of Natural Resource and Environmental Safety (1998). This document clearly defines the key priorities of Environmental Policy and Practical Actions including international obligations of Ukraine to nutrient pollution reduction as follows:

- Improvement of the environment status in the Dniper Basin and potable water quality;
- Prevention of pollution and improvement of the environmental status of Black Sea;
- Improvement of the environmental status in the Donetsko-Prydniprovy Industrial Regions;
- Construction and reconstruction of municipal waste water systems.

These defined priorities are directly related to sustainable water management and clearly stipulate the necessity of consolidation of national (inter-sectoral) and international efforts for practical actions in pollution reduction.

The main objectives with relevance to nutrient reduction are:

- Reduction of nutrients load (N, P, BOD), oil products, pesticides, heavy metals ions, radionuclides and other harmful substances in the water bodies;
- Pollution reduction from WWTPs, including pollution from municipal waste water;
- Pollution reduction from diffuse sources, particularly from agriculture;
- Improvement of regulatory, legislative, environmental and economic bases for quality of water bodies;
- Improvement of registration, monitoring, and control systems of surface and ground water pollution; development and setting up of a system for identification and analytical control of all surface water pollution sources;
- Conservation of biological and landscape diversity; expansion of the network of national parks and reserves and restoration of wetlands.

The integration in the European Union, identified as an objective of international policy of Ukraine, implies a sustainable use of natural resources, improvement of environmental health and a restoration of the ecosystems. Heavy environmental problems inherited from the Former Soviet Union due to extensive style of resource utilization and mismanagement, are on the top of the national priority list for actions.

13.2 Status of Legislation Dealing with Nutrient Control / Reduction


In addition, there are a number of regulations, rules norms, etc., regulating particular issues in detail.

Altogether, it is recognized that an improvement of the unsatisfactory environmental situation can only be achieved by more effective control and enforcement of gradually improved environmental legislation.

Ukraine does not currently have any direct legislative norms or standards regulating the content of nutrient discharges into surface waters and related eutrophication; instead, there are norms for N and P discharges in terms of maximum permitted concentrations which can serve as an indirect tool for controlling nutrients loads.
13.3 Main Barriers to Policy and Legal Reforms

When Ukraine became an independent country in 1991, it had to revise the former Soviet environmental legislation and develop a new, market-oriented environmental legislation.

This process was and still is hampered by:

- historical issues (structures of administration and public enterprises, ownership of public infrastructure, process of privatization, social attitudes, etc);
- critical situation of the national economy (industry, agricultural production);
- critical social situation and the low living standard of a significant portion of the population;
- typical deficiencies in institutional and administrative capabilities;
- lack of modern control tools (e.g. environmental audit);
- enforcement of new economic tools to address environmental issues and prevent environmental pollution (e.g. payments for use of natural resources and release of pollutants in the environment).

13.4 Envisaged Changes of Nutrient-Related Legislation

In order to address nutrient reduction, Ukraine plans to:

- Improve regulations on the application of N and P fertilizers;
- Develop regulations for P-free detergents;
- Develop and introduce techniques for the assessment of diffuse pollution loads.

The ultimate goal is the harmonization of Ukrainian legislation on nutrients with the existing EU Directives and future Framework Water Directive.

13.5 Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation

Water-related legislation in Ukraine and the EC are substantially different in their structures. Therefore, the harmonization of the Ukrainian legislation with the EU legislation is a long-term objective (for a period until 2015).

The envisaged harmonization of Ukrainian legislation with the relevant EU Directive should take into account the following sequence of priorities:

- measures with low financial requirements including amendments and additions to the acting legislation, regulations, standards, etc.
- measures with affordable financial requirements including improvement of control system, and optimization of monitoring that satisfy the information needs of environmental management; an enforcement system for improved environmental legislation for water users and polluters of water resources, etc.
- measures that will require significant financial investments (including international investments): reconstruction and improvement of the existing manufacturing and waste water treatment technologies; construction of new urban waste water treatment facilities (in compliance with the respective EU Directives), etc.

The identification of the financial needs for the harmonization of environmental legislation of Ukraine and EU Directives requires a separate study.

Unlike other Central European Countries, Ukraine’s integration into European Union is not a matter of the near future. Nevertheless, the harmonization of Ukrainian environmental legislation with the EU Directives, including the EU Water Framework Directive, is an important component for the development of the national legislation process.
### Table 13.5-1: Schedule for Approximation of Ukraine’s Legislation to EU Legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of National Law, Regulations</th>
<th>Related EU Directive</th>
<th>Proposed Period of Adjustment (years)</th>
<th>Proposed Date of Coming in Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Code of Ukraine</td>
<td>Principles of the EC Water Policy (draft, 4/12/96)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Reduction of Waste of Nitrates in Agriculture</td>
<td>On Protection of Waters from Pollution by Nitrates from Agricultural Sources (91/676/EEC)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control</td>
<td>On Pollution Caused by Certain Dangerous Substances, Discharged into Water Bodies (76/464/EEC)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Municipal Wastewater Treatment</td>
<td>On Urban Wastewater Treatment (91/271/EEC)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Water for Human Consumption</td>
<td>On Water Quality for Human Consumption (80/778/EEC, COM(94), 612 final – 95/10(SYN))</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Amendments to the List of Industrial Parts of Fishery Water Bodies (Parts Thereof), approved by the Resolution of the CMU # 552 of May 22, 1996;</td>
<td>On Surface Water Quality Necessary to Support Fish Life (78/659/EEC)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 INTRODUCTION

The Summary Report is an integral component for the preparation of the GEF/UNDP funded project entitled "Strengthening Implementation of Nutrient Reduction Measures and Transboundary Co-operation in the Danube River Basin". The basic task of this preparatory work is to prepare a qualified material basis for the elaboration of a complete Danube Regional Project for submission to the GEF Council.

The purpose of this summary report is to provide an overview and assessment of the basic materials, data and information available for the elaboration of comprehensive “Five Years National Nutrient Reduction Action Plans” on national level for all DRB countries.

The Country Reports, based on contributions from national consultants follows the structure of the “national reports” and provides country specific data and information for each of the Danube River Basin. The “country specific information” is structured as follows:

1. Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads
2. Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources
3. Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources
4. Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation
5. Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources
6. Summary of Main Country Specific Particularities
2 SUMMARIZING CONCLUSIONS

2.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

Most of the data and information required to be reviewed and verified have been identified in official reports, updated statistical documents and previously developed projects. However, at this stage of the project development, data on nutrients loads/emissions are not yet available in some areas. The revision of data and information on nutrient emissions/ loads performed by the Danube countries has taken into consideration nutrient mass balance, with main emphasis on diffuse pollution, nutrient transport, wetlands and losses of nutrients in water systems.

Generally, the countries considered that diffuse pollution sources include direct discharges of private households (not connected to sewers), storm water overflow, direct discharge of manure, base flow (percolation of human waste, agriculture land), erosion run-off from forests, air depositions and ground water flow. However, agricultural production and livestock farming represent the main diffuse sources of pollution.

The agricultural diffuse pollution contribution is large and can be controlled best by regulatory measures. The range of measures necessary can be seen in the regulations on the “Prevention of Pollution from Agriculture adopted by Helsinki Commission” (1998).

The negative effects of fertilization are a long term problem. Danube countries cannot afford to delay implementation of nutrient reduction measures.

The present farming system, known as "conventional farming", has produced progressively negative social and economic results and serious environmental damages upon its vital resources, i.e. water and soil, and, consequently, upon bio-diversity as a genetic basis as well as on human health. Moreover, if we consider the potential synergetic effects, about which little is known at this point (we must note also the fact that in several sectors, agriculture is both polluted and polluting), we shall begin to understand the severity of the situation.

The first conclusion is that there have been no significant changes in the diffuse pollution loads on the territory of the Danube River Basin since 1998. In many parts of the region, industry and agriculture are still in recession while the first signs of improvement have became visible only since 1999.

Second, the data show that fertilizers were used on a small scale. The unbalanced fertilization and the deficit in the main nutrients have been detrimental to both crop production and soil fertility, which adversely influenced the basin’s environmental situation.
2.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

The urgent measures proposed by the countries of the Danube River Basin to be implemented with a view to nutrient reduction refer to the improvement of both legal and institutional framework.

Moreover, public awareness raising and strengthening public participation in nutrient reduction initiatives are both seen as priorities.

In order to achieve maximum nutrient load reduction within their share of the Danube River Basin, the countries have identified measures for nutrient control and reduction from diffuse sources that mainly address policy and legislation-related actions, institutional strengthening and capacity building.

Animal production and manure application to fields are important for the economies of many Danube countries, but they are also the biggest contributors to diffuse sources of water pollution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>creation / harmonization of legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delimitation of &quot;sensitive water areas&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watershed management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-free detergents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soil conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good agricultural practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wetland restoration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>BIH</th>
<th>YU</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>creation/</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmonization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delimitation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of &quot;sensitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watershed</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-free</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detergents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soil</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wetland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a growing consensus among policy makers of the Danube countries that command and control environmental regulations stifle the efficiency and innovation by heterogeneous plants to adopt a uniform abatement strategy. Plants are allowed to develop pollution control strategies that replace or modify specific regulatory requirements on the condition that these strategies improve their environmental performance. Germany is an example of a Danube country where voluntary, site-specific performance standards exist which can give the plants regulatory flexibility to meet the standards in unconventional ways.

Further, it appears that watershed management is an attractive concept for Danube countries with economies in transition. For some countries, such as Romania and Bulgaria, the implemented watershed approach, which basically relies on stakeholder involvement, could in principle improve coordination between agencies and jurisdictions with water quality responsibilities, help set priorities for action on a systematic basis, promote cost-effective control policies and targeting of funds, further public participation and public-private partnerships. The latter may be particularly important in the Danube transition economies, where funds for environmental programs are severely limited and the involvement of affected stakeholders essential for identifying critical problems and building support for program activities.

Some Danube countries (Germany, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Moldova) have already initiated actions leading to nutrient reduction that are based on the need to implement soil conservation measures.

Developing a culture of enforcement, compliance, and cooperation that supports implementation is considered by the Danube transition countries likely to be critical when pollution control is involved.

Protecting the environment, safeguarding human health and promoting effective agricultural practices go hand-in-hand.

The introduction of P-free detergents has been already taken into consideration by most of the countries. In addition, the need to develop a code of good practice, covering matters such as periods when land...
application of fertilizers is inappropriate and the conditions for land application of fertilizers near watercourses have been taken into consideration by the policy makers of the whole basin. Examples of such countries include: Austria, Slovakia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Romania.

Finally, the identification of vulnerable areas regarding the Nitrates Directive and the new proposal on the methods of control of biological degradability of active substance detergents will soon bring the countries of Danube River Basin in line with EU standards.

2.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

Most countries have found it difficult to make estimates, but it is assumed that noticeable nutrient reduction from diffuse sources might be recorded once the required measures and actions have been implemented. As a consequence of the recent economic development of the countries in the region, mainly through the extension of cultivated agricultural areas and the intensification of farming, a future increase in nutrient emission can be expected.

However, if the proposed urgent measures are introduced during the year 2001, visible effects in terms of nutrient content reduction can be expected in the year 2005.

The anticipated nutrient reduction from diffuse sources is estimated to reach high values in countries such as Yugoslavia (25% for N and P) or average values as 10% of N for countries such as the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Romania and Ukraine.

A designation of vulnerable areas and the implementation of the required forms of farming in these areas will bring the countries of the basin in line with EU requirements. The nutrient pollution reduction in waters will mostly be of local character. Programs aimed at revitalizing landscape, streams, small wetlands constructing etc. will also contribute to improving the environmental situation in the Danube River Basin.

2.4 Identification and Assessment of Proposed Priority Projects

(1) Quality of provided data

At this stage, all the thirteen DRB countries have provided “draft national lists of priority projects” which are supposed to be ready for implementation in the coming 5-year period and can be considered as a reasonable basis for the elaboration of comprehensive “Five Year National Nutrient Reduction Action Plans”.

The “draft lists of priority projects” have been prepared by the national consultants usually in close co-ordination and co-operation with the concerned national ministries and authorities.

The “lists of priority projects” are mainly based on and derived from the list of projects compiled in the “Danube Action Pollution Reduction Programme”, developed within the framework of the DRPRP in June 1999 and updated within the framework of this project.
According to the requirements of the TOR, the national consultants had explicitly to take into account the projects included in the EMIS/EG - Joint Action Programme, which is currently under preparation.

As a first conclusion it can be stated that both (i) the structure and completeness of the “lists of priority projects”, and (ii) the quality, completeness, accuracy and reliability of the particular project data are significantly different from country to country.

Countries that provided relatively complete project lists, respectively relatively complete project data for the identified priority projects include Austria, the Czech Republic; Hungary; Germany, Moldova; Romania; Slovenia and Yugoslavia.

The “national lists of priority projects” of these countries can be considered as a profound basis for further elaboration of comprehensive “Five Year National Nutrient Reduction Action Plans”.

The “project lists” provided by the other countries show significant gaps which can be summarized as follows:

⇒ Incomplete data on expected nutrient reduction - particularly Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Ukraine, (partly Hungary regarding BOD and COD);

⇒ Inadequate data on project specific investment requirements - all DRB countries have eventually provided investment cost figures for more or less all proposed priority projects; in the majority of the counties it is obvious that the cost estimates need partial, respectively substantial up-date;

⇒ Incomplete data regarding differentiation by baseline and incremental cost (as required for GEF co-financing) - particularly Bulgaria, Slovakia, Slovenia, Yugoslavia;

⇒ Incomplete data regarding adequate project funding schemes - particularly Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Slovakia, Ukraine.

For these countries, the list of identified projects itself or the particular project data need partially substantial improvement. Especially as long as a clearly defined project sponsor and an appropriate funding scheme is not available, a project cannot really be considered in the short-term as a candidate project for a “National Nutrient Reduction Action Plan”.

(2) Summarized Results

The composition of the “national project lists” and the details of the identified priority projects can be seen from the annexed county tables (Annex II).

An overall summary with full information on the priority projects, as identified by the national consultants in the framework of this study, is compiled in Table 2.4-1.

A summary of the structure of the priority projects by country is compiled in Table 2.4-2.

A summary of the structure of the priority projects by sector is compiled in Table 2.4-3

(a) Investment Requirements

According to the available data provided by the national reports, the total investment requirements for the 13 DRB countries amount to about EUR 4402 million.

The structure of the identified investment requirements by sector is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Municipal Sector</th>
<th>Industrial Sector</th>
<th>Agricultural Sector</th>
<th>Wetlands</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of Projects</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Million EUR</td>
<td>3,702</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>4404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)-Structure</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The structure of the identified investment requirements by country is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>CRO</th>
<th>B&amp;H</th>
<th>YU</th>
<th>BUL</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>MOL</th>
<th>UA</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of Proj.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill. EUR</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Countries with the highest identified investment requirements of more than EUR 500 million include Yugoslavia and Hungary.

Countries with the lowest identified investment requirements of less than EUR 200 million include Ukraine, Slovakia, the Czech Republic (small DRB area), Bulgaria and B&H.

The most of the countries have basically derived their “national project list” from the list of projects already identified in the “Action Pollution Reduction Programme” (elaborated within the framework of the DRPRP, 1999).

Taking into account the reduced number of projects compiled in the “draft national project lists” the identified investment requirements of about EUR 4.4 billion seem rather reasonable in comparison to the investment requirements of about EUR 5.6 billion as identified in the framework of the “Danube Action Pollution Reduction Programme” in 1999.

(b) Project Funding

According to the data provided by the national reports, the anticipated composition of project funding for all DRB countries is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding component:</th>
<th>Million EUR</th>
<th>(%) – Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National funding contribution</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International loans:</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International grants:</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not secured funding components:</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4404</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The country-specific composition of project funding can be seen from Table 2.4-2.

- The following seven countries could provide a more or less complete funding scheme for the proposed priority projects to be completed within the coming 5-year period: Austria, Germany, Hungary, Moldova, Romania, Slovenia and Yugoslavia.
- Countries in which funding is not secured for the majority of the proposed priority projects include B-H, Croatia, Ukraine.
- In the other countries (Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia) portions between 30% and 70% of the identified investment requirements are at the present stage of knowledge supposed to be secured; the rest remains to be raised.
(c) **Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point Sources**

According to the available data provided by the national reports, the total nutrient reduction anticipated with the implementation of the proposed priority point source projects should be in the range of:

- N: 58 500 tons/year;
- P: 12 100 tons/year;
- BOD: 276 000 tons/year;
- COD: 525 000 tons/year

The composition of the anticipated nutrient reduction by sector is approximately as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrient Reduction</th>
<th>Municipal Sector</th>
<th>Industrial Sector</th>
<th>Agricultural Sector</th>
<th>Wetlands</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of Projects</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (t/y)</td>
<td>33 300</td>
<td>3 400</td>
<td>6 700</td>
<td>16 600</td>
<td>58 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (t/y)</td>
<td>5 500</td>
<td>3 700</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>1 800</td>
<td>12 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOD (t/y)</td>
<td>221 000</td>
<td>39 700</td>
<td>9 500</td>
<td>5 900</td>
<td>276 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD (t/y)</td>
<td>398 900</td>
<td>78 700</td>
<td>15 000</td>
<td>32 400</td>
<td>525 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The composition of the anticipated nutrient reduction by countries is compiled in Table 2.4-2.

It has to be mentioned at this point that the BOD and COD data in particular are still preliminary, because in some countries they have not yet been determined completely or correctly for some or even the majority of the identified projects.
TABLE 2.4-1
SUMMARY OF PRIORITY PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR FIVE YEAR NATIONAL NUTRIENT REDUCTION ACTION PLANS
Country

Austria

Sector

Municipal
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total
B&H
Municipal
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total
Bulgaria
Municipal
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total
Croatia
Municipal
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total
Czech
Municipal
Republic
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total
Germany
Municipal
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total
Hungary
Municipal
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total
Moldova
Municipal
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total
Romania
Municipal
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total
Slovakia
Municipal
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total
Slovenia
Municipal
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total
Ukraine
Municipal
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total
Yugoslavia Municipal
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total
All Countries Municipal
Industrial
Agricultural
Wetlands
Total

No of
Projects
3
1
0
0
4
5
6
1
0
12
17
1
0
3
21
11
0
0
0
11
6
4
1
1
12
7
2
0
2
11
16
1
5
2
24
15
11
3
2
31
10
7
3
5
25
13
4
0
3
20
23
0
1
0
24
10
0
0
0
10
21
7
7
5
40
157
44
21
23
245

N
tons/y
3,950
0
0
0
3,950
3,005
125
1,570
0
4,700
2,308
0
0
375
2,683
1,509
0
0
0
1,509
1,010
61
20

Expected Reduction
P
BOD
tons/y
tons/y
404
5,740
0
5,500
0
0
0
0
404 11,240
450
7,689
53
963
350
0
0
0
853
8,652
562 19,448
0
299
0
0
37
0
599 19,747
239 15,310
0
0
0
0
0
0
239 15,310
58
1,228
1
18
3
0

1,091
62
1,246
3,620
13
75
260
40
0
0
0
0
211
21
0
4,091
74
75
3,455 1,153
0
420
6
0
2,600
340
0
233
23
0
6,708 1,522
0
784
119
248
167
36
27
350
25
20
5,600
725
1,300
6,901
905
1,595
3,644
823 53,521
688
3
2,947
1,374
150
3,343
6,154
615
0
11,860 1,591 59,811
2,001
125 12,968
348
0
641
0
0
0
225
23
0
2,574
147 13,609
5,053
786 27,836
0
0
0
180
28
980
0
0
0
5,233
814 28,816
486
65
677
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
486
65
677
2,486
700 76,280
1,347 3,571 29,345
640
242
5,133
2,320
350
4,600
6,793 4,863 115,358
33,311 5,495 221,020
3,416 3,710 39,741
6,734 1,138
9,476
15,118 1,794
5,900
58,579 12,136 276,136

Investment Cost
Funding Scheme
COD Total Inv.Increment Baseline National Int. Loan Int. Grant
tons/y mil EUR mil EUR mil EUR mil EUR mil EUR mil EUR
12,028
231.0
207.0
24.0
231.0
0.0
0.0
4,500
33.0
7.0
26.0
33.0
0.0
0.0
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
16,528
264.0
214.0
50.0
264.0
0.0
0.0
14,802
147.0
10.0
137.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
2,159
27.1
9.3
17.9
0.0
0.0
0.0
0
2.3
0.7
1.6
0.0
0.0
0.0
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
16,961
176.4
20.0
156.5
0.0
0.0
0.0
34,718
111.9
0.0
0.0
6.5
0.0
23.0
655
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0
13.5
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
7.5
35,373
125.4
0.0
0.0
6.5
0.0
30.5
34,424
433.4
134.3
299.1
2.3
9.9
0.0
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
34,424
433.4
134.3
299.1
2.3
9.9
0.0
93
133.7
46.9
86.8
56.2
21.4
13.9
26
5.1
0.9
4.2
3.2
0.5
0.5
0
5.3
4.2
1.1
3.5
0.9
0.9
2.6
1.3
1.3
1.3
1.3
120
146.7
53.3
93.4
64.2
22.8
16.6
511
98.3
88.4
9.9
98.3
0.0
0.0
780
6.3
1.2
5.1
6.3
0.0
0.0
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0
126.7
84.7
42.0
126.7
0.0
0.0
1,291
231.3
174.3
57.0
231.3
0.0
0.0
0
658.2
68.2
91.8
260.8
180.1
213.8
0
5.9
2.9
3.0
2.0
3.9
0.0
0
7.2
4.8
2.5
2.0
0.0
3.6
0
15.4
13.3
2.1
2.1
0.0
13.3
0
686.7
89.2
99.4
266.9
184.0
230.7
458
296.7
17.8
279.3
88.6
102.0
106.0
74
84.7
4.4
74.9
27.8
34.1
22.8
70
26.5
2.5
23.9
8.5
8.8
9.2
230
85.0
4.2
80.8
25.5
31.8
27.8
832
492.9
28.9
458.9
150.4
176.7
165.8
61,154
392.9
119.8
274.5
124.4
175.0
93.5
4,110
22.0
10.1
12.0
17.3
4.7
0.0
2,206
3.7
1.3
2.4
2.9
0.5
0.3
0
73.9
12.3
61.6
32.0
32.0
9.9
67,470
492.5
143.5
350.5
176.6
212.2
103.7
25,458
103.4
10.3
21.0
43.0
3.3
1.3
1,690
14.2
2.3
5.8
2.3
1.4
2.1
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0
0.9
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.2
27,148
118.4
12.6
26.8
45.3
4.7
3.6
45,440
382.5
4.6
0.0
328.2
44.2
10.0
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
1,600
1.7
1.5
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
47,040
384.2
6.1
0.0
328.2
44.2
10.0
621
67.2
16.6
50.6
5.3
0.0
0.0
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
621
67.2
16.6
50.6
5.3
0.0
0.0
169,212
646.0
0.0
0.0
137.0
441.0
68.0
64,710
68.5
0.0
0.0
17.0
34.5
17.0
11,074
65.8
0.0
0.0
20.1
30.5
15.2
32,200
5.0
0.0
0.0
0.5
2.5
2.0
277,196
785.3
0.0
0.0
174.6
508.5
102.2
398,919 3702.1
723.9 1274.0 1381.7
976.9
529.5
78,704
266.7
38.1
148.9
108.9
79.0
42.4
14,950
112.6
15.0
31.5
37.0
40.7
29.2
32,430
323.0
115.8
187.8
188.1
66.3
62.0
525,004 4404.3
892.8 1642.2 1715.7 1162.9
663.1


### TABLE 2.4-2

**SUMMARY OF PRIORITY PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR FIVE YEAR NATIONAL NUTRIENT REDUCTION ACTION PLANS (BY COUNTRIES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N tons/y (%)</td>
<td>P tons/y (%)</td>
<td>BOD tons/y (%)</td>
<td>COD tons/y (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4,091</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6,708</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6,901</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11,860</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5,233</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUG</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6,793</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,863</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,579</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,136</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2.4-3

**SUMMARY OF PRIORITY PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR FIVE YEAR NATIONAL NUTRIENT REDUCTION ACTION PLANS (BY SECTORS FOR ALL DRB COUNTRIES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N tons/y (%)</td>
<td>P tons/y (%)</td>
<td>BOD tons/y (%)</td>
<td>COD tons/y (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>33,311</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5,495</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6,734</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15,118</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,579</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,136</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX I COUNTRY REPORTS

1. GERMANY
2. AUSTRIA
3. CZECH REPUBLIC
4. SLOVAKIA
5. HUNGARY
6. SLOVENIA
7. CROATIA
8. BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA
9. YUGOSLAVIA
10. BULGARIA
11. ROMANIA
12. MOLDOVA
13. UKRAINE
1 GERMANY

1.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

The analysis of the existing data shows that immission loads for nutrients in the German part of the river Danube, calculated from regularly monitored water quality data, reach a level of around 85,000 t N and 4000-6000 t P per year. Especially phosphorus loads have been decreased very dramatically for the last twenty years but also nitrogen loads show a decreasing trend for the last years. Emission values vary according to the method applied for their evaluation. An investigation of Behrendt (1999) mention about 130,000 t N and 5300 t P for the years 1993 to 1997. The major part of the nutrient input derives from diffuse sources. For nitrogen, the diffuse input reaches 80 % with 60 % stemming from groundwater and around 10 % from drainage. For phosphorus, 70% of the input is provided by diffuse sources with 35% stemming from erosion, 15% from surface flow and 10 % from groundwater. Concerning point sources, the major part origins from municipal wastewater, industrial input can be neglected.

For the year 1996, the use of mineral fertilizers amounts about 220,000 tN/a and 70,000 tP/a. Generally, the application of mineral fertilizers decreased, for the Bavarian part of the Danube River Basin while the use of nitrogen dropped since 1989 from 119 kg/ha to 80 kg/ha (1997). The organic fertilizer application declined for the last 5 years, too.

Most of the 9,135,000 inhabitants are connected to sewage system (Bavaria part: 91%, 1998). The wastewater treatment plants show a high degree of elimination for nutrients (Bavarian part: 75% for P and 45% for N (1998)).

1.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

Measures for nutrient reduction are based on legislation given by EU-guidelines and water acts of the German Republic (framework conditions) and the German Federal States.

In order to reduce nutrient input to the Danube basin, a number of measures have been already taken and some important targets have been achieved. The input of nutrients has been decreased e.g. by elimination of these substances on wastewater treatment plants and by imposing legal restrictions for phosphates in detergents.

Further targets are (i) the consequent applying of legal instruments for nutrient input reduction, (ii) the maintenance and upgrading of wastewater sewage systems to reduce nutrients from point sources and, (iii) the stimulation of new approaches for reducing nutrients from diffuse sources.

Some approaches concerning diffuse sources are to reduce nutrient input by (1) applying extensive and ecological farming, (2) using modern technologies to determine fertilizers needed and to minimize the losses by fertilizing, (3) identifying and defining protection areas e.g. river banks, sensible regions where restrictions for agricultural activities have to be required, and (4) protecting landscape from erosion. In addition, the capability of ecosystems to keep and transform nutrients can be strengthened by river and wetland renaturation.

Germany is introducing flexibility in implementation of these measures, within the frame of a close cooperation between water managers, farmers and researches. First, a common consensus on the importance of nutrient reduction must be funded. Methods have to be developed on how to reduce nutrients in a efficient and cost-effective way e.g. by pilot studies and through permanent training and consulting on the state of art.

Instruments to initiate and continue this process include the (1) promotion of methods for nutrient reduction, and (2) financial support for farmers and for research, education and consulting. In the German part of the Danube River Basin, different action programs make use of these instruments e.g. the "Bayerische Kulturlandschaftsprogramm".

Besides these programs aiming mostly at agricultural methods, measures that are oriented at rivers and wetlands are also undertaken. River management plans lead to a development in a sustainable way e.g. by
river renaturation or riverbank protection. These measures have also to be applied in a cooperative way and to be agreed by all groups of interest.

In general, measures for nutrient reduction of diffuse sources have to be an integrated part of the overall plans for land use and development.

1.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

The measures just undertaken and planned in the future for nutrient reduction of diffuse source will lead to a decrease of nutrient input. However, the complex nature of processes makes difficult to quantify this nutrient reduction. It is anticipated that the whole process will last over 10 to 20 years and only long-term changes are to be expected.

1.4 Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation

The identified projects which are currently under implementation or supposed to be ready for implementation in the coming 3 years are compiled and characterized in Annex 6.4.

The total investment requirements of the 11 identified priority projects is EUR 231 million; their composition by sectors is as follows:

- 8 municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 98.3 million,
- 2 industrial projects with investment requirements of EUR 6.3 million;
- no agricultural point-source project;
- 2 wetland projects with investment requirements of EUR 126.7 million;

In addition to these 11 point-source projects Germany is going to spent about EUR 1.0 million per year in the DRB area of Germany for measures related to reduction of nutrient emissions in the agricultural / land use sector (buffer zone program, etc).

Regarding project funding it is assumed that the required funds will fully be covered by national sources.

1.5 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources

For the 12 identified projects the anticipated nutrient reduction is stated in detail in Annex II-1 and can be summarized as follows:

- N: 4091 tons/year;
- P: 74 tons/year;
- BOD: 75 tons/year;
- COD: 1291 tons/year;

The composition of the anticipated nutrient reduction by sectors is compiled in Section 1.6(2).

1.6 Summary of Main Country Specific Particularities and Conclusions

(1) Main particularities regarding “non point source” issues

The verification of data shows that especially phosphorus loads have been decreased very dramatically for the last twenty years but also nitrogen loads show a decreasing trend for the last years.

Generally, the application of mineral fertilizers decreased, for the Bavarian part of the Danube River Basin while the use of nitrogen dropped since 1989 from 119 kg/ha to 80 kg/ha (1997). The organic fertilizer application declined for the last 5 years, too.
It is obvious that the efforts undertaken by Germany in reducing nutrient emissions from diffuse sources of pollution are mainly based on a flexible approach which allow the polluters to voluntarily agree with the suggested measures. It is considered that the major part of the nutrient input derives from diffuse sources.

Germany suggests measures to reduce nutrient input from diffuse sources which include the use of (1) extensive and ecological farming, (2) modern technologies to determine fertilizers amounts, (3) protection areas e.g. river banks, sensible regions where restrictions for agricultural activities have to be required, and (4) protecting measures against soil erosion.

(2) Main particularities regarding “point source” projects

Germany is one of the countries which provided a complete project list and a complete set of project data regarding investment requirements and funding schemes for the priority projects to be implemented in the coming five year period.

The primary characteristics of the identified priority projects can be summarized as follows:

Table 1.6-1: Primary Characteristics of the Identified Priority Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Nutrient Reduction (tons/year)</th>
<th>Investment Cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3620</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural point sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4091</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is assumed that the required funds of about EUR 231 million will fully be covered by national sources.

In addition to the 11 point-source projects Germany is going to spent about EUR 1.0 million per year in the DRB area of Germany for measures related to reduction of nutrient emissions in the agricultural / land use sector (buffer zone program, etc).
2 AUSTRIA

2.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

In Austria requirements for urban wastewater treatment (i.e. all plants > 50 p.e.) are fixed in the First Emission Ordinance BGBl. In this ordinance quality standards for wastewater treatment plants for e.g. phosphorous or nitrogen are fixed. The treatment of industrial wastewater is performed by internal industrial wastewater treatment plants or together with urban wastewater in urban wastewater treatment plants. The requirements for the indirect discharge are as well laid down in the sector specific emission ordinances and in the Ordinance for Indirect industrial WasteWater Emissions BGBl.

The following tables provide relevant statistical figures on wastewater treatment in Austria.

Table 2. 1-1: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country total popul.</th>
<th>Emission coefficient</th>
<th>Population not connected to sewage (1)</th>
<th>Population connected to sewerage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kg N/ inh/y (2)</td>
<td>kg P/ inh/y (2)</td>
<td>Without treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,038,200</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1,486,059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) This figure means not connected to public sewers, these inhabitants are connected to smaller waste water treatment plants, cess pools or other facilities.

(2) values also include N and P discharges of small and medium served enterprises, served by urban waste water treatment plants, as emission coefficient has been calculated by dividing loads from the waste water treatment plants through number of inhabitants served by those facilities.

The following table presents the loads (t/a) of urban wastewater treatment plants into receiving waters in Austria 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Austria 1998</th>
<th>BOD$_5$-Load</th>
<th>COD-Load</th>
<th>N-Load</th>
<th>P-Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban waste water treatment plants</td>
<td>t/a</td>
<td>t/a</td>
<td>t/a</td>
<td>t/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants with biological treatment</td>
<td>17,206</td>
<td>62,848</td>
<td>21,804</td>
<td>2,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants with mechanical treatment</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,125</td>
<td>64,792</td>
<td>22,046</td>
<td>2,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the next table presents the comparison for the years 1981, 1991, 1995, 1998 in terms of wastewater treatment plants in Austria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban waste water</td>
<td>Pers.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Pers.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected to sewer system</td>
<td>4,374,547</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>5,544,833</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small sewer systems</td>
<td>1,219,321</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>762,732</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cess pools</td>
<td>1,530,610</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>1,386,894</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>428,567</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>113,638</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without sewer system, sum</td>
<td>3,178,498</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>2,263,264</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,533,045</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7,808,097</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1998 in Austria 6,552,141 inhabitants were connected to sewers. Among them 6,540,641 were connected to a wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), 11,500 were connected to the sewerage system but without WWTP. The total population in Austria is 8,038,200 from them 1,486,059 Austrian inhabitants were not connected to a public sewer system which equals to a percentage of 18.5 %. This percentage of 18.5% comprises 6.5% who are connected to a small waste water treatment plants, 11.4 % to cess pools and 0.6 % to other facilities.

The following table shows the agricultural area in Austria and types of crops, (chemical fertilisers in kg N or P/ha/year).

**Table 2.1-2: Agricultural land**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface ha 1997</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Type of crop</th>
<th>Kg N/y</th>
<th>Kg P /ha/y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259,800</td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57,800</td>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260,600</td>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,100</td>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188,300</td>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51,600</td>
<td>Sugar beet</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,422,449</td>
<td>Sum of agricultural land</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of agricultural land (including grassland): 3,422,449 mio. ha (1997)

Without extensive grassland (e.g. alpine meadows): 2,417,324 mio. ha (1997)

(Source: Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, Report „Austria’s Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management 1998“)

Note: * N-chemical fertiliser: 143,818 tons (1997)
++ P –chemical fertiliser: 24,942 tons (1997)

(Source: Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, Report „Grüner Bericht“, Table 4.9, 1998“)

Recommendations for fertilising of crops exist, statistical figures on actual fertilisation per crop are not available. The average application of chemical fertiliser per ha of agricultural land in 1997 was in terms of N 42 kg/ha and in terms of P 7.3 kg/ha of the total agricultural land.

Finally, the emission coefficients and the number of animals in Austria are presented in the next table.

**Table 2.1-3: Livestock units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory of animals 1997</th>
<th>Number (1998)</th>
<th>Number of animal in GVE (1 GVE = livestock unit with 500 kg alive)</th>
<th>Emission coefficient Kg N/head/y</th>
<th>Emission coefficient Kg P/head/y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. pigs</td>
<td>3,810,310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. cows</td>
<td>882,994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. cattle total</td>
<td>2,171,681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. horses</td>
<td>75,347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sheep</td>
<td>360,812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. poultry*</td>
<td>13,539,693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Mangement, Report „Güner Bericht 1998“, Tables 3.15

* Number of chicken
Sum of manure N of all livestock: 169,750,000 kg (1995)
Sum of manure P: 37,755,000 kg (1995)
Manure N/year and ha: 48.9 kg/y/ha (1995)
Manure P/year and ha: 10.9 kg/y/ha (1995)


The manure application is comparatively low in Austria with other EU countries.

2.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

Austria is very actively involved in restoring wetland and floodplain areas where feasible and possible. The (1995) "Austrian Programme for the promotion of a sound environmental friendly and extensive natural resources protecting agriculture" (ÖPUL) shall be substituted by the further advanced programme "ÖPUL 2000".

2.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

Due to the measures already imposed in wastewater purification and by encouraging environmentally friendly agriculture and due to the comparatively very low figures in nutrient application and livestock density, in Austria, no really considerable further reductions of nutrient input in Austrian waters will be achievable.

Significant efforts to quantify the effects of the measures introduced in agriculture and also, most important, of the natural and non-avoidable existing background-loads shall be undertaken in the near future.

2.4 Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation

The identified point-source projects that are supposed to be ready for implementation in the coming 5 years are compiled and characterized in Annex 2.4.

The total investment requirements of the 4 identified projects are EUR 264 million; the composition by sectors is as follows:

- 3 municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 231 million;
  * WWTP Vienna (extension and upgrade of N / P removal);
  * WWTP Linz-Asten (extension and upgrade of N / P removal);
  * WWTP Graz (extension and upgrade of N / P removal);
- 1 industrial project with investment requirements of EUR 33 million;
- no agricultural point-source projects;
- no wetland point-source projects.

Regarding project funding it is assumed that the required funds will fully be covered by national sources.
2.5 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources

For the four identified point-source projects in the municipal and industrial sectors the anticipated annual nutrient reduction is stated in detail in Annex II-2 and can be summarized as follows:

- N: 3950 tons/year;
- P: 404 tons/year;
- BOD: 11240 tons/year;
- COD: 16528 tons/year;

The composition of the anticipated nutrient reduction by sectors is compiled in Section 2.6(2).

2.6 Summary of Main Country Specific Particularities

(1) Main particularities regarding “diffuse” projects

Austria is one of the few Danube countries, which is already taking measures leading to nutrient reduction and control through various programs on promotion of a sound environmental friendly and extensive natural resources protecting agriculture”. In addition, Austria is very active in restoring and conserving wetlands and vulnerable areas.

(2) Main particularities regarding “point source” projects

Austria is one of the countries which provided a complete project list and a complete set of project data regarding investment requirements and funding schemes for the priority projects to be implemented in the coming five year period.

The primary characteristics of the identified priority projects can be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Nutrient Reduction (tons/year)</th>
<th>Investment Cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural point sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is assumed that the required funds of about EUR 264 million will fully be covered by national sources.
3 CZECH REPUBLIC

3.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

Analysis of data information on nutrient loads is based on available data in 1999, from official sources of information as the Statistical yearbooks, WRI databases prepared in National water protection project and other sources used by WRI.

The data presented in the tables 1-3 are based on estimation of the real nutrient run-off into surface and ground waters. Total N and P production calculated from specific production and number of inhabitants has a decreasing tendency, in accordance with the assumed wastewater treatment plants efficiency.

The estimated nutrient discharge from both large municipal point sources and small diffuse municipal sources is 13,735 t/y of N and 1,587 t/y of P.

Czech Republic considers that farmland nutrient balances are influenced by many factors apart of the basic inputs and outputs, which can include hydrology, climate and geographic conditions, as well as weather in particular years.

Within the Morava River basin it is assumed that about 30-50 % of N and 2-5 % P balance surplus, calculated for the representative year 1996, will represent run-offs into waters.

Table 3.1-1: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total population of Morava river basin in CZ</th>
<th>Emissions Coefficients</th>
<th>Population not connected to sewerage</th>
<th>Population connected to sewerage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kg N/inh/y</td>
<td>kg P/inh/y</td>
<td>Inh.</td>
<td>kg N/inh/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 700 000 6,2</td>
<td>0,73</td>
<td>710 000</td>
<td>1 990 000 1850 000 300 000 50 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1-2: Loads-Agricultural Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface ha</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Type of crop</th>
<th>kg N/ha/y</th>
<th>kg P/ha/y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>909500</td>
<td>Arable land</td>
<td>64,5</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15000</td>
<td>Vineyards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110000</td>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78000</td>
<td>Pasture land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1-3: Number of Livestock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory of animals</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Specific Emission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kg N/head/y</td>
<td>kg P/head/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. pigs</td>
<td>1382500</td>
<td>9,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. cows</td>
<td>165000</td>
<td>41,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. cattle</td>
<td>273000</td>
<td>41,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. horses</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sheep</td>
<td>19500</td>
<td>8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. poultry</td>
<td>8627500</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

According to the Statistical Yearbook, application of industrial fertilizers is decreased from 98.8 kg N/ha/y (1988) to 64.5 kg N/ha/y (1998), and from 68.4 kg P/ha/y (1988) to 14.4 kg P/ha/y (1998). In the same period, the number of breeding farm animals has been significantly reduced and the quantity of applied farmyard manure diminished as well. An additional decrease of these inputs is not expected. On contrary, favorable economic situation could have been resulting in a slight increase of applied fertilizers. It is obvious that the response of fertilization decrease is a long-term process that may have been outlasting for a few tens of years.

A favorable impact on the nutrient run-off reduction is expected after the designation of vulnerable areas and implementation of the required forms of farming in these areas. The nutrient pollution reduction in waters will mostly be of local character. The revitalization programs of landscape, streams, small wetlands constructing etc. will help to improve mainly the ecological situation in their neighborhood.

One of the problems still pertaining in some areas is water erosion, transporting into streams, together with soils, high concentrations of nitrates and partly of phosphorus as well.

A schedule of the intended extent of anti-erosion measures for the following 5 years as well as calculation of nutrient reduction due to these measures is difficult to elaborate, without detailed research and investigation.

Presently, the amount of P in detergents is regulated by the "Voluntary agreement on gradual decrease of impact of detergents on the environment" (1995) which has been concluded between the Ministry of the Environment of the Czech Republic and the Czech corporation of producers of soaps, detergents and cleaning agents. Further decrease of P emissions from detergents depends on negotiations between the involved partners.

3.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

The total reduction of nutrient out flow from agricultural land is assumed as 10% of N and 3% of P. As the main focus of both Czech State Environmental Policy and the EU directives are on large localities, for the next five years period, from the category of diffuse sources of pollution from small municipalities and scattered farms it cannot be expected any nutrient reduction.

3.4 Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation

The identified priority projects that are supposed to be ready for implementation in the coming 5 years are compiled and characterized in Annex 3.4.

The total investment requirements of the 11 identified projects (including not further specified “small scale municipal projects”) are EUR 144 million; their composition by sectors is as follows:

- 6 municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 92 million,
- (other “small scale municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 42 million);
- 4 industrial projects with investment requirements of EUR 5.1 million,
- 1 agricultural project with investment requirements of EUR 5.3 million,
- 1 Wetlands Program (24 actions concerning wetland restoration) for EUR 2.6 million.

Czech Republic has identified a number of 24 actions concerning wetland restoration or similar activities together for about EUR 2.6 million as an integral part of the five year Joint Action Programme. Details on nutrient reduction effects after the implementation of these projects are subject of further studies.

Regarding project funding it is expected that national funds, 16% by international loans and about 11% by international grants will cover about 44%; the funding of the residual 30% is not yet secured.
3.5 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources

For the identified priority projects the anticipated nutrient reduction is stated in detail in Annex II-3 and can be summarized as follows:

- N: 1091 tons/year;
- P: 62 tons/year;
- BOD: 1246 tons/year;
- COD: 120 tons/year;

The composition of the anticipated nutrient reduction by sectors is compiled in Section 3.6(2).

In addition significant nutrient reduction is in the future expected from the application of the EU Directive 91/272/EEC which imposes waste water treatment on all municipalities with more than 2000 PE and increased treatment requirements on municipal pollution sources in “designated sensitive areas”. As the designation of sensitive areas is only in the stage of preparation, the expected effects will probably not become evident before 2005.

3.6 Summary of Main Country Specific Particularities

1) Main particularities regarding “non-point source” issues

Analysis of data information on nutrient loads has been performed based on available data in 1999, using official sources of information and documents. As other Danube countries, total N and P production calculated from specific production and number of inhabitants has also recorded a decreasing tendency during last years.

Czech Republic considers that farmland nutrient balances are influenced by many factors, which can include hydrology, climate and geographic conditions, as well as weather in particular years.

A specific characteristic of this country is related to the effect of the possible favorable economic situation, which can be resulting in a slight increase of applied fertilizers. Therefore, the response of fertilization decrease is a long-term process that may have been outlasting for a few tens of years.

Czech Republic proposes various methods aiming to nutrient reduction. Designation of vulnerable areas and implementation of the required forms of farming in these areas will bring the country in line with EU requirements. The nutrient pollution reduction in waters will mostly be of local character. The revitalization programs of landscape, streams, small wetlands constructing etc. will help to improve mainly the ecological situation in their neighborhood.

Other particularities is given by the effects of water erosion, transporting into streams, together with soils, high concentrations of nitrates and partly of phosphorus as well.

A schedule of the intended extent of anti-erosion measures for the following 5 years as well as calculation of nutrient reduction due to these measures is difficult to elaborate without detailed research and investigation.

2) Main particularities regarding “point source” projects

Czech Republic is one of the countries which provided a more or less complete project list and set of project data regarding investment requirements, implementation schedule and funding scheme for the priority projects to be implemented in the coming five year period.
The primary characteristics of the 12 identified priority projects can be summarized as follows:

### Table 3.6-1: Primary Characteristics of the Identified Priority Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Nutrient Reduction (tons/year)</th>
<th>Investment Cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural point sources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>not yet assessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development of the anticipated nutrient reduction can be summarized as follows:

### Table 3.6-2: Development of anticipated Nutrient Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (t/y)</td>
<td>P (t/y)</td>
<td>N (t/y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>13735</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>12725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural point sources</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>14109</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>13018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural non-point sources</td>
<td>22900</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>20600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37009</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>33618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 SLOVAKIA

4.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

Emissions from diffuse sources of pollution in Slovakia can be divided as emissions coming from population not connected to sewerage system, from agricultural land (by erosion) and from livestock. Table 4.1-1 contains information on population and emissions coefficients for N and P coming out from inhabitants not connected to sewage system. Different coefficients are given for inhabitants connected to water works, but not to sewerage system (emission coefficients are supposed to be higher) than those for inhabitants not connected neither to water works nor to sewerage system.

Table 4.1-1: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country total population</th>
<th>Emissions coefficients</th>
<th>Population not connected to sewerage</th>
<th>Population connected to sewage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kg N/inh/y</td>
<td>kg P/inh/y*</td>
<td>without treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 398 657</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>96030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>938 657 inh.</td>
<td>(inhabitants connected to water works but not to sewage system)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Phosphorus from detergents included

Table 4.1-2 presents data on main type of crops cultivated in Slovakia with corresponding areas and amount of nitrogen and phosphorus applied on particular lands. The values of nutrients from both organic and artificial fertilizers applied have been considered. Runoff coefficients have been estimated as 20 % of applied nitrogen and 2 % of applied phosphorus. The average amount of nutrients applied on agricultural land in Slovak Republic is 48,74 kg of nitrogen and 8,0 kg of phosphorus (for period 1998-99).

Table 4.1-2: Agricultural Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface (ha)</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Runoff coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of crop</td>
<td>kg N/ha/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870 449</td>
<td>Cereals in total, of which:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415 708</td>
<td>- Wheat</td>
<td>77,61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 369</td>
<td>- Rye</td>
<td>43,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 885</td>
<td>- Barley</td>
<td>53,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 641</td>
<td>- Oats</td>
<td>32,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 230</td>
<td>- Grain maize</td>
<td>88,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 657</td>
<td>Legume in total</td>
<td>13,59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 332</td>
<td>Potatoes in total</td>
<td>117,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 667</td>
<td>Sugar – beet</td>
<td>95,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 351</td>
<td>OIL - PLANTS IN TOTAL, OF WHICH:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 155</td>
<td>- Rape</td>
<td>95,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 126</td>
<td>- Sunflower</td>
<td>52,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 556</td>
<td>- Soya</td>
<td>52,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 450</td>
<td>- Poppy seeds</td>
<td>37,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 455</td>
<td>Flax</td>
<td>29,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 019</td>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>14,45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 516</td>
<td>Market vegetables</td>
<td>76,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 173</td>
<td>Feeding root - crops</td>
<td>54,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surface (ha) | Culture | Type of crop | Runoff coefficient |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kg N/ha/y</td>
<td>kg P/ha/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 009</td>
<td>FODDER ON ARABLE LAND ANNUAL, OF WHICH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 318</td>
<td>Unripe and ensilage maize</td>
<td>74,42</td>
<td>5,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 011</td>
<td>Lasting more years</td>
<td>15,98</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 377</td>
<td>Vineyards</td>
<td>22,33</td>
<td>4,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 017</td>
<td>Orchards</td>
<td>21,07</td>
<td>7,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 031</td>
<td>Hop-gardens</td>
<td>107,3</td>
<td>28,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Runoff coefficients are 20 % of applied N and 2 % of applied P to be in line with methodology used in National Reviews 1998, Part C: Water Quality.

One important information is that in the last years, the amounts of nitrogen and phosphorus applied on agricultural land are lower than their real need for cultivation of crops. The study performed by Central Control and Testing Institute of Agriculture (CCTIA) shows the need of an additional 23-kg N/ha nitrogen application and 6-kg P/ha. The difference of required nutrient for crops were provided by the soil.

Table 4.1-3 contains information on number of animals that are breeding in Slovakia with their corresponding emission coefficients for Nitrogen and Phosphorus.

**Table 4.1-3: Number of Livestock**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory of animals*</th>
<th>Number (1998)</th>
<th>Emission Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kg N/head/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. pigs</td>
<td>1593 000</td>
<td>0,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. cows</td>
<td>284 000</td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. cattle</td>
<td>421 000</td>
<td>0,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. horses</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td>no emission coefficient available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sheep</td>
<td>326 000</td>
<td>0,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. poultry</td>
<td>13 117 000</td>
<td>0,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* no waste water treatment plant provided

1) No emission coefficient especially for cows, only for cattle in general

The estimated total amount of nitrogen and phosphorus coming from diffuse sources of pollution is presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>N 1000 t/y</th>
<th>P 1000 t/y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erosion</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>0,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing-out</td>
<td>24,0</td>
<td>0,39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population connected to water works, but not connected to sewerage system</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>1,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population connected neither to water works, or sewerage system</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>1,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33,8</td>
<td>1,82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

The most important measures for nutrient reduction from diffuse sources of pollution are prepared mainly in accordance with transposition and implementation of European Union legislation. The basic document in the field of approximation process is the „National Programme for transposition of Aquis Communautaire“. In addition, requirements resulting from the governmental priority related to the EU accession process has also been transformed as „National Environmental Action Plan II“ (1999), with particular tasks to transpose and implement EU legislation.

In addition to the recent approved Law on fertilizers, Slovakia proposes the following measures that are supposed to become effective in the forthcoming period of five years, with the purpose to reduce nutrient emissions from diffuse sources:

1. Preparation of Governmental Decree on protection of water resources against pollution from agriculture
2. Development and implementation of the Code of good agricultural practices with purpose to reduce pollution caused by nitrates
4. Identification of vulnerable areas regarding the Nitrates Directive
5. Development of Action Programme in vulnerable areas to ensure protection of waters against pollution from agriculture (in relation to Nitrates Directive)
6. Establishment of a „Soil Service“ which should serve as advisory unit in the field of utilization and protection of soils. It should cooperate with relevant institutions with purpose to protect environment

Moreover, Slovakia, through the Ministry of Economy is preparing a new proposal on the methods of control of biological degradability of active substance detergents.

4.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

The assessment of the nutrient reduction from non-point sources of pollution is considered difficult to be carried out during the period of economic transformation as it is recognized the influence of reduced financial means on the implementation of the necessary measures to decrease nutrient release.

There is a large need of investments to ensure the increase of share of the population connected to sewerage system (now, only 54 % of total population is connected).

In the last decade, the consumption of artificial fertilizers decreased rapidly (app. 38,3 kg N/ha and 9,6 kg P/ha of agricultural land), but on long-term is expecting an increase of this amount up to 90 kg N/ha. The amount of applied artificial fertilizers in the future is also strongly dependent on financial situation of agricultural enterprises.

Slovakia encourages the beneficial application of the code of good agricultural practices in relation to the release of nutrients from agricultural land.

With all these measures being implemented in the forthcoming five years, the amount of nutrients from diffuse sources of pollution can be lowered by 10 %. More significant effects can be observed after longer periods of time, as most of the planned activities are due to the year 2002 and full implementation needs some additional time.
4.4 Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation

The list of priority projects supposed to be ready for implementation in the coming five years is presented in Annex 4.4. The elaboration of this list is based on:

- Projects included in the Joint Action Programme, which is under preparation under EMIS/EG at this time
- Final draft of Updated National Action Plan for Danube River Basin, containing priorities of both Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Soil Management regarding projects of construction/reconstruction/expansion of sewer systems and waste water treatment plants
- The National Environmental Action Plan, approved in December 1999, containing the list of particular measures to achieve objectives set up for the water management sector in SR

Regarding data on investments and funding status it is expected that the partly existing information gaps can be filled through information directly provided by the authorities or companies, responsible for project realisation.

The total investment requirements of the 20 identified projects are EUR 118 million; their composition by sectors is as follows:

- 13 municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 103 million,
- 4 industrial projects with investment requirements of EUR 14 million,
- no agricultural project;
- 3 wetland projects with investment requirements of EUR 0.9 million,
  (of which two projects “Integrated Management in Olšavica River Basin” and “Floodplain Meadow Restoration in the Lower Morava River” are already implemented and the third project “Wetland Restoration in Laborec River Basin” is prepared, but financial sources not yet secured).

Regarding project funding it is expected that about 38% will be covered by national funds, 4% by international loans and about 3% by international grants; the funding of the residual 55% is not yet secured.

4.5 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources

Regarding municipal sector, the nutrient emissions have either been known from wastewater quality monitoring data, which are stored in Slovak Hydro-meteorological Institute or have been estimated by a standardized method, based on per capita emission coefficients.

In discharged wastewater from industrial sources, nitrogen and phosphorus is measured only in case of significant emissions. This is the reason why the total amount of discharged N and P from industry is not given in Annex II-4.

The expected reduction of BOD, COD, nitrogen and phosphorus has been estimated on the basis of planned measures in the particular source of pollution. If estimation of expected reduction is higher than the present discharge, the reason is primarily that the expansion of the sewer system is usually planned for a higher number of people connected to the wastewater treatment plant.

The anticipated nutrient reduction from the identified point source projects and the composition by sectors is compiled in Section 4.6 (2) and can be summarized as follows:

- N: 2574 tons/year;
- P: 147 tons/year;
- BOD: 13609 tons/year;
- COD: 27148 tons/year;
4.6 Summary of Main Country Specific Particularities

(1) Main particularities regarding “non-point source” issues

Emissions from diffuse sources of pollution are considered in Slovakia as emissions coming from population not connected to sewerage system, from agricultural land (by erosion and washing up) and from livestock. Two important particularities of the country are related to the amounts of nitrogen and phosphorus applied on agricultural land that are lower than their real need for cultivation of crops and the initiative to implement soil conservation measures.

The most important measures for nutrient reduction from diffuse sources of pollution are prepared mainly in accordance with transposition and implementation of European Union legislation.

Slovakia is so far the only one country of the Danube river basin that has a recent approved Law on fertilizers. In addition, development and implementation of the Code of good agricultural practices with purpose to reduce pollution caused by nitrates is having a high priority.

Finally, the identification of vulnerable areas regarding the Nitrates Directive and the new proposal on the methods of control of biological degradability of active substance detergents bring Slovakia in line with EU standards.

With all these measures being implemented in the forthcoming five years, the amount of nutrients from diffuse sources of pollution can be lowered by 10%.

(2) Main particularities regarding “point source” projects

Altogether Slovak Republic could provide a relatively complete set of project data regarding investment requirements, implementation schedules (and partly funding schemes) for the identified priority projects to be implemented in the coming five year period. It is expected that the existing data gaps can be filled through information directly provided by the authorities or companies, responsible for project realisation.

The primary characteristics of the identified priority projects, which are envisaged to be implemented within the coming period of five years in Slovakia, can be summarized as follows:

Table 4.6-1: Primary Characteristics of the Identified Priority Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Nutrient Reduction (tons/year)</th>
<th>Investment Cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural point sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2574</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 HUNGARY

5.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

The revision of data and information on nutrient emissions/ loads performed by Hungary has been accomplished taking into consideration (i) the nutrient mass balance with main accent on diffuse pollution, nutrient transport, wetlands and losses of nutrients in water systems, along the Danube and, (ii) the functioning of the Black See ecosystems, with regard to the nutrient discharges.

The updated data and information are presented in table 5.1-1, 5.1-2 and 5.1-3.

Table 5.1-1: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country total population 1998</th>
<th>Emissions coefficients</th>
<th>Population not connected to sewerage</th>
<th>Population connected to sewerage *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inh</td>
<td>Kg N/inh/y Kg P/inh/y</td>
<td>inh without treatment</td>
<td>Mechanical step Biological step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,135,000</td>
<td>4,358,000</td>
<td>81,833,000</td>
<td>231,634,000 245,386,000 11,762,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Data refer to waste water discharge expressed in m³

Table 5.1-2: Agricultural Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Runoff coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>Type of crop</td>
<td>kg N/ha/y kg P/ha/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,183,000</td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,023,000</td>
<td>Maize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>Barley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>Rye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194,000</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,837,000</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,766,000</td>
<td>Of which fertilized area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistical Yearbook of Agriculture 1998, Central Statistical Office

Table 5.1-3: Number of Livestock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory of animals*</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Emission Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Heads</td>
<td>Kg N/head/y kg P/ head/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. pigs</td>
<td>5,479,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. cows</td>
<td>407,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. cattle</td>
<td>873,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. horses</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sheep</td>
<td>909,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. poultry</td>
<td>30,557,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistical Yearbook of Agriculture 1998, Central Statistical Office

* no wastewater treatment plant provided
The evolution of the total fertilizer usage per hectare of arable land, garden, orchard and vineyard at the world scale and Hungary is presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment of amount of fertilizers used in Hungary between 1992-1996 is presented in the next table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total quantity in 1000 t</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use on arable land, for 1 ha kg/ha</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of which:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N kg/ha</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P kg/ha</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K kg/ha</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

The identified measures for nutrient reduction from diffuse sources by Hungary, which are supposed to become effective within the forthcoming period of 5 years are based on the following concerns:

- introduction of P-free detergents;
- improvement of national policies and legislation regarding utilization of fertilizers and livestock waste;
- approximation of national legislation to relevant EU legislation and standards.

The National Environmental Programme of Hungary in relation to the nutrient reduction from diffuse sources defines two major measures:

1. The wastewater treatment in the region of nutrient sensitive waters should be at least 3rd degree.
2. The nutrient emission into surface waters should be reduced below 20% in comparison with the recent level.

Introduction of P-free detergents measure is not yet included in the National Environmental Programme of 1997-2006 neither in environmental, nor in the economic chapters.
5.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

The assessment of the anticipated annual potentials of nutrient reduction has been difficult to be carried out by Hungary due to the lack of data.

However, the implementation of the following projects in the agricultural sector will lead at a reduction of minimum 2,000-t/year N provided by non point sources of pollution:

- Introduction of EU-conform and environmentally protective pig fattening technology, in Mosonmagyarovar region;
- Agriculture originated pollution minimization in the floodplain of Tisza river;
- Establishment of agro- and nature-conservation training centers in the Koros-Maros National Park;
- Central-Danube Valley organic farming, nutrient control, wetland rehabilitation;
- Babocsa Organic farming in the Drava floodplain.

5.4 Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation

The identified priority projects that are supposed to be ready for implementation in the coming 5 years are compiled and characterized in Annex II-5.

The total investment requirements of the 24 identified priority projects are EUR 687 million; their composition by sectors is as follows:

- 16 municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 658 million,
- 1 industrial project with investment requirements of EUR 5.9 million,
- 5 agricultural project with investment requirements of EUR 7.2 million,
- 2 wetland projects with investment requirements of EUR 15.4 million.

Regarding project funding it is expected that about 39% will be covered by national funds, 27% by international loans and about 34% by international grants.

5.5 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources

The anticipated nutrient reduction for the 24 identified priority projects is stated in detail in Annex 5.4 and can be summarized as follows:

- N: 6708 tons/year;
- P: 1522 tons/year;
- BOD: - (figures not available);
- COD: - (figures not available);

The composition of the anticipated nutrient reduction by sectors is compiled in Section 5.6(2).

5.6 Summary of Main Country Specific Particularities

(1) Main particularities regarding “non-point source” issues

The revision of data and information on nutrient emissions/ loads performed by Hungary has taking into consideration the nutrient mass balance, with main accent on diffuse pollution, nutrient transport, wetlands and losses of nutrients in water systems.

Specific for Hungary is the increase of the fertiliser usage per hectare of arable land, garden, orchard and vineyard for the last eight years.
The identified measures for nutrient reduction from diffuse sources by Hungary, which are supposed to become effective within the forthcoming period of 5 years include the introduction of P-free detergents and improvements of national policies and legislation regarding utilisation of fertilisers and livestock waste.

An another particularity of Hungary is given by the measure to introduce wastewater treatment in the region of nutrient sensitive waters.

It is expected that the implementation of the nutrient reduction measures in the agricultural sector will lead to a reduction of minimum 2,000-t/year N.

(2) Main particularities regarding “point source” projects

Hungary is one of the countries which provided a complete project list and set of project data regarding investment requirements, implementation schedule and funding scheme for the identified priority projects to be implemented in the coming five year period.

The primary characteristics of the identified priority projects which are envisaged to be implemented within the coming period of five years in Hungary can be summarized as follows:

Table 5.6-1: Primary Characteristics of the Identified Priority Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Nutrient Reduction (tons/year)</th>
<th>Investment Cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3455</td>
<td>1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural point sources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6708</td>
<td>1522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the time being there are no figures on anticipated reduction of BOD and COD.
6 SLOVENIA

6.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

The verification of data and information were performed based on the estimates of the ad-hoc expert group of Slovenia. Although some measurements exist, the current monitoring procedures do not contain rules to allow measurements of Nitrogen and Phosphorus.

To facilitate the interpretation, Slovakia used the same values for one pollution equivalent (PE) as it is reported elsewhere in the literature, e.g. the Haskoning report of 1999 as indicated below:

1 PE (of municipality origin) is:
- 60 g BOD5/day => 25 kg BOD5/year
- 150 g COD/day => 50 kg COD/year
- g N/day => 5 kg N/year
- 2.5 g P/day => 1 kg P/year

It is also considered necessary to implement a new regulation on the responsibilities of large polluters to measure apart of BOD and COD content, also N and P.

For situations when part of data on BOD and COD were not reliable, the calculations were based on the population of the localities, adding measured or estimated values of the industrial load. An asterisk denotes such values (*).

The data are presented in the Tables 6.1-1, 6.1-2, 6.1-3 below.

### Table 6.1-1: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total population in the DRB</th>
<th>Emissions Coefficients</th>
<th>Population not connected to sewerage</th>
<th>Population connected to sewerage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kg N/nh/y Kg P/inh/y</td>
<td>without treatment Mechanical step biological step tertiary step</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.7% of total</td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td>56% = 13% = 16% = 15% = 0% =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,754 000</td>
<td></td>
<td>982 240</td>
<td>228 020 280 640 263 100 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.1-2: Agricultural Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface (ha) in the DRB</th>
<th>Culture Type of crop</th>
<th>Runoff coefficient</th>
<th>kg N /ha/y</th>
<th>kg P/ ha / y</th>
<th>Total Outflow / Total Precipit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>234 230</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>estimate 0.55 whole DRB</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 500</td>
<td>Vineyards</td>
<td>estimate 0.55 whole DRB</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 220</td>
<td>Orchards</td>
<td>estimate 0.55 whole DRB</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 430</td>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>estimate 0.55 whole DRB</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 230</td>
<td>Pastures</td>
<td>estimate 0.55 whole DRB</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>868 980</td>
<td>Forests</td>
<td>estimate 0.55 whole DRB</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 210</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>estimate 0.55 whole DRB</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 750 810</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>estimate 0.55 whole DRB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.1-3: Number of Livestock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory of animals*</th>
<th>Number in the Republic of Slovenia</th>
<th>Emission Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(factor 0.90 for DRB)</td>
<td>kg N /head/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. pigs</td>
<td>116 658</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. cows</td>
<td>381 846</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. cattle</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. horses</td>
<td>10 312</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sheep</td>
<td>22 972</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. poultry</td>
<td>1 419 884</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* no waste water treatment plant provided

6.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

As a consequence of EU accession process, Slovenia is already introducing EU market rules in terms of P-free detergent use.

Slovenia proposes measures to improve the national policies and legislation regarding utilization of fertilizers and livestock waste.

The Slovenian transposition of the EU Nitrates Directive states that total Nitrogen application on 1 ha of land could be less than 210 kg N/year. This maximum allowable value is further limited on water protection zones according to the type of the crop, e.g. maize 170 down to 80 kg N/year for 1 ha of land for wheat.

These lower limits shall also be taken into consideration on the country level once the forthcoming Water Act will come into force.

Slovenia already initiated actions to elaborate the code of proper best agricultural practices for achieving a sustainable agriculture.

It is expected that the national legislation shall be harmonized with the EU legislation within 2-3 years, while the full compliance time for some directives will be extended up to the year 2011 (IPPC) or even 2015 (UWWTD).

6.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

The assessment of the nutrient reduction measures has been performed with the view that EU approximation will bring positive changes but with long waiting periods to be able to properly valuing them.

As it has been already presented in some earlier studies (e.g. Haskoning, 1992 and 1993) Slovenia considered that there would be extremely difficult to reduce the present diffuse loads.

One reason is given by the fact that 50% of Slovenia’s population live in settlements below 2000 PE, and almost 70 % below 10 000 PE. As the Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive calls for centralized treatment, the number of PE connected to WWTP’s will be much higher, which will, in turn, negligibly reduce diffuse pollution, but, significantly, increase point-sources pollution. Any attempt in agriculture to compensate for this increase in point-source pollution will mean great financial, logistic and management burden for Slovenia.
6.4 Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation

The list of projects that are supposed to be ready for implementation in the coming 5 years is presented in Annex II-6. The elaboration of this list of projects is mainly based on the up-dated Action Pollution Reduction Programme of the DDPRP and a selection of the most feasible and best-prepared projects (with complete project files, adequate funding schedules, and ready for implementation) been considered:

The total investment requirements of the 24 identified projects are EUR 384 million; their composition by sectors is as follows:

- 23 municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 383 million,
- no industrial project;
- 1 agricultural project with investment requirements of EUR 1.7 million;
- no wetland project.

Regarding project funding it is expected that about 85% will be covered by national funds, 12% by international loans and about 3% by international grants.

6.5 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources

The overall anticipated nutrient reduction from the identified point source projects and the composition by sectors is stated in the compilation presented in section 6.6 (2) and can be summarized as follows:

- N: 5233 tons/year;
- P: 814 tons/year;
- BOD: 28816 tons/year;
- COD: 47040 tons/year;

6.6 Main Country Specific Particularities

(1) Main particularities regarding “non-point source” issues

The verification of data and information were performed based on the estimates of the ad-hoc expert group of Slovenia, with some constraints related to the current monitoring procedures which do not contain rules to allow measurements of Nitrogen and Phosphorus.

As a consequence of EU accession process, Slovenia is already introducing EU market rules in terms of P-free detergent use.

Slovenia proposes also measures to improve the national policies and legislation regarding utilisation of fertilisers and livestock waste. Moreover, Slovenia already initiated actions to elaborate the code of proper best agricultural practices for achieving a sustainable agriculture.

The assessment of the nutrient reduction measures has been performed with the view that EU approximation will bring positive changes but with long waiting periods to be able to properly valuing them.

(2) Main particularities regarding “point source” projects

Altogether Slovenia provided a complete project list and set of project data regarding investment requirements, implementation schedules and funding schemes for the identified priority projects to be implemented in the coming five year period.
The primary characteristics of the identified priority projects which are envisaged to be implemented within the coming period of five years in Slovenia can be summarized as follows:

**Table 6.6-1: Primary Characteristics of the Identified Priority Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Nutrient Reduction (tons/year)</th>
<th>Investment Cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5 053</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural point sources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5 233</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 CROATIA

7.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

Croatia was not the part of the Nutrient Mass Balance Project within the Danube Program.

The analysis/verifications of the data and the information on nutrient emissions/loads has been performed for population and livestock unit, as most of the necessary data for agricultural land do not yet exist.

Moreover, data about emissions of Phosphorus and Nitrogen need to be collected which it will take some time and supplementary investigations.

However, it was possible that some data that refer to the type of crop production, by specific crop production, in tons in 1997, to be reviewed. Tables 1 and 3 contain some information that were collected and reviewed.

Table 7.1-1: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country total population</th>
<th>Emissions Coefficients</th>
<th>Population not connected to sewerage</th>
<th>Population connected to sewerage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kg N/inh/y</td>
<td>Kg P/inh/y</td>
<td>without treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mechanical step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>biological step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 250 000</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>1 583 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 475 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>145 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1-2: Agricultural Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface ha</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Type of crop</th>
<th>Runoff Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>kg N/ha/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kg P/ha/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1-3: Number of Livestock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory of animals*</th>
<th>Number (1998)</th>
<th>Emission Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kg N/head/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kg P/head/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. pigs</td>
<td>1 333 449</td>
<td>8,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. cows</td>
<td>232 694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. cattle</td>
<td>377 307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. horses</td>
<td>10 075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sheep</td>
<td>157 287</td>
<td>8,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. poultry</td>
<td>8 736 791</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• total – with and without treatment

7.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

In accordance with the National Pollution Control Plan of Croatia, the proposed measures include:

- Preservation of the water resources quality
- Reduction of the pollution sources
- Strengthening of the monitoring system inclusively for accidental pollution.
For the next five years, Croatia proposes the necessary measures for nutrient reduction that include (i) introduction of P-free detergents, (ii) improvement of national policies and legislation regarding utilization of fertilizers and livestock waste, and (iii) approximation of national legislation to relevant EU legislation, respectively EU-standards.

7.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

During the last decade, the use of plant protection agents has decreased, not due to ecological reasons, but exclusively because of the economic constraints.

It seems that visible nutrient reduction from diffuse sources might take place only once the required measures and actions will be implemented.

7.4 Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation

The identified priority projects, which are supposed to be ready for implementation in the coming 5 years, are compiled and characterized in Annex II-7.

The total investment requirements of the 11 identified priority projects are EUR 433 million; their composition by sectors is as follows:

- 11 municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 421 million (including EUR 256 million for implementation of biological treatment in Zagreb, 1500000 PE):
  - Cakovec (extension of WWTP for tertiary treatment);
  - Varazdin (reconstruction works and sludge treatment);
  - Koprivnica (secondary and tertiary treatment for 90000 PE);
  - Zagreb (biological treatment for 1500000 PE);
  - Sisak, Karlovac (preparatory works);
  - 5 other smaller WWTPs

- no industrial projects;
- no agricultural projects;
- no wetland projects.

Industrial, agricultural and wetland projects could not yet be identified because these projects need commitment from other authorities which is not to be obtained in the short term.

Regarding project funding the figures presented in Annex 7.4 are just for ongoing projects, respectively contracted values. For the majority of the projects there are no adequate funding schemes available.

7.5 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources

The anticipated nutrient reduction for the identified priority projects is stated in detail in Annex 7.4 and summarized in Section 7.6(2).

As nutrient reduction figures are not available for all of the identified priority projects, the provided figures do not fully represent the actual nutrient reduction.
7.6 Summary of Main Country Specific Particularities

(1) Main particularities regarding “non-point source” issues

Specific for Croatia is the fact that it has not been part of the Nutrient Mass Balance Project within the Danube Program. Most of data are not available and the analysis/verifications of the data and the information on nutrient emissions/loads has been performed only for population and livestock units.

In accordance with the National Pollution Control Plan of Croatia, the proposed measures include:

- Preservation of the water resources quality
- Reduction of the pollution sources
- Strengthening of the monitoring system, inclusively for accidental pollution.

For the next five years, Croatia proposes the necessary measures for nutrient reduction that include (i) introduction of P-free detergents, (ii) improvement of national policies and legislation regarding utilization of fertilizers and livestock waste, and (iii) approximation of national legislation to relevant EU legislation, respectively EU-standards.

It has been difficult to make estimates, but it is assumed that noticeable nutrient reduction from diffuse sources might be recorded once the required measures and actions will be implemented.

(2) Main particularities regarding “point source” projects

Up to now, there is no formalized, respectively officially agreed program or plan for nutrient reduction projects in Croatia.

There is a relatively clear priority schedule and implementation program for WWTP in the municipal sector; (but not for the industrial and the agricultural sector, and not for wetlands).

The primary characteristics of the identified priority projects which are envisaged to be implemented within the coming period of five years in Croatia can be summarized as follows:

Table 7.6-1: Primary Characteristics of the Identified Priority Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Nutrient Reduction (tons/year)</th>
<th>Investment Cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural point sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even these priority projects in the municipal waste water sector cannot be considered as really committed, as there are no committed funding schemes for the majority of the identified projects.

According to the provided data there are no figures for the anticipated nutrient reduction for the majority of the identified projects.
8 BOSNIA - HERCEGOVINA

8.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

In comparison with similar previous revisions of data on emissions and loads, for this project, Bosnia - Herzegovina presented a full picture of all rivers belonging to the Danube river basin on its territory.

However, since the system of monitoring and assessment has not been yet re-established and therefore the up-dated values are not yet available, the data and information on nutrient emissions/loads represent estimations from the pre-war period.

Moreover, Bosnia - Herzegovina included recorded data on nutrient content at the mouths of main rivers into Sava river to be considered for transboundary pollution analysis within the framework of this present project.

The data on total nitrogen and phosphorus content measured in monitoring stations that are not up-dated are presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>River</th>
<th>COD (t/y)</th>
<th>BOD5 (t/y)</th>
<th>Total N (t/y)</th>
<th>Ortho P (t/y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Una</td>
<td>32.777</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Vrbas</td>
<td>52.305</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bosna</td>
<td>29.601</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>6,540</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Drina – downstream of Visegrad</td>
<td>33.726</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At present about 88.61 % or 3,348 734 inhabitants of the total B&H population lives in the Danube river basin. Data for the share of Danube river basin related to pre-war and present population are summarized in the Table 8.1-1, with emissions coefficient calculated per capita and year.

**Table 8.1-1: Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The population in the DRB</th>
<th>Emissions Coefficients</th>
<th>Population not connected to sewerage system</th>
<th>Population connected to sewerage system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kg N/inh/y</td>
<td>Kg P/inh/y (65 %)</td>
<td>without treatment</td>
<td>Mechanical step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>biological step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tertiary step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,010 467*</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2,606 804</td>
<td>933,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,348 734**</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2,176 677</td>
<td>896,881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* population in 1991, within Danube River Basin
** population from post-war period (assessment)

Most of the data required to fill up the Tables 8.1-2 and 8.1-3 were not yet available. Data given (agricultural areas and number of livestock) refers to the entire territory of B&H.

**Table 8.1-2: Agricultural Land**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface (ha)</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Type of crop</th>
<th>Runoff Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,055,000</td>
<td>Ploughed fields and gardens</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Orchards</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Vineyards</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383,000</td>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,542,000</td>
<td>Total arable land</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>866,000</td>
<td>Pastures</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>Fish ponds, pools and reeds</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873,000</td>
<td>Total uncultivable land</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,415,000</td>
<td>Total agricultural area</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Unpublished data of the two entity statistic institutes
Table 8.1-3: Number of Livestock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory of Animals*</th>
<th>Number (B&amp;H, 31.12.1997)</th>
<th>Emission coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kg N/head/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kg P/head/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. pigs</td>
<td>372,654</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. cows</td>
<td>574,102</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. cattle</td>
<td>417,704</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. horses</td>
<td>56,807</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sheep</td>
<td>580,493</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. poultry</td>
<td>3,362,488</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. others</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* no waste water treatment plant provided

Only a very small number of inhabitants are served by sewerage system (up to 35 %), mostly located in larger municipalities. All other settlements do not have any sewerage system or connection to wastewater treatment plants. The increase of number of settlements having access to sewerage and treatment facilities is considered as being a priority by the government. As an example, two newly constructed wastewater treatment plants are already in operation. Also, the rehabilitation of those wastewater treatment plants that were damaged in the past represents a concern for the policy makers.

8.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

The nutrient content of waters of B&H provided by the diffused sources of nutrient emissions is mainly from the agricultural production and livestock farming.

As a consequence of recent economic development of the country mainly through both the extension of cultivated agricultural areas and intensification of farming, a future increase of nutrient emission can be expected.

The current legal framework related to water and environmental concerns, which can be considered as the most appropriate measure to control and reduce nutrient is mainly out-dated and does not allow the harmonization to the relevant EU legislation.

Although, at the state level, new pieces of legislation are in the process of preparation, there are still no instruments available to both control and enforce the necessary measures in reducing nutrient emissions. One example can be given by the existence of the only one recorded Detergent Production Factory – DITA located in Tuzla which produces P-free detergents, in spite of the fact that there are may other producers which are not yet part of the evidence in the water and environmental registers.

The urgent measures proposed by Bosnia - Herzegovina to be implemented include:

- Creation of various relevant legal regulations and rules in accordance to EU legislation referred to the use of various chemical products in agriculture;
- Introduction and use of relevant standards for production/use of various chemical products in agriculture;
- Introduction and use of relevant standards for production/use of various chemical products in agriculture;
- Setting up of relevant institutions to be responsible for enforcement of legal instruments and standards;
- Establishment of an inspection system to enforce the legal requirements;
- Promotion of sanitation measures of all centralized farms and construction of wastewater treatment plants on farms in parallel;
- Development and implementation of relevant regulations related to the production of phosphorus-free detergents.
8.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

Taking into consideration the necessity of development of the required legal framework, which can allow the introduction of nutrient control and reduction measures, it is understandable that the first results concerning the reduction of emissions/loads pollutants will be visible after the implementation period of the proposed urgent measures.

Under these conditions, if the predicted urgent measures shall be introduced during the year 2001, one can expect reduction of nutrient emissions in the after-coming period. If it is assumed that the adoption and implementation of regulations and standards will be within the next two years, then visible effects of nutrient content reduction can be expected in the year 2005.

However, improvement of the economic situation of the country can already be seen especially in the field of agriculture and stock farming. As the activities in the field of agriculture and livestock farming are recently intensified, the nutrient content will record higher levels. This concern is going to be taking into consideration and included in the proposed urgent measures of B&H.

Generally, it can be assumed that the condition of transboundary rivers, considering pollution impacts in general, is better than the assessed conditions in the previous period. However, figures showing the expected nutrient reduction are not available at the moment.

8.4 Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation

The Long Term Protection Program finalized in 1991 (just before the war started) proposed different activities that were supposed to be implemented within a period of 18 years. At that time, the expected investment cost for the defined priority projects to be implemented within the next five years period was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River basin</th>
<th>Investment cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Una-Sana</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vrbas</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosna</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sava</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Up to now, there is no formalized, respectively officially agreed investment programme or action plan for nutrient control/reduction projects in B&H.

The most urgent priority projects which should be implemented within the coming period of five years are compiled in Annex II-8.

The total investment requirements of the 12 identified priority projects is EUR 176 million; the composition by sectors is as follows:

- 5 municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 147.0 million;
- 6 industrial projects with investment requirements of EUR 27.1 million;
- 1 agricultural project with investment requirements of EUR 2.3 million;
- no wetland project.

Even these projects with total investment requirements of about EUR 156 million cannot be considered as really committed, as for most of the projects, adequate implementation and funding schedules are not yet available.

8.5 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources

Since data on current nutrient emissions are not really known for most of the discharge points, and since available data are mainly based on pre-war measurements, it is actually not possible to assess the anticipated nutrient reduction correctly.
The anticipated nutrient reduction from the implementation of the identified priority projects (which can due to the incomplete data actually not be considered as the total nutrient reduction) is compiled in detail in Annex 8.4 and summarized in section 8.6(2).

8.6 Summary of Main Country Specific Particularities

(1) Main particularities regarding “non-point source” issues

Bosnia - Herzegovina reviewed recorded data on nutrient content for all main rivers located within the Danube basin share. However, at this stage of the project development, most of the data required are not yet available.

Agricultural production and livestock farming represent the main diffuse sources of pollution. However, the large diffuse pollution provided by the lack of treatment facilities for 65% of the population living in the country imposed new priorities for the policy makers, in relation to the constructed of new wastewater treatment plants or the rehabilitation of those plants that were damaged in the past.

The current legal framework related to water and environmental concerns is mainly out-dated and does not allow the harmonization to the relevant EU legislation.

The introduction of P-free detergents has been already taken into consideration.

The urgent measures proposed by Bosnia - Herzegovina to be implemented in relation to the nutrient reduction concern refer to improvements of both legal and institutional framework.

As a consequence of recent economic development of the country mainly through both the extension of cultivated agricultural areas and intensification of farming a future increase of nutrient emission can be expected. However, if the predicted urgent measures shall be introduced during the year 2001, visible effects of nutrient content reduction can be expected in the year 2005.

(2) Main particularities regarding “point source” projects

Up to now, there is no formalized, respectively officially agreed investment programme or action plan for nutrient control/reduction projects in B&H.

The primary characteristics of the identified priority projects which are envisaged to be implemented within the coming period of five years in B&H can be summarized as follows:

Table 8.6-1: Primary Characteristics of the Identified Priority Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Nutrient Reduction (tons/year)</th>
<th>Investment Cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3005</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural point sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even these most urgent priority projects, with total investment requirements of about EUR 176 million, cannot be considered as committed, as even for these projects, adequate implementation schedules and funding schemes are not yet available.

At the time being, there are no reliable data on the existing situation of nutrient emissions, respectively the anticipated nutrient reduction from the implementation of proposed “point source” projects. Thus the above stated figures do due to missing data actually not represent the total nutrient reduction of the proposed priority projects.
9 YUGOSLAVIA

9.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

Yugoslavia verified the data and information on nutrient emissions/loads that were collected before the year 1992. This is justified by the fact that the data collected after this period present a particular character of uncertainty. In addition, it is considered that the data from the period up to 1992 reflect more realistically the situation for the planning period covered by Phase II of the Strategic Action Plan for the Danube River.

Table 9.1-1: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country total population living in DRB</th>
<th>Emissions coefficients</th>
<th>Population not connected to sewerage</th>
<th>Population connected to sewerage in the DRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kg N/inh/y Kg P/inh/y</td>
<td>Inh. without treatment</td>
<td>mechanical step biological step tertiary step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 016 000</td>
<td>4.0 0.95</td>
<td>6 039 000 2 400 000 80 000</td>
<td>447 000 50 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
The consumption of detergents in the FR YU DRB is 52 000 t/y or about 6 kg/cap/y.
The production of P-free detergents is not practiced yet. It is estimated that 1 400 t/y of Phosphorous emission comes from detergents.
This amount is included in the data of municipal wastewater emission.

Table 9.1-2: Agricultural Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface (ha)</th>
<th>Type of crop</th>
<th>Applied fertilizers (kg/ha/y)</th>
<th>Runoff Coefficient (see remarks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mineral Manure mineral manure</td>
<td>kg/ha/y kg/ha/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850 000</td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>25 25</td>
<td>N P N P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 350 000</td>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>30 25</td>
<td>12.0 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 000</td>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>15 15</td>
<td>14.0 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 000</td>
<td>Sugar beat</td>
<td>90 15</td>
<td>7.0 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 000</td>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>20 10</td>
<td>30.0 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 000</td>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>25 15</td>
<td>4.0 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 000</td>
<td>Grapes, Fruits</td>
<td>20 15</td>
<td>7.5 6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:
(1) In the YU Part of DRB there are: Arable land 4 680 000 ha (60% cultivated for the crop);
(2) Natural pastures – 1 011 900 ha; Forested land – 2 707 000; Water bodies – 137 000 ha; Unspecified land – 348 900 ha;
(3) About 2 600 000 ha of arable land lye in the flat area where vertical component of runoff dominates;
(4) Due to low consumption of fertilizers there is 25-30 % deficit of Nitrogen in the soil. The largest portion of Phosphorous is adsorbed by unsaturated soil;
(5) There is no data on the runoff (export) coefficients for specified crop, but the average export coefficients for N and P estimated on the basis of N and P mass flow for several rivers (exactly defined watersheds) are: 1 - 1.5 (kg N/ha/y) and 0.15 - 0.25 (kg P/ha/y) respectively;
(6) The emission of Nitrogen and Phosphorous from diffuse pollution sources in the YU Part of DRB is about 15 000 tons N/y and 2000 tons P/y respectively.
Table 9.1-3: Number of Livestock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory of animals (no waste water treatment plant provided)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Emission Coefficient (average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kg N/head/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs (breeding in the larger farms)</td>
<td>1 200 000</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs (small private livestock, individual households)</td>
<td>3 000 000</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cows (breeding in the larger farms)</td>
<td>150 000</td>
<td>26.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cows (small private livestock, individual households)</td>
<td>500 000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle (breeding in the larger farms)</td>
<td>150 000</td>
<td>38.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle (small private livestock, individual households)</td>
<td>1 120 000</td>
<td>28.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>90 000</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep (small private livestock, individual households)</td>
<td>2 500 000</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry (breeding in the larger farms)</td>
<td>12 000 000</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry (small private livestock, individual households)</td>
<td>15 000 000</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:

(1) The emission coefficient for animals breeding in small private livestock and individual households is lower due to the different feeding practice.

(2) Manure is usually discharged into lagoons and after enough period of maturation is used for application on the land.

(3) A neglecting portion of manure directly reaches watercourses.

9.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

The nutrient emissions from diffuse sources do not present significant values to justify the implementation of severe measures. As estimated, the total emission of nitrogen and phosphorous from diffuse sources are about 14-15 000 t/y and 1600 – 2000 t/y, respectively.

The reduced emissions are due to the effects of using, on most of the arable land (85%), of the good agricultural practices (soil care, using of manure rather than mineral fertilizers, adjusting of the periods of soil application manure, etc.). As the consequence, nutrients run off from the largest part of arable land is minimized to the lowest level.

However, in the plain region, the run-off is low and nutrients are transformed or adsorbed by the soil. The small part of it reaches the recipients.

The consumption of fertilizers in FR of Yugoslavia in the last then years has severely decreased. In this period it is just one third of what it was before the year 1990. As estimated, the uptake of nutrients by plants overcomes the consumption by 25%.

The proposed measures for nutrient reduction from diffuse sources include:

(1) Continuation of the use of good agricultural practices

(2) Controlling of the use of mineral fertilizers, particularly in the slope areas

(3) Forestation in order to decrease erosion
9.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

The effects of measures for nutrient reduction from diffuse sources could be observed on the long-term basis. Comparing with nutrient emission data, an improvement could be recorded by decreasing erosion i.e. by afforesting measures implemented in the areas of excessive erosion. It is estimated that the current emission could be decreased for about 25%.

9.4 Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation

Yugoslavia provided a complete project list and set of project data regarding investment requirements, implementation schedule and funding schemes for the identified priority projects to be implemented in the coming five year period.

The identified priority projects that are supposed to be ready for implementation in the coming 5 years are compiled and characterized in Annex II-9.

The total investment requirements of the 40 identified priority projects are EUR 783 million; the composition by sectors is as follows:

- 21 municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 646 million,
- 7 industrial projects with investment requirements of EUR 68.5 million,
- 7 agricultural project with investment requirements of EUR 65.8 million,
- 5 wetland projects with investment requirements of EUR 5 million.

Regarding project funding it is expected that about 22% will be covered by national funds, 65% by international loans and about 13% by international grants.

9.5 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources

The overall anticipated nutrient reduction from the identified point source projects and the composition by sectors is stated in the compilation presented in Section 9.6 (2) and can be summarized as follows:

- N: 6793 tons/year;
- P: 4863 tons/year;
- BOD: 115358 tons/year;
- COD: 277196 tons/year.

9.6 Summary of Main Country Specific Particularities

(1) Main particularities regarding “non-point source” issues

Yugoslavia considered that the data and information on nutrient emissions/loads recorded before the year 1992 reflect more realistically the situation for the planning period subject to the Strategic Action Plan for the Danube River.

One significant particularity of Yugoslavia is related to the current reduced nutrient emissions from diffuse sources with values of about 14 -15 000 t N/y and 1600 – 2000 t P/y, respectively.

The reduced emissions are due to the effects of using, on most of the arable land (85%), of the good agricultural practices (soil care, using of manure rather than mineral fertilizers, adjusting of the periods of soil application manure, etc.). As the consequence, nutrients run off from the largest part of arable land is minimized to the lowest level.
As in other countries, the consumption of fertilizers, in the last ten years, has severely decreased. In this period it is just one third of what it was before the year 1990.

The proposed measures for nutrient reduction from diffuse sources include:

1. Continuation of the use of good agricultural practices
2. Controlling of the use of mineral fertilizers, particularly in the slope areas
3. Forestation in order to decrease erosion

The effects of measures for nutrient reduction from diffuse sources could be observed on the long-term basis. Comparing with nutrient emission data, an improvement could be recorded by decreasing erosion i.e. by afforesting measures implemented in the areas of excessive erosion. It is estimated that the current emission could be decreased for about 25%.

(2) **Main particularities regarding “point source” projects**

Yugoslavia provided a complete project list and set of project data regarding investment requirements, implementation schedule and funding schemes for the identified priority projects to be implemented in the coming five year period.

The primary characteristics of the identified priority projects can be summarized as follows:

**Table 9.6-1: Primary Characteristics of the Identified Priority Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Nutrient Reduction (tons/year)</th>
<th>Investment Cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>3,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural point sources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6,793</td>
<td>4,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If these extraordinary high anticipated nutrient reduction figures could really be realized the implementation of the proposed point source projects in Yugoslavia would lead to a significant reduction of nutrient emissions and nutrient loads in the DRB.


10 BULGARIA

10.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

The verification of the data and information on nutrient emissions in Bulgaria implied initially the organization of data and information provided by various specific institutions on the river basin basis. This exercise made possible the separation, with some kind of uncertainty, at this time of the development of the project, of the independent contributions of both diffuse and point sources of pollution. However, the precise correction of nutrient mass balance with main accent on diffuse pollution, nutrient transport, wetlands and losses of nutrients in water systems along the Danube on the Bulgarian territory was not possible at this stage.

Therefore, the data and information relating to agricultural and municipal sectors were updated for the year 1998. The evaluation of nutrient emissions/loads is presented in the tables 10.1-1, 10.1-2 and 10.1-3.

The updated data on the total number of the population in the Danube river basin on the Bulgarian territory, the emissions coefficients, the number of the population connected and not connected to sewerage are given in Table 10.1-1.

**Table 10.1-1: Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country population-Danube RB</th>
<th>Emissions Coefficients</th>
<th>Population not connected to sewerage</th>
<th>Population connected to sewerage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kg N/inh/y Kg P/inh/y</td>
<td>inhabitants Without treatment Mechanical step Biological step Tertiary step</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone A 137 744</td>
<td>71 214 66 530</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone B 408 795</td>
<td>236 868 159 276</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77 592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone C 1545 417</td>
<td>426 484 53 427</td>
<td>26 608</td>
<td>1 016 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone D 411 029</td>
<td>204 750 86 229</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120 050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone E 560 047</td>
<td>272 372 209 020</td>
<td>13 655</td>
<td>65 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone F 189 277</td>
<td>132 015 15 338</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41 924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone G 645 911</td>
<td>350 371 198 964</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96 576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 3 898 220</td>
<td>1 694 074 788 784</td>
<td>40 263</td>
<td>1 417 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.47% 35.11% ** 1.79%**</td>
<td>63.09%** 1%**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSI, MRDPW

* WWTP- Samokov, not yet under operation

** 35.11% of the population connected to sewerage; the share of the population connected to sewerage is 66.53% of the total population in the Danube catchment

The percentage of the population, which is not connected to sewerage, is 43.47% within the Danube river catchment area. The amount of wastewater of 35.11% of the population connected to sewerage is discharged without treatment while 1.79% is treated using only mechanical step and 63.09% is biologically treated. There is a small portion of only 1% of the total wastewater that is treated using tertiary stage.

The expressed data for the population, which refer to nitrogen and phosphorus emissions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average parameters „pollution production“ of one person in one day or one year</th>
<th>BOD5 g/inh/day</th>
<th>Total N kg/inh/year</th>
<th>Total P kg/inh/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopted in Bulgaria</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19.71</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European (often used)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 43.47% 35.11% ** 1.79%** 63.09%** 1%**
The structure of the agricultural sector by type of activity and production in 1997 and 1998 is considered to be almost the same. On a national level, the crop production has the biggest share 63.9%. Next to this is the livestock production with 16.2% and mixed (crop and livestock) with 6.1%.

The updated information, concerning the agricultural land use and the types of crops are presented in Table 10.1-2.

Table 10.1-2: Agricultural Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface (ha)</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Runoff coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of crop</td>
<td>kg N/ha/y</td>
<td>kg P/ha/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584 203.6</td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>203.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 547.3</td>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>547.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353 846.0</td>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>846.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325 292.9</td>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>292.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>field tomatoes</td>
<td>104.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 821.9</td>
<td>Grapes</td>
<td>821.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSI, MoAF

In Bulgaria there are several regions with well-developed agriculture, such as Dobrich, Pleven, Silistra, Russe, Veliko Tarnovo, Vratza, Razgrad, Montana.

Therefore, the fertilization of the cultivated land is of great importance for the agricultural output and the nutrient balance. The imbalance fertilization and deficit of the main nutrients have been detrimental to both crop production and soil fertility, that adversely influenced the country’s environmental situation (see the table below).

Average Use of Mineral Fertilizers (in tons) – Country Bulgaria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NPK- total</th>
<th>Kg/ha</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>kg/ha</th>
<th>P205</th>
<th>kg/ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1056369</td>
<td>226.9</td>
<td>511761</td>
<td>109.94</td>
<td>419688</td>
<td>90.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>142127</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>129545</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>12426</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>164894</td>
<td>35.61</td>
<td>151883</td>
<td>32.36</td>
<td>12824</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>163922</td>
<td>36.47</td>
<td>145773</td>
<td>32.49</td>
<td>16275</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>113146</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>97497</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>8900</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.06.1999</td>
<td>111972</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>97497</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>8900</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The high cost of chemical treatment of soil impeded improvements or amelioration work during past 6 years. According to MoAF data, before 1998, only some 7.7% of the areas under crops was treated with phosphorous fertilizers, 5.9% with nitrogen fertilizers and a bare surface of 0.2% experienced potassium treatment.

The Nutrients Balance shows the values indicated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Balance Elements</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(in 1000 t)</th>
<th>P205</th>
<th>(in 1000 t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986-1990</td>
<td>Exported with crop exports</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imported with fertilizer imports</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>+169</td>
<td>+126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1995</td>
<td>Exported with crop exports</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imported with fertilizer imports</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Exported with crop exports</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imported with fertilizer imports</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Exported with crop exports</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imported with fertilizer imports</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>-77</td>
<td>-83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the livestock production in 1998, both animal numbers and production were increased (sheep and buffalo numbers being an exception to the trend) against 1997, but comparing with 1989/1990 the numbers show several fold decrease.

The number of animals bred in small family farms has been increasing in recent years. The number of livestock ranges - 1 to 3 cows, and 5 to 10 sheep.

Based on the research work carried out by the Soil & Science Institute „N. Pushkarov“ it is shown that the solid and liquid wastes from cattle (cows, calves, and buffaloes) constitute 8% of the animal weight and they are at rate of 1,66:1. Presuming that the average weight of a cow is 500 kg, one cow should deliver daily 25 kg solid and 15-kg liquid wastes. The solid and liquid wastes from a pig constitute 7% of its weight i.e. for a 100 kg pig the wastes will be 7 kg/day in relation 0,62:1, etc. The average annual load per an animal (N & P) is given in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of animal</th>
<th>Quantity of manure (tons/year)</th>
<th>Total Nitrogen (TN) (kg/head/year)</th>
<th>Total Phosphorous (TP) (kg/head/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td>66,3</td>
<td>17,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>16,0</td>
<td>6,45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>0,87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hens</td>
<td>0,054</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research publication of Soil Science Institute „N. Pushkarov“

The updated information, concerning inventory of animals, their number and emission coefficient is presented as Table 10.1-3.

**Table 10.1-3: Number of Livestock**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory of animals* (*no WWTP provided)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Emission Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kg N/head/y</td>
<td>kg P/head/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. pigs</td>
<td>610 049</td>
<td>16,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. cows</td>
<td>220 960</td>
<td>66,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. sheep</td>
<td>1 045 736</td>
<td>5,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. poultry</td>
<td>7 101 697</td>
<td>0,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSI, MoAF

### 10.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

To achieve the largest nutrient loads reduction within the border of its Danube share, Bulgaria identified measures for nutrient control and reduction from diffuse sources that mainly address (i) the policy and legislation related actions, (ii) institutional strengthening and capacity building, and (iii) public awareness raising and strengthening public participation in nutrient reduction initiatives.

The identified preventive measures that are supposed to be implemented during the next 5 years include:

1. Improvement of national policies and legislation regarding utilization of fertilizers and livestock waste and approximation of national legislation to relevant EU legislation and standards through the following measures:
   - Development and enforcement of the effluent limits/emission standards;
   - Adoption and enforcement of the Regulation on the protection of water from pollution with nitrates from agricultural origin;
   - Improvement of soil conservation measures;
   - Improvement of water and soil monitoring systems on non point sources of pollution;
   - Establishment of necessary data bases for assessment of nutrients related parameters and indicators with the MOEW Water Directorate;
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- Development of a river bank erosion monitoring system and analysis of the causes of erosion (mainly related to river-bank deforestation);
- Adaptation of the EU methodology for assessment of non point sources of pollution for the Bulgarian conditions;
- Implementation of the National Plan for the development of agriculture and rural areas;
- Development of the Geographic Information System, aimed to support and to facilitate the management process;

(2) Institutional strengthening and capacity building through the following measures:
- Training of the experts from the different stakeholders groups on topics such as river basin management and nutrients control and reduction, and establishment of the training center in Veliko Tarnovo;
- Development and enforcement of guidelines for the application of the agro-environmental schemes (including: guidelines on fertilizer (organic & inorganic) application rates to individual crops; guidelines on crop rotation; guidelines/rules on preventive application of manure/slurry; guidelines on proper on-farm manure storage/composting, etc.);
- Development and enforcement of guidelines for river basin management;
- Development and implementation of guidelines for the measurement and calculation of total emission of nutrients by source;

(3) Public awareness raising and strengthening public participation in nutrient reduction through the following measures:
- Organization of a targeted public awareness campaigns;
- Development of a regional agri-environmental scheme for sustainable development and efficient management of agricultural activities (including organic agriculture, manure storage, erosion control etc.);
- Development of a pilot projects for implementation of alternative methods (construction of artificial wetlands) for households wastewater treatment in the small towns and villages;
- Development of a pilot project for wetlands restoration;
- Development of a pilot project for changes of the consumer practices (including introduction and use of phosphate free detergents).

10.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

At this stage, it is very difficult to evaluate the nutrient loads and their expected reduction. However, the anticipations for improvement of the arable land fertilization in the coming 5 years are not very optimistic. Therefore, on the Bulgarian territory of the Danube river basin, only insignificant changes are expected in the coming 5 years.

The most important beneficial expected changes are related to those obtained as a result of the creation and implementation of new legislation harmonized with EU legislation. Moreover, the institutional strengthening will also contribute to positive changes concerning the nutrient reduction measures.

10.4 Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation

The elaboration of the „list of projects, which are supposed to be ready for implementation in the coming 5 years“ was made in close co-operation with EMIS/EG and in full compliance with the national program for priority construction of urban WWTP’s with more than 10 000-population equivalent. The identified projects are compiled in Annex II-10.
The national priority ranking for completion, rehabilitation, upgrade, update and construction of new urban WWTPs, is based on a “point score method” with scores calculated according to the set up criteria, and the adoption of respective weighing factors.

The investment cost for construction of priority WWTP’s is determined by the chief designers of the sites (if a detailed design exists) and updated bills of quantities. For sites, which do not have detailed designs, the costs were based on parameters, following the methodology of the Institute on Water Quality and Waste Management at the Technical University in Vienna, published in the "Guide on strategies for waste water management" from 1996.

The total investment cost is extracted from the National Programme for Priority Construction of Urban Wastewater Treatment Plants.

The investment cost of the 21 identified priority projects which are envisaged to be implemented within the coming period of five years is about EUR 125 million; their composition by sectors is as follows:

- 17 municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 112 million;
- 1 industrial projects with not yet identified investment requirements;
- no agricultural projects;
- 3 wetland projects with investment requirements of EUR 13.5 million;
  (the rehabilitation of two priority wetlands will be done under the Danube Partnership Programme with the financial support of World Bank/GEF).

Data on project funding (regarding national and international composition) have not been provided, because adequate information is not available at the time being.

The anticipated funding components from international funding sources are mainly addressed to EU/ISPA. The national contributions will mainly be covered by the National Environmental Protection Fund and by the State Budget.

10.5 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources

The expected results in terms of pollution/nutrient reduction (BOD, COD, N and P) are based on the information provided by the EMIS/EG.

If the identified projects will be implemented according to the designs and will be operated and maintained properly within the next 5 years, the anticipated reduction of the N and P total loads is about 30% and of the BOD5 load about 50-60%.

The anticipated nutrient reduction for the identified projects is stated in detail in Annex 10.4 and can be summarized as follows:

- N: 2683 tons/year;
- P: 599 tons/year;
- BOD: 19747 tons/year;
- COD: 35373 tons/year;

The composition of the anticipated nutrient reduction by sectors is compiled in Section 3.6(2).

10.6 Summary of Main Country Specific Particularities

(1) Main particularities regarding “non-point source” issues

The verification of the data and information on nutrient emissions in Bulgaria performed for the year 1998 shows that the structure of the agricultural sector by type of activity and production in 1997 and 1998 is considered to be almost the same. On a national level, the crop production has the biggest share 63,9%. Next to this is the livestock production with 16,2% and mixed (crop and livestock) with 6,1%.
The use of fertilizers was very small. The imbalance fertilization and deficit of the main nutrients have been detrimental to both crop production and soil fertility, which adversely influenced the country’s environmental situation. In addition, the high cost of chemical treatment of soil impeded improvements or amelioration work during past 6 years.

Regarding the livestock production in 1998, both animal numbers and production were increased against 1997, but comparing with 1989/1990, the numbers show several fold decreases.

To achieve the largest nutrient loads reduction within the border of its Danube share, Bulgaria identified measures for nutrient control and reduction from diffuse sources that mainly address policy and legislation related actions, institutional strengthening and capacity building. Moreover, public awareness raising and strengthening public participation in nutrient reduction initiatives are both seen as priorities. A specific particularity for Bulgaria, concerning nutrient reduction actions is given by the need to implement soil conservation measures.

On the Bulgarian territory of the Danube river basin, only insignificant changes are expected in the coming 5 years. The most important beneficial expected changes are related to those obtained as a result of the creation and implementation of new legislation harmonized with EU legislation.

(2) Main particularities regarding “point source” projects

Up to now, there is no formalized, respectively officially agreed investment program or action plan for nutrient reduction projects in Bulgaria.

There is, however, a relatively clear priority schedule and implementation program for WWTP in the municipal sector; (but not for the industrial and the agricultural sector, and not for wetlands).

The primary characteristics of the identified priority projects that are envisaged to be implemented within the coming period of five years can be summarized as follows:

Table 10.6-1: Primary Characteristics of the Identified Priority Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Nutrient Reduction (tons/year)</th>
<th>Investment Cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2308</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural point sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2683</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even these priority projects with total investment requirements of about EUR 125 million cannot be considered as really committed, as there are no committed funding schemes for the identified projects.
11 ROMANIA

11.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

According to the Romanian legislation, the contribution of the diffuse sources to the pollution in the nutrient balance is provided by (i) direct discharges of private households (not connected to sewers), (ii) storm water overflow, (iii) direct discharge of manure, (iv) base flow (percolation of human waste, agriculture land), (v) erosion run-off from forests and others, (vi) air depositions and, (vii) ground water flow.

The diffuse pollution is derived from the population not connected to the sewerage network (60.1%) which represents 13.7 mill inh. Using the emission factors and taking into consideration that 10% of the diffuse emissions reach the water receiver, the population related diffuse nutrient pollution is 4.93 thou tons Nitrogen per year and 0.89 thou. tons Phosphorus per year.

Table 11.1-1: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country total population in D.R.B.</th>
<th>Emissions coefficients</th>
<th>Population not connected to sewerage</th>
<th>Population connected to sewerage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kg N/inh/yr</td>
<td>kg P/inh/yr</td>
<td>Without treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biological step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tertiary step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.8 mil.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>13.7 mil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1 mil.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The weight of diffuse pollution in the total emissions from the population target is represented in the next table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>1000 tons/yr</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1000 tons/yr</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1000 tons/yr</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>30.83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorous</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diffuse pollution for the industry is considered to be quite small (5%) as the most relevant food processing industry is connected to the municipal wastewater treatment plant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>N 1000 tons/year</th>
<th>P 1000 tons/year</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural land diffuse pollution (inorganic fertilizers)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manure application and waste from agriculture</td>
<td>44.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total nutrient emissions are about 100 Thou. tons Nitrogen per year and 11 Thou. tons Phosphorus per year. The weight of the nitrogen diffuse pollution is about 56% while in the case of phosphorous 46%.

Table 11.1-2: Agricultural Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface ha (mil.)</th>
<th>Culture nutrient application (1993-1997)</th>
<th>Run-off coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of crop</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Kg/ha</td>
<td>Kg/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>Maize, wheat, rye, barley etc.</td>
<td>293 KT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 11.1-3: Number of Livestock**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory of animals*</th>
<th>Number (mil.)</th>
<th>Emission coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kg N/head/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. pigs</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. cows</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. cattle</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. horses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sheep</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. poultry</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* no waste water treatment plant provided

In the total emissions of Nitrogen, agriculture represents 57%, population 30.9% and industry 12.1%. For Phosphorous, the weight of target groups in the total emission is as follows: agriculture 51%, population 48.3% and industry 0.7%.

The table below presents the overview of the total nutrient emissions in Romania:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Nitrogen</th>
<th>Phosphorus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Point</td>
<td>Diffuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>56.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking into consideration the relevance of the diffuse pollution attention should be paid to the agriculture that has a weight of 90% in the case of Nitrogen and 82% in the case of Phosphorous.

In spite of the drastic reduction in the use of fertilizers in Romania, the positive effects on the Danube Delta are not yet evident. It is considered that the reduction on the measured Nitrogen loads on the delta is not yet very evident. One assumption is related to the potential reservoir role played by the ground water in the whole basin. In addition, the large number of inhabitants, which are not adequately connected to the treatment facilities, is considered as the main cause of pollution.

Based on the DWQM, the difference between immission and emission values is considered in the case of nitrogen to be primarily caused by denitrification, and to a much lesser extend by a similar retention as with phosphorous. Phosphorous retention is believed to be related to sedimentation and temporal storage in the sediments of the P – absorbed by suspended solids. It is considered, with some risk of uncertainties, that the floodplains in the Romanian Danube basin are capable of retaining an average of the amount of Phosphorous that is of the same order of magnitude as the current yearly emissions. This value corresponds with the difference between the total P load at the border between Yugoslavia and Romania (33 thou. tons per year) and the entrance of the Danube Delta (22 thou. tons per year).

Romania considers the role of Iron Gate reservoir to be significant in relation to the retention of Phosphorus content and increase of Nitrogen load. This would mean a retention of 27% or about 6 thou. P per year and an increase of Nitrogen concentration with about 0.5 mgN/l, which would mean that 80 thou.N per year, is added. The undecided justification of this phenomenon is currently based on the Nitrogen fixation by blue/green algae.

Among the processes that influences the nutrient reduction, the role of wetlands play a significant position during both summer and winter seasons.

In a WWTP study „Evaluation of wetlands and flood plains areas in the Danube river basin“ (1999) the capacity for removal is estimated at 100 kg N/ha/yr and 10 kg P/ha/yr. For Romania this would mean a removal of 80 thou. tons N/year and 8 thou. tons P/year.
11.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

Romania proposes a substantial programme of associated measures related to (a) the improvement of national legislation, and (b) insurance of its approximation with the EU legislation and standards.

(a) First, the improvement of national policies and legislation regarding utilization of fertilizers and livestock waste takes into consideration three main areas: (i) legislation, (ii) institutional development and, (iii) investments promotion.

(i) The legal framework will be improved with regulations related to (1) waste management and control, (2) norms for maximum allowable number of capita in the livestock’s farms, and (3) norms for manure application.

(ii) The improvements of the institutional framework will take into consideration the strengthening of the institutional capabilities to facilitate (1) the implementation of the water management multipurpose approach in order to ensure an integrated water and land management, in order to protect the sensitive areas and to ensure the conditions for BAT/BEP implementation, and (2) establishment of a framework for control and limiting the inorganic fertilizer application.

(iii) On the investment encouragement side, the necessary ingredients include (1) development and implementation of the agricultural run-off source pollution reduction plan as part of a Programme concerning the introduction and development of an environmental sound and sustainable agricultural products and practices, (2) programs for individual environmentally sound wastewater management for rural areas, (3) environmentally friendly landfills with phosphorous salts, and (4) pilot/ demo projects of Best Environmental Practice (BEP) implementation in the agriculture.

(b) Second, the approximation of national legislation to relevant EU legislation and standards will include (1) on short term, transposition of the Urban Waste Water Directive (91/271/EEC) and of Nitrate Directive (91/676/EEC), and (2) on medium term, the implementation of the European Water Framework Directive (COM 97/49-97/614, 98/76).

11.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

As a very rough estimation, a reduction of at least 10% for the nitrogen total diffuse (agriculture) reduction could be anticipated and for phosphorous which is related more with the erosion a decrease of around 20%. That means 5 thou tons N/year and 0.84 thou. tons P/year a supplementary reduction by buffer zones.

Beside of the wetland/flood plain restoration measures, one of the most important action aiming to decrease the run-off from the agricultural lands is to set-up buffer zones for erosion/ run-off limitation (this buffer zones could include the forestation zones, too).

In total, taking into account the effects of wetlands, flood plains, buffer zones, control of the nutrient application, etc. the following diffuse pollution reduction from agriculture could be anticipated:

- N: 13.4 thousand tons /year
- P: 1.7 thousand tons /year

This reduction represents a decrease by 13.4% N and 15.5% P from the total actual emissions.

Romania considers that it might take several years before the effects of reduced fertilizer use become effective in the river load, mainly due to the changes of the ground water base flow and the role of the ground water as a large stock of nitrates. If the yearly flow of Danube divided over the surface area of the whole basin represents 200 mm, the amount of ground water stocked may represent several meters (hydraulic residence in ground water reservoirs is estimated between 10-30 years).

In addition, the erosion – run-off may have caused dramatically changes because many hectares of arable land are overgrown by weeds due to the economical crisis in agriculture. The cumulative effect of elimination of fertilizer use and the weed growth could significantly reduce the erosion run-off almost by 95%.
11.4 Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation

For the elaboration of a draft list of projects supposed to be ready for implementation in the coming 5 years the following criteria have been considered:

(i) financial viability;
(ii) environmental effectiveness (based on Environmental Impact Assessment);
(iii) preparedness/readiness (availability of feasibility study, quality of project documents)

The projects identified on this basis are compiled and characterized in Annex II-11.

The total investment requirements of the 25 identified priority projects are EUR 492.5 million; their composition by sectors is as follows:

- 10 municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 392.2 million,
- 7 industrial projects with investment requirements of EUR 22 million,
- 3 agricultural projects with investment requirements of EUR 3.7 million,
- 5 wetland projects with investment requirements of EUR 74 million.

Regarding project funding it is expected that about 60% will be covered by national funds, 32% by international loans and about 8% by international grants.

11.5 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources

Excluding the wetland projects, the anticipated nutrient reduction from the identified point source projects can be summarized as follows:

- N: 5706 tons/year;
- P: 975 tons/year;
- BOD: 59811 tons/year;
- COD: 67470 tons/year;

From the implementation of the proposed wetland projects an additional reduction of about 6000 tons/a of N and about 600 tons/a of P is anticipated.

Excluding wetland projects the dominating improvements are expected from the municipal sector (80%); followed by the industrial sector (17%) and the agricultural sector (3%).

In terms of cost efficiency, the relatively small investment in the agricultural sector has to be considered as very rational.

The composition of the anticipated nutrient reduction by sectors is compiled in Section 11.6(2).

11.6 Summary of Main Country Specific Particularities

(1) Main particularities regarding “non-point source” issues

The first particularity of Romania is related to the approach of considering the diffuse pollution sources as being provided by diversified causes which include: direct discharges of private households (not connected to sewers), storm water overflow, direct discharge of manure, base flow (percolation of human waste, agriculture land), erosion run-off from forests and others, air depositions and, ground water flow.

In the total emissions of Nitrogen, agriculture represents 57%, population 30.9% and industry 12.1%. For Phosphorous, the weight of target groups in the total emission is as follows: agriculture 51%, population 48.3% and industry 0.7%.

As other countries, Romania also recorded a drastic reduction in the use of fertilisers.
In addition, Romania considers that among the nutrient reduction measures, Iron Gate reservoir and the existence of wetlands can play a significant role in relation to the retention or increase of Nitrogen and Phosphorus contents.

Romania proposes a substantial programme of associated measured related to the improvement of national legislation, and insurance of its approximation with the EU legislation and standards. One important initiative is considered to be the proposal to develop the code of good agricultural practices.

A reduction of at least 10% for the nitrogen and around 20% for phosphorous is anticipated by Romania, which in total can lead to 13.4 thousand tons N/year and 1.7 thousand tons P/yr.

(2) Main particularities regarding “point source” projects

Romania is one of the countries which provided a more or less complete set of project data regarding investment requirements, implementation schedules and funding schemes for the identified priority projects to be implemented in the coming five year period.

The primary characteristics of the identified priority projects which are envisaged to be implemented within the coming period of five years in Romania can be summarized as follows:

### Table 11.6-1: Primary Characteristics of the Identified Priority Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Nutrient Reduction (tons/year)</th>
<th>Investment Cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3644</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural point sources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 374</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 154</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11 860</td>
<td>1 591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding project funding it is expected that about 60% will be covered by national funds, 32% by international loans and about 8% by international grants.
12 MOLDOVA

12.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

In 1998, the total number of population not connected to the sewerage in the Moldovan part of the Danube River basin was quite large: 938,802 inh. (85.55%).

The total emission of nutrients resulted from population has been estimated based on the population statistics, N and P emission coefficient (9 kgN/day or 3.3 kgN/year per inhabitant for Nitrogen and 2.4 gP/day or 0.9 kgP/year per inhabitant for Phosphorus) and characteristics of sewerage system and wastewater treatment.

Therefore, the nutrient load from population on the Moldovan part of the Danube River basin could be estimated as follows:

- Nitrogen - as 3.3 kg/N x 1096464 inhabitants = 3.62 thousand tons;
- Phosphorus - as 0.9 kg/P x 1096464 inhabitants = 0.99 tons.

Table 12.1-1: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Population not connected to sewerage</th>
<th>Population connected to sewerage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>306863</td>
<td>159876</td>
<td>146987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>789006</td>
<td>778152</td>
<td>11449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (urban and rural)</td>
<td>1096464</td>
<td>938028</td>
<td>158436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.55</td>
<td>14.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The input nutrients from population into surface water is assessed as being for Nitrogen - 0.5 thousand tons and for Phosphorus - 0.1 thousand tons while into groundwater is assessed as being for Nitrogen - 3.1 thousand tons and for Phosphorus - 0.8 thousand tons.

Most of the industrial and agro-industrial enterprises are still not operated. Therefore, the nutrients load from industrial wastewater treatment plants at wineries, diaries, sugar refinery plants and some others is estimated as being not significant - 47.4 tons of Nitrogen and 8.5 tons of Phosphorus.

Moldova is mainly an area with very active erosion processes, due to intensive agricultural practices, combined with specific natural features that provoke a massive loss of fertile soil (5 mln tons per year agricultural land on the Danube river basin share) and nutrients. In general, for Moldova, the average losses of nutrients with eroded soil are estimated at 34 kgN/ha and 18 kgP₂O₅/ha per year.

According to the results of the Nutrient Balance Study (1996), on average, 7.5 tons of soil are washed away from one hectare of arable land and perennial plantations, and 1.5 tons/ha from grassland.

In 1998, the nutrient loads due to soil erosion constituted about 7 thousand tons Nitrogen and 3 thousand tons Phosphorus.

The nutrient load from main crops on arable lands constituted 26.1 thousand tons of Nitrogen and 4.7 thousand tons of Phosphorus in 1998 as it presented in the Table 12.1-2.
Table 12.1-2: Agricultural Land (1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of crop</th>
<th>Harvest, tons</th>
<th>N Content, %</th>
<th>P Content, %</th>
<th>N load tons</th>
<th>P load tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sugar-beet</td>
<td>710000</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2343</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereals</td>
<td>650000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>19500</td>
<td>3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>240000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapes</td>
<td>220000</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>850000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>65000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybean</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2122200</strong></td>
<td><strong>26084</strong></td>
<td><strong>4653</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The application of mineral fertilizers decreased drastically within the last years. According to the data presented in Statistical Guide Agriculture, in 1998 in Moldova 2,76 thousand tons (active component) of mineral fertilizers have been applied. Out of this amount 2,71 thousand tons were nitric fertilizers and 0,05 tons of phosphate fertilizers.

According to assessment made in Nutrient Balance Study (1996), on average 17.5% of the nitrogen and 1.5% of phosphorus from the amounts applied as mineral fertilizers end up in the surface waters. Considering gaseous losses of N-compounds from mineral fertilizers applied on arable lands is on average 7.5%, in 1998 the nutrient loads into surface waters originating from mineral fertilizer application was for Nitrogen - 0.4 thousand tons and for Phosphorus - 0.0007 tons.

Considering that (1) nutrient input on agricultural land from manure (in 1998 estimated at 86.2 thousand tons) constitutes 0.45% N and 0.13% P, (2) 20% of nitrogen is lost in gaseous form and, (3) applying the runoff coefficients of 30% for N and 20% for P, the nutrient load on surface waters originating from organic fertilizer could be assessed as for Nitrogen - 0.29 thousand tons and for Phosphorus - 0.09 thousand tons.

Currently, in Moldova exist very few cattle-breeding farms, pig farms and poultry at the public sector. Most of domestic animals (65%) belong to the private sector.

In 1998 from animal husbandry, Nitrogen load constituted 18.8 thousand tons, including 6.6 thousand tons from public sector and Phosphorus load - 4.8 thousand tons, including 1.7 thousand tons from public sector (livestock indexes in the Moldovan part of the Danube River basin are presented in Table 12.1-3).

Table 12.1-3: Number of Livestock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Pigs</th>
<th>Horses</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Domestic Birds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>430000</td>
<td>25600</td>
<td>520000</td>
<td>4320500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excrement rate</td>
<td>* 9</td>
<td>* 1.6</td>
<td>* 9</td>
<td>* 0.7</td>
<td>* 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t/head/year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of manure, k/t</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>230,4</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>86,41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content in manure</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>* 0.39</td>
<td>* 0.12</td>
<td>* 0.57</td>
<td>* 0.15</td>
<td>* 0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrient Load, k/t</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N (k/tons)</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total P (k/tons)</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

The existing legal framework in Moldova does not impose yet the identification of areas vulnerable to water pollution from agricultural sources of nitrates. However, nitrate pollution of groundwater is a serious problem in Moldova while the agricultural run-off is not considered to be a significant factor.

In addition, the need to develop a code of good practice, covering matters such as periods when land application of fertilizers is inappropriate and the conditions for land application of fertilizers near watercourses, has not been yet taken into consideration by the policy makers.

The sources of water pollution due to agricultural practice include mainly the following causes:

- Lack of adequate water treatment and manure storage facilities;
- Absence of regulation imposing the maximum permissible number of animals per hectare. Cattle, goats and sheep often graze in forests;
- Reduced proportion (35%) of scientifically grounded crop rotation to be implemented;
- Deficit of separation zones between forests and agricultural lands which impede the proper management of both, i.e. natural afforestation actions;
- The often use of contaminated water (dry saline residue) for irrigation.

Moldova proposed agricultural pollution reduction measures aiming at the water protection objectives in (i) the designation of agricultural lands (e.g. riverbanks), (ii) the suitability of water used for irrigation and, (iii) handling and application of agro-chemicals. In addition, soil conservation represents a special concern.

The proposed measures include:

- Constructing storage and treatment facilities for manure;
- Establishing sewerage systems of appropriate type in rural area;
- Implementing wetland conservation and restoration programmes;
- Introducing a specific program on lands that serve as buffer strips and buffer zones for protection of water resources;
- Introducing land use restriction on highly eroded lands;
- Completing the afforestation programme and permanent vegetable cover;
- Sustainable fertilizers application;
- Developing the organic farming methods;
- Introducing soil conservation measures to reduce agricultural run-off.

12.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

The anticipated nutrient reduction from diffuse sources is estimated to reach a value of 320 tons for Nitrogen and 20 tons for Phosphorus taking into consideration the effects of the national pollution reduction projects review.

Second, as a result of implementation of Afforestation Programme (planting trees that would serve as buffer strips and buffer zones in the selected areas on the lower Prut) will contribute to a reduction of 195 tons of Nitrogen and 20 tons of Phosphorus.

Finally, as a consequence of the application of Soil Conservation Programme (land use restrictions on highly eroded lands and appropriate crop rotation on upper Prut), the anticipated nutrient reduction is assessed to be 80 tons of Nitrogen and 5 tons of Phosphorus.
12.4 Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation

The identified priority projects that are supposed to be ready for implementation in the coming 5 years are compiled and characterised in Annex II-12.

The total investment requirements of the 31 identified projects are EUR 492.9 million; their composition by sectors is as follows:

- 15 municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 247 million,
- (other small scale municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 50 million);
- 11 industrial projects (plus not further specified small scale projects) with investment requirements of EUR 84.7 million,
- 3 agricultural projects (plus not further specified small scale projects) with investment requirements of EUR 26.6 million;
- 2 wetland projects (plus not further specified small scale projects) with investment requirements of EUR 85.0 million.

Regarding project funding it is expected that about 31% will be covered by national funds, 36% by international loans and about 34% by international grants.

12.5 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources

The anticipated nutrient reduction for the 31 identified point source projects (and the not further specified small scale projects) is stated in detail in Annex II and can be summarized as follows:

- N: 6901 tons/year;
- P: 891 tons/year;
- BOD: 1595 tons/year;
- COD: 832 tons/year;

The composition of the anticipated nutrient reduction by sectors is compiled in Section 12.6(2).

12.6 Summary of Main Country Specific Particularities

(1) Main particularities regarding “non-point source” issues

Moldova is mainly an area with very active erosion processes due to intensive agricultural practices, combined with specific natural features that provoke a massive loss of fertile soil (5 million tons per year agricultural land on the Danube river basin share) and nutrients.

The application of mineral fertilizers decreased drastically within the last years.

The existing legal framework in Moldova does not impose yet the identification of areas vulnerable to water pollution from agricultural sources of nitrates. However, nitrate pollution of groundwater is a serious problem in Moldova while the agricultural run-off is not considered to be a significant factor.

In addition, the need to develop a code of good practice, covering matters such as periods when land application of fertilisers is inappropriate and the conditions for land application of fertilisers near watercourses, has not been yet taken into consideration by the policy makers.

Moldova proposed agricultural pollution reduction measures aiming at the water protection objectives in the designation of agricultural lands, constructing storage and treatment facilities for manure, establishing sewerage systems of appropriate type in rural area and implementing wetland conservation and restoration programmes.
The anticipated nutrient reduction from diffuse sources is estimated to reach the highest values within the whole Danube river basin, taking into consideration (i) the effects of the national pollution reduction projects, (ii) implementation of Afforestation Programme, and (iii) the application of Soil Conservation Programme.

The anticipated nutrient reduction is assessed to be 50,000 tons of Nitrogen and 5,000 tons of Phosphorus.

(2) Main particularities regarding “point source” projects

Moldova provided a more or less complete project list and set of project data regarding investment requirements, implementation schedule and funding scheme for the identified priority projects to be implemented in the coming five year period.

The primary characteristics of the 31 identified priority projects can be summarized as follows:

Table 12.6-1: Primary Characteristics of the Identified Priority Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Nutrient Reduction (tons/year)</th>
<th>Investment Cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6901</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding project funding it is expected that about 31% will be covered by national funds, 36% by international loans and about 34% by international grants.
13 UKRAINE

13.1 Verification of Data and Information on Nutrient Emissions / Loads

The most important sources of diffuse pollution in Ukrainian part of the Danube river basin include crop production, animal farming and households unconnected to sewer systems.

The revision of data and information was facilitated by the assessment carried out in previous studies (Monitoring and Assessment of Water Quality of Latorytsia/Uzh river basins, Selected Measures in the Danube river basin).

As a conclusion, updated statistical data shows that there are not significant changes in the diffuse pollution loads on the territory of Ukraine since 1996. The industry and agriculture in Ukraine are still in recession while the first signs of improvement became visible only since few months due to the Decree of President on Land privatization.

The approximations for pollution loads are made with assumption that the share of the Danube river basin is 5.4% of total territory of Ukraine. The Latorytsia and Uzh river basin occupies 0.81% of territory of Ukraine.

Diffuse pollution from arable lands was estimated with emission factors considering soil type, area, slopes, etc. The emissions factors in the Latorytsia/Uzh River Basins are presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River basin</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Emission N Kg/ha/year</th>
<th>Emission P, Kg/ha/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latorytsia, total</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latorytsia, total</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latorytsia, total</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latorytsia, total</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzh, total</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzh, total</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzh, total</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzh, total</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ukraine made estimates for 1992 and 1998 for Nitrogen and phosphorus loads from arable land in the Latorytsia and Uzh river basin as a whole and its tributaries as presented in the next table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River basin</th>
<th>N, kg per year</th>
<th>P, kg per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzh</td>
<td>31186</td>
<td>33963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latorytsia</td>
<td>188609</td>
<td>189244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>219795</td>
<td>223207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danube basin</td>
<td>1450647</td>
<td>1486558.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danube basin</td>
<td>464039.4</td>
<td>468943.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The updated data on the total number of the population in the Danube river basin on the Ukrainian territory are given in the next table.

Table No. 13.1-1: Population connected to the sewer system in the Ukrainian Part of the Danube River Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country total population</th>
<th>Emissions coefficients</th>
<th>Population connected to sewerage</th>
<th>Population connected to sewerage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kg N /inh/y</td>
<td>kg P/inh/y</td>
<td>without treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3010000</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The updated information concerning the agricultural land use and the types of crops are presented in table 13.1-2.

**Table 13.1-2: Agricultural land**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface ha</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Type of crop</th>
<th>kg N/ha/y</th>
<th>kg P/ha/y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>894850</td>
<td>Arable lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138734</td>
<td>Perennial plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262004</td>
<td>Hayfields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446766</td>
<td>Pastures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742354</td>
<td>Total agricultural lands</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The updated information, concerning inventory of animals, their number and emission coefficient is presented as table 13.1-3.

**Table 13.1-3. Number of Livestock**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heads of animals, total * (1999)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Emission Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kg N/ head/y</td>
<td>kg P/ head/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. pigs</td>
<td>536.05</td>
<td>10.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. cows</td>
<td>316.49</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. cattle</td>
<td>372.02</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. sheep</td>
<td>108.86</td>
<td>13.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. poultry</td>
<td>6957.41</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* no waste water treatment plant provided

**13.2 Identification of Measures for Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources**

Ukraine considers that reduction of nutrient pollution from diffuse pollution should be addressed through various measures including (i) the strengthening of institutional capacity of controlling and regulating bodies, dealing with environmental issues, (ii) introduction of environmentally sound agricultural practices, (iii) establishing the buffer zones of streams and tributaries of the Danube rivers, (iv) assessment and implementation measures for solid waste management and wastewater treatment in rural settlements, and (v) education of general public.

The following measures are proposed:

- Inventory of diffuse pollution sources in the Ukrainian part of the Danube river basin
- Strengthening the institutional capacity of environmental, municipal and agricultural entities
- Establishing the Farmer Training Centers in Uzhgorod, Chernivtsi, Ivano-Frankivsk and Izmail to introduce principles of organic farming.
- Implementation of Buffer Zones along Rivers of the Danube River Basin
- Public Awareness on Nutrient Reduction and Reduction of Domestic Wastes
- Wetland Conservation in Lower Danube
13.3 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Diffuse Sources

Ukraine assumes that implementation of proposed measures will result in anticipated reduction of diffuse nutrient load by 10% during five years, and will prevent pollution when economy will start recovering from recession.

13.4 Identification of Projects Ready for Implementation

The identified priority projects that are supposed to be ready for implementation in the coming 5 years are compiled and characterized in Annex II-13.

The total investment requirements of the 10 identified projects are EUR 67 million; their composition by sectors is as follows:

- 10 municipal projects with investment requirements of EUR 67 million;
- no industrial projects;
- no agricultural projects;
- no wetland projects;

Even these priority projects cannot be considered as really committed, as project funding is not yet secured.

13.5 Assessment of the Anticipated Nutrient Reduction from Point-Sources

The anticipated nutrient reduction for the 10 identified municipal point-source projects is stated in detail in Annex II - 13 and can be summarized as follows:

- N: 486 tons/year;
- P: 65 tons/year;
- BOD: 677 tons/year;
- COD: 621 tons/year;

13.6 Summary of Main Country Specific Particularities

(1) Main particularities regarding “non-point source” issues

The most important sources of diffuse pollution in Ukrainian part of the Danube river basin include crop production, animal farming and households unconnected to sewer systems.

The revision of data and information was facilitated by the assessment carried out in previous studies and the updated statistical data shows that there are not significant changes in the diffuse pollution loads on the territory of Ukraine since 1996. The industry and agriculture in Ukraine are still in recession while the first signs of improvement became visible only since few months due to the Decree of President on Land privatization.

Ukraine considers that reduction of nutrient pollution from diffuse pollution should be addressed through various measures including the strengthening of institutional capacity of controlling and regulating bodies, introduction of environmentally sound agricultural practices, establishing the buffer zones of streams and tributaries of the Danube rivers, assessment and implementation measures for solid waste management and wastewater treatment in rural settlements, and education of general public.

One particularity of Ukraine is related to the emphasis on the wetland conservation measures proposed in Lower Danube.

Ukraine assumes that implementation of proposed measures will result in anticipated reduction of diffuse nutrient load by 10% during five years, and will prevent pollution when economy will start recovering from recession.
(2) Main particularities regarding “point source” projects

The 10 municipal point-source projects supposed to be ready for implementation within the coming 5 year period have investment requirements of about EUR 67 million.

Even these priority projects cannot be considered as really committed, as project funding is not yet secured.

The primary characteristics of the identified priority projects can be summarized as follows:

Table 13.6-1: Primary Characteristics of the Identified Priority Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Expected Nutrient Reduction (tons/year)</th>
<th>Investment Cost (Million EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal point sources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial point sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural point sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX II
COUNTRY LISTS OF PRIORITY PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR FIVE YEAR NATIONAL NUTRIENT REDUCTION ACTION PLANS

1. GERMANY
2. AUSTRIA
3. CZECH REPUBLIC
4. SLOVAKIA
5. HUNGARY
6. SLOVENIA
7. CROATIA
8. BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA
9. YUGOSLAVIA
10. BULGARIA
11. ROMANIA
12. MOLDOVA
13. UKRAINE
### EXISTING SITUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>Existing Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hot spot N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mergelstetten - Brenz</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leutkirch - Eschach, Iller</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zweckverband Obere Iller, Sonthofen</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Munchen I - Isar</td>
<td>2,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Munchen II - Isar</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Zweckverband Starnberger See - Isar</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Zweckverband Chiemsee - Inn</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>3,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Municipalities</td>
<td>24,420</td>
<td>1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>3,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Industry</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agriculture</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Wetlands</td>
<td>11,690</td>
<td>4,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,091</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX II - 2: AUSTRIA

#### LIST OF PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR FIVE YEAR NATIONAL NUTRIENT REDUCTION ACTION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Source / Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Implementation Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N P BOD COD Total Inv.</td>
<td>Increment Baseline</td>
<td>National Int. Loan Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y tons/y tons/y tons/y tons/y tons/y</td>
<td>mil EUR mil EUR</td>
<td>mil EUR mil EUR mil EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot spot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wien - HKA - extension and upgrade of NP removal</td>
<td>2,000 0 5,500 10,000</td>
<td>146.0 131.0 15.0</td>
<td>146.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linz - Asten - extension and upgrade of NP removal</td>
<td>770 64 0 1,278</td>
<td>48.0 43.0 5.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graz - extension and upgrade of NP removal</td>
<td>1,180 340 240 755</td>
<td>37.0 33.0 4.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>3,950 404 5,740 12,028</td>
<td>231.0 207.0 24.0</td>
<td>231.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Municipalities</td>
<td>3,950 404 5,740 12,028</td>
<td>231.0 207.0 24.0</td>
<td>231.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCA Fine Paper Hallein</td>
<td>0 0 5,500 4,500</td>
<td>33.0 7.0 26.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0 0 5,500 4,500</td>
<td>33.0 7.0 26.0</td>
<td>33.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Industry</td>
<td>0 0 5,500 4,500</td>
<td>33.0 7.0 26.0</td>
<td>33.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Agriculture</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Wetlands</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,950 404 11,240 16,528</td>
<td>264.0 214.0 50.0</td>
<td>264.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex II - 3: Czech Republic

### List of Projects Proposed for Five Year National Nutrient Reduction Action Plan

#### Existing Situation 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Implementation Period</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>COD</td>
<td>Total Inc.</td>
<td>Increment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mun. WWTP Brno</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extension of WWTP</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP Uherske Hradiste</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reconstruction of technology in WWTP</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP Hodonin</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Intensification and extension of WWTP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP Prostejov</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reconstruction of WWTP</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP Přerov</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reconstruction of WWTP</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP Brčlau</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reconstruction and intensification of WWTP</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Others

| Total Hot Spots | 1,121 | 72 | Sub-total | 633 | 24 | 158 | 93 | 46.9 | 44.7 | 56.2 | 21.4 | 13.9 |

| Total Municipalities | 13,735 | 1,587 | Total Municipalities | 1,010 | 58 | 1,228 | 93 | 133.7 | 86.8 | 56.2 | 21.4 | 13.9 |

#### Industry WWTP Tomá Otrokovice | 59 | 1 | Intensification of WWTP | 39 | 8 | 2.8 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 2004 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 |

#### Others

| Total Industry | 215 | 35 | Sub-total | 45 | 0 | 18 | 26 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 |

| Total Agriculture point sources | 159 | 16 | 1 | Total Agriculture point sources | 29 | 3 | 0 | 5.3 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 3.5 | 0.9 | 0.9 |

#### Wetlands Program (24 projects/activities) | 2.6 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 2005 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 |

#### Total

| 14,109 | 1,638 | 12 | 1,091 | 62 | 1,246 | 120 | 146.7 | 93.4 | 64.2 | 22.8 | 16.6 |

번역결과

## 연습문제 II - 3: 체코 공화국

### 5년간 국적 영양물질 감소 행동 계획을 위한 제안된 프로젝트 목록

#### 기존 상황 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>부</th>
<th>배출원 / 홀스포</th>
<th>영양물질 배출</th>
<th>기대 감소</th>
<th>투자 비용</th>
<th>구현 기간</th>
<th>보조금</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>메</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>COD</td>
<td>인크рем언트</td>
<td>바선계</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn. WWTP Brno</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Expansion of WWTP</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP Uherske Hradiste</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reconstruction of technology in WWTP</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP Hodonin</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Intensification and extension of WWTP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP Prostejov</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reconstruction of WWTP</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP Přerov</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reconstruction of WWTP</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP Brčlau</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reconstruction and intensification of WWTP</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 기타

| Total Hot Spots | 1,121 | 72 | Sub-total | 633 | 24 | 158 | 93 | 46.9 | 44.7 | 56.2 | 21.4 | 13.9 |

| Total Municipalities | 13,735 | 1,587 | Total Municipalities | 1,010 | 58 | 1,228 | 93 | 133.7 | 86.8 | 56.2 | 21.4 | 13.9 |

#### 산업 WWTP Tomá Otrokovice | 59 | 1 | Intensification of WWTP | 39 | 8 | 2.8 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 2004 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 |

#### 기타

| Total Industry | 215 | 35 | Sub-total | 45 | 0 | 18 | 26 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 |

#### 농업 point sources | 159 | 16 | 1 | Total Agriculture point sources | 29 | 3 | 0 | 5.3 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 3.5 | 0.9 | 0.9 |

#### 수목지 프로그램 (24 프로젝트/활동) | 2.6 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 2005 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 |

#### 총

| 14,109 | 1,638 | 12 | 1,091 | 62 | 1,246 | 120 | 146.7 | 93.4 | 64.2 | 22.8 | 16.6 |
### ANNEX II - 4: SLOVAKIA

#### LIST OF PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR FIVE YEAR NATIONAL NUTRIENT REDUCTION ACTION PLAN

**EXISTING SITUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>No. Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Imple-</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N P BOD COD</td>
<td></td>
<td>N P BOD COD</td>
<td>Total Inv.</td>
<td>ment</td>
<td>National Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y tons/y</td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y tons/y</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
<td>period</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mun.</td>
<td>Kosice</td>
<td>624 90</td>
<td>1 Expansion of WWTP-2nd stage</td>
<td>405 18 1,596 3,110 20.2 4.8 15.4</td>
<td>2002 16.6 3.3 1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nitra</td>
<td>442 64</td>
<td>3 Finalisation of WWTP</td>
<td>287 32 2,041 3,613 13.1</td>
<td>2002 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liptovsky Mikulas</td>
<td>397 27</td>
<td>4 Reconstruction of sewage works, intensification of WWTP</td>
<td>258 3 253 612 6.8</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ružomberok</td>
<td>225 14</td>
<td>5 Intensification of WWTP</td>
<td>22 1 975 1,966 0.1</td>
<td>2002/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topolcany</td>
<td>221 32</td>
<td>6 Intensification of WWTP</td>
<td>144 3 299 408 0.9</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michalovce</td>
<td>207 30</td>
<td>7 Intensification of WWTP</td>
<td>135 3 1,142 2,251 2.6</td>
<td>2002 1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humenne</td>
<td>164 24</td>
<td>8 Expansion of WWTP</td>
<td>106 2 867 1,588 11.1</td>
<td>5.5 5.6</td>
<td>2002 5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trnecin-right side</td>
<td>64 4</td>
<td>9 Sewage works and WWTP</td>
<td>57 3 819 1,692 10.6</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rozňava</td>
<td>62 7</td>
<td>10 Expansion of WWTP</td>
<td>40 1 359 776 0.5</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Svidnik</td>
<td>30 3</td>
<td>11 Sewage works and WWTP</td>
<td>27 1 446 849 10.9</td>
<td>2002 5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banska Stiavnica</td>
<td>23 3</td>
<td>12 Construction of WWTP and sewer collector</td>
<td>53 5 258 526 9.1</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cadca</td>
<td>62 18</td>
<td>13 Reconstruction and expansion of WWTP and sewer system</td>
<td>41 6 197 350 4.4</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>2,992 382</td>
<td>12 12,968 25,458</td>
<td>103.4 10.3 21.0</td>
<td>43.0 3.3 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7.439 1.101</td>
<td><strong>Total Municipalities</strong></td>
<td>10,431 1,463</td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>2,001 125 12,968 25,458</td>
<td>103.4 10.3 21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>Bratislava</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1 Construction of biological WWTP</td>
<td>175 641 1,690 8.2</td>
<td>2.3 5.8</td>
<td>2002 2.3 1.4 2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Istriochem Bratislava</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2 Reconstruction of WWTP</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Považ. Chemical Plants (1)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3 Expansion of WWTP by anaerobic stage</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biotika Slovenska Lupca (1)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4 Reconstruction of sewerage system</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemko Strazske (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>555 0</td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>348 0 641 1,690</td>
<td>14.2 2.3 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Industry</strong></td>
<td>555 0</td>
<td><strong>Total Industry</strong></td>
<td>348 0 641 1,690</td>
<td>14.2 2.3 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr.</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td><strong>Total Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetl.</td>
<td>1 Integrated Management in Olšavica River Basin</td>
<td>30 3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2000 /05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Floodplain Meadow Restoration in the Lower Morava River</td>
<td>45 5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2000 /05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Wetland restoration in Laborec River basin</td>
<td>150 15</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Subtotal</td>
<td>225 23</td>
<td>0 0 0.9 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Wetlands</strong></td>
<td>225 23</td>
<td>0 0 0.9 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total**: 20

- **Total**: 10,386 1,483

1) as N-NH4
2) as N-anorg
### ANNEX II - 5: HUNGARY

#### LIST OF PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR FIVE YEAR NATIONAL NUTRIENT REDUCTION ACTION PLAN

**EXISTING SITUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N P BOD COD</td>
<td>Total Inv</td>
<td>Imple- Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y tons/y tons/y</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
<td>mentation period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budapest South</td>
<td>203 122</td>
<td>2 Extension + upgrade to III.</td>
<td>27.9 25.1 2.8</td>
<td>1998-2000 13.9 14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budapest Central</td>
<td>900 140</td>
<td>3 New waste water treatment plant</td>
<td>407.0</td>
<td>2001-2007 107.0 150.0 150.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Szeged</td>
<td>600 250</td>
<td>4 Extension + upgrade to III. + sewerage</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>2001-2006 23.6 0.0 45.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gyor</td>
<td>273 43</td>
<td>5 Extension + upgrade to III.</td>
<td>12.7 6.3 6.3</td>
<td>2001-2002 12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somogy</td>
<td>100 30</td>
<td>6 WWTP with biological treatment</td>
<td>6.0 3.0 3.0</td>
<td>1995-1999 1.5 0.0 1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debrecen</td>
<td>300 150</td>
<td>7 WWTP I grade</td>
<td>0.7 0.3 0.4</td>
<td>1995-1998 0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Szekesfehervar</td>
<td>160 25</td>
<td>8 Extension + upgrade</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1999-2000 15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tatabanya</td>
<td>30 40</td>
<td>9 Extension + upgrade to III. + sludge treatment</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1999-2001 8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sopron</td>
<td>40 30</td>
<td>10 Upgrade + nutrient removal</td>
<td>10.6 3.2 7.4</td>
<td>2000-2002 7.4 3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Szécséd</td>
<td>80 20</td>
<td>11 Upgrade + nutrient removal</td>
<td>3.3 1.3 2.0</td>
<td>2000-2003 2.0 1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salgotarjan</td>
<td>80 20</td>
<td>12 Upgrade + nutrient removal</td>
<td>23.4 4.7 18.7</td>
<td>2000-2001 18.7 4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Godollo</td>
<td>120 37</td>
<td>13 WWTP + regional sewerage</td>
<td>11.1 2.3 9.0</td>
<td>2004 9.0 2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100 20</td>
<td>14 WWTP + regional sewerage</td>
<td>11.1 1.7 9.4</td>
<td>2004 9.4 1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>160 20</td>
<td>15 Kerka-Mura watershed sewerage + WWTP</td>
<td>11.9 0.6 11.3</td>
<td>1999-2001 11.3 0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>836 12</td>
<td>16 WWTP + regional sewerage</td>
<td>11.9 0.6 11.3</td>
<td>1999-2001 11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vészpüspöki/Northern Bakony</td>
<td>7,713 1,229</td>
<td>17 WWTP + regional sewerage</td>
<td>11.9 0.6 11.3</td>
<td>1999-2001 11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16 Subtotal</td>
<td>3,455 1,153 0 0 658.2 68.2 91.8</td>
<td>260.8 180.1 213.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Municipalities</td>
<td>7,713 1,229</td>
<td>18 Subtotal</td>
<td>420 6 0 0 5.9 2.9 3.0</td>
<td>2004 2.0 3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Industry</td>
<td>836 12</td>
<td>19 Subtotal</td>
<td>420 6 0 0 5.9 2.9 3.0</td>
<td>2004 2.0 3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Agriculture</td>
<td>4,500 920</td>
<td>20 Subtotal</td>
<td>2,600 340 0 0 7.2 4.8 2.5</td>
<td>2.0 0.0 3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wetl.</td>
<td>4,500 920</td>
<td>21 Subtotal</td>
<td>2,600 340 0 0 7.2 4.8 2.5</td>
<td>2.0 0.0 3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Wetl.</td>
<td>13,849 2,361</td>
<td>22 Subtotal</td>
<td>6,708 1,522 0 0 686.7 89.2 99.4</td>
<td>266.9 184.0 230.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECTS READY FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN THE COMING 5 YEARS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N P BOD COD</td>
<td>Total Inv</td>
<td>Imple- Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y tons/y tons/y</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
<td>mentation period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extension + upgrade to III.</td>
<td>308 183</td>
<td>32.3 16.1 16.1</td>
<td>1997-1999 16.1 16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extension + upgrade to III.</td>
<td>27.9 25.1 2.8</td>
<td>1998-2000 13.9 14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New waste water treatment plant</td>
<td>407.0</td>
<td>2001-2007 107.0 150.0 150.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extension + upgrade to III. + sewerage</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>2001-2006 23.6 0.0 45.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extension + upgrade to III.</td>
<td>12.7 6.3 6.3</td>
<td>2001-2002 12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WWTP with biological treatment</td>
<td>6.0 3.0 3.0</td>
<td>1995-1999 1.5 0.0 1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>WWTP I grade</td>
<td>0.7 0.3 0.4</td>
<td>1995-1998 0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extension + upgrade</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1999-2000 15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Extension + upgrade to III. + sludge treatment</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1999-2001 8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Upgrade + nutrient removal</td>
<td>10.6 3.2 7.4</td>
<td>2000-2002 7.4 3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Upgrade + nutrient removal</td>
<td>3.3 1.3 2.0</td>
<td>2000-2003 2.0 1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Upgrade + nutrient removal</td>
<td>23.4 4.7 18.7</td>
<td>2000-2001 18.7 4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>WWTP + regional sewerage</td>
<td>11.1 2.3 9.0</td>
<td>2004 9.0 2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>WWTP + regional sewerage</td>
<td>11.1 1.7 9.4</td>
<td>2004 9.4 1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kerka-Mura watershed sewerage + WWTP</td>
<td>11.9 0.6 11.3</td>
<td>1999-2001 11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>WWTP + regional sewerage</td>
<td>11.9 0.6 11.3</td>
<td>1999-2001 11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Reconstruction of the WWT system of the Nitrokemia Co.</td>
<td>420 6 0 0</td>
<td>5.9 2.9 3.0</td>
<td>2004 2.0 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Introduction of EU-conform and environmentally protective fattening technology in a pigfarm for 1,300 sows</td>
<td>200 50</td>
<td>0.7 0.5 0.2</td>
<td>2004 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Agriculture originated pollution minimization in the floodplain of Tisza River</td>
<td>100 20</td>
<td>0.5 0.3 0.2</td>
<td>2004 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Establishment of agro- and nature conservation training centers in the Koros-Maros National Park</td>
<td>200 50</td>
<td>3.0 2.7 0.3</td>
<td>2004 0.3 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>National farming for decreasing nutrient inputs in the DRB in Hungary</td>
<td>2,000 200</td>
<td>1.4 0.9 0.5</td>
<td>2000 0.5 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Organic farming in the Drava floodplain</td>
<td>100 20</td>
<td>1.7 0.4 1.3</td>
<td>2004 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Danube-Drava region wetland rehabilitation programme</td>
<td>120 12</td>
<td>6.4 5.4 1.0</td>
<td>2004 1.0 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Reduction of pollution by rehabilitation of wetlands in the mouth of Bodrog</td>
<td>113 11</td>
<td>9.0 7.9 1.1</td>
<td>2005 1.1 7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXISTING SITUATION

#### Nutrient Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y tons/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mun. Maribor (3rd stage)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mun. Ljubljana (3rd stage)</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murska Sobota (3rd stage)</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celje</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rogashta Slatina</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lendava</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krize</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bre ice</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Velenje (upgrading)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murksa Soba</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vrhnika</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trbovlje</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bohinjska Bistrica</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radovljica</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kranjska Gora</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tr i</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Litija</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zagore</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hrastnik</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dravograd</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mislina</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sloveni gradec</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ptuj (3rd stage)</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>5,681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECTS READY FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN THE COMING 5 YEARS

#### No Proposed Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>2nd stage % / 3rd stage %</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N P</td>
<td>tons/y tons/y</td>
<td>tons/y tons/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WWTP - 300,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WWTP - 420,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>9,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WWTP - 45,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>WWTP - 79,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>WWTP - 12,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WWTP - 45,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>WWTP - 20,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>WWTP - 10,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>WWTP - 50,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>WWTP - 10,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>WWTP - 20,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>WWTP - 18,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>WWTP - 11,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>WWTP - 30,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>WWTP - 6,500 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>WWTP - 20,000 PE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>WWTP - 19,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>WWTP - 17,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>WWTP - 11,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>WWTP - 9,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>WWTP - 2,500 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>WWTP - 20,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>WWTP - 105,000 PE (3rd st.)</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Total Subtotal</td>
<td>5,053</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>27,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Municipalities

| Total Municipalities | 23 | 5,053 | 786 | 27,836 | 45,440 | 382.5 |

#### Subtotal

| Subtotal | 23 | 5,053 | 786 | 27,836 | 45,440 | 382.5 |

#### Total

| Total | 24 | 5,233 | 814 | 28,816 | 47,040 | 384.2 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 328.2 | 44.2 | 10.0 |
### Annex II - 7: Croatia

#### List of Projects Proposed for Five Year National Nutrient Reduction Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N P BOD COD</td>
<td>Total Inv.</td>
<td>Increment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mun. Cakovec</td>
<td>WWTP of Cakovec and nearby towns</td>
<td>22 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WWTP of Cakovec and nearby towns</td>
<td>132 1</td>
<td>1,162 1,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varazdin</td>
<td>Reconstruction of WWTP of Varazdin</td>
<td>140 60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reconstruction of WWTP of Varazdin</td>
<td>132 1</td>
<td>1,162 1,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koprivnica</td>
<td>WWTP of Koprivnica</td>
<td>29 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WWTP of Koprivnica</td>
<td>604 806</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>Central WWTP of Zagreb</td>
<td>4,400 110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Central WWTP of Zagreb</td>
<td>1,320 220</td>
<td>10,438 29,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisak</td>
<td>The sewerage and the WWTP of Sisak</td>
<td>240 60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The sewerage and the WWTP of Sisak</td>
<td>48 2</td>
<td>700 919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlovac</td>
<td>Sewerage and WWTPs of Karlovac and Duga Resa</td>
<td>320 60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sewerage and WWTPs of Karlovac and Duga Resa</td>
<td>9 16</td>
<td>2,026 1,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varazdin</td>
<td>WWTP of Velika</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>WWTP of Velika</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>Sewerage and WWTP of Vinkovci</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sewerage and WWTP of Vinkovci</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlovac</td>
<td>WWTP of Velika Gorica</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>WWTP of Velika Gorica</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlovac</td>
<td>WWTP of Nasice - I phase</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WWTP of Nasice - I phase</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Subtotal

| Mun. Cakovec | 22 7 | 1 | WWTP of Cakovec and nearby towns | 132 1 | 1,162 1,778 | 12.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 2003 |
| Varazdin | 140 60 | 2 | Reconstruction of WWTP of Varazdin | 132 1 | 1,162 1,778 | 12.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 2002 |
| Koprivnica | 29 9 | 3 | WWTP of Koprivnica | 604 806 | 10.8 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 2003 |
| Zagreb | 4,400 110 | 4 | Central WWTP of Zagreb | 1,320 220 | 10,438 29,743 | 250.0 | 76.8 | 179.2 | 2005 |
| Sisak | 240 60 | 5 | The sewerage and the WWTP of Sisak | 48 2 | 700 919 | 60.0 | 18.0 | 42.0 | |
| Karlovac | 320 60 | 6 | Sewerage and WWTPs of Karlovac and Duga Resa | 9 16 | 2,026 1,177 | 50.0 | 15.0 | 35.0 | |
| Varazdin | 190 | 7 | WWTP of Velika | 100 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 2010 | 1.5 |
| Zagreb | 190 | 8 | Sewerage and WWTP of Vinkovci | 190 | 12.0 | 3.6 | 8.4 | 2003 | 9.9 |
| Karlovac | 2.2 | 9 | WWTP of Velika Gorica | 2.2 | 1.1 | 1.1 | |
| Karlovac | 1.1 | 10 | WWTP of Nasice - I phase | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 2001 | 0.8 |

#### Subtotal

5,151 326 | 1,509 239 | 15,310 34,424 | 433.4 | 134.3 | 299.1 | 2.3 | 9.9 | 0.0 |

#### Total Municipalities

5,151 326 | 1,509 239 | 15,310 34,424 | 433.4 | 134.3 | 299.1 | 2.3 | 9.9 | 0.0 |

#### Industry

0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

#### Agriculture

0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

#### Wetlands

0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

#### Total

5,151 326 | 1,509 239 | 15,310 34,424 | 433.4 | 134.3 | 299.1 | 2.3 | 9.9 | 0.0 |
### ANNEX II - 8: BOSNIA-HERCEGOVINA

**LIST OF PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR FIVE YEAR NATIONAL NUTRIENT REDUCTION ACTION PLAN**

#### EXISTING SITUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>N P BOD COD Total Inv. Increment Baseline</td>
<td>National Int. Loan Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y tons/y tons/y tons/y tons/y tons/y</td>
<td>mil EUR mil EUR mil EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mun.</td>
<td>Tuzla</td>
<td>481 144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Construction of regional sewage system Tuzla-Lukavac with central WWTP for municipalities and industry.</td>
<td>1,080 160 1,539 4,142 58.0 2.9 55.1</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarajevo</td>
<td></td>
<td>621 176</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rehabilitation and reconstruction of sewage and industrial WWTP for Sarajevo municipality</td>
<td>1,015 150 6,150 10,660 15.0 3.0 12.0</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banja Luka</td>
<td></td>
<td>712 214</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Construction of regional sewerage system Banja Luka with central WWTP for municipality and industry</td>
<td>910 140 50.0 2.5 47.5</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijeljina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Construction of sewerage system in Bijeljina with central WWTP for municipality and industry</td>
<td>12.0 0.6 11.4</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brcko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Construction sewerage system Brcko with central WWTP for municipality and industry</td>
<td>12.0 1.0 11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,814 534</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>3,005 450 7,689 14,802 147.0 10.0 137.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,570 1,539 1,259 2,159 27.1 9.3 17.9</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Municipalities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,814 535</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total Municipalities</td>
<td>3,005 450 7,689 14,802 147.0 10.0 137.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>Chlorine Alkaline Complex - Tuzla</td>
<td>42 74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reconstruction of pre-treatment WWTP in Chlorine Alkaline Complex in Tuzla</td>
<td>26 53 632 1,631 2.2 0.4 1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pulp and paper industry-Maglaj</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rehabilitation and reconstruction of WWTP in &quot;Natron&quot; Maglaj</td>
<td>3.0 1.5 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coke and Chemical Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reconstruction of pre-treatment WWTP for Coke and Chemical Industry Lukavac</td>
<td>2 284 344 2.8 0.6 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cellulose and Viscose Factory</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reconstruction and improvement of WWTP of &quot;Incel&quot; Banja Luka</td>
<td>3.5 1.8 1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron work-Zenica</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reconstruction of industrial WWTP for DD &quot;Zelezara&quot; Zenica</td>
<td>97 47 184 1.6 0.8 0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>176 74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>125 53 963 2,159 27.1 9.3 17.9</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,570 350 0 0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>176 74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total Industry</td>
<td>125 53 963 2,159 27.1 9.3 17.9</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Construction of WWTP for pigs breeding farm in Brcko</td>
<td>1,570 350 0 0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,570 350 0 0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,570 350 0 0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total Agriculture</td>
<td>1,570 350 0 0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total Wetlands</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,990 609</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,700 853 6,152 16,961 176.4 20.0 156.5</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX II - 9: YUGOSLAVIA

#### LIST OF PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR FIVE YEAR NATIONAL NUTRIENT REDUCTION ACTION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N P BOD COD Total Inv.</td>
<td>inorder</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Int. Loan</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y tons/y tons/y tons/y tons/y tons/y</td>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>period</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mun. City of Belgrade (Central)</td>
<td>5840 1,314</td>
<td>876 260 31,536 70,080 215.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>155.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Novi Sad (Left Bank)</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>146 60 5,657 12,571 52.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>124 60 5,302 11,782 40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pristina</td>
<td>975 226</td>
<td>86 30 3,563 7,918 39.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>160 47 3,932 8,322 37.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>90 32 3,390 7,183 34.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>44 26 2,874 6,386 29.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>50 16 2,779 6,176 23.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>62 28 2,466 5,480 23.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>43 24 1,912 4,249 17.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>43 18 1,853 4,117 17.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>550 36 3,600 8,322 32.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>33 12 1,399 3,285 14.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>31 11 1,315 3,222 14.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>36 11 1,261 2,803 7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>22 9 1,258 2,796 14.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>36 11 1,225 2,722 14.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>6 3 355 788 9.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>38 9 316 657 7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>5 2 175 390 2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>3 1 118 263 2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>21 Total Municipalities 2,486 700 76,280 169,212 646.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>137.0</td>
<td>441.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nis</td>
<td>826 289</td>
<td>21 Total Municipalities 2,486 700 76,280 169,212 646.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>137.0</td>
<td>441.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>13,243 3,478</td>
<td>2,455 4,817</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>13,243 3,478</td>
<td>2,455 4,817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>13,243 3,478</td>
<td>2,455 4,817</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>13,243 3,478</td>
<td>2,455 4,817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind. IHP 'Prahovo’</td>
<td>570 4,760</td>
<td>1 P - Fertilizers 200 3,500 285 2,000 2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 'Zorka'-Sabac</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>2 Chemical Industry 750 8 220 560 2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOPA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 Card Board 17 8 940 3,450 6.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK &quot;Beograd&quot;</td>
<td>355 47</td>
<td>4 Wood &amp; Paper 30 14 11,200 28,000 8.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermopower Plant 'Obilic'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 Food Processing Ind. 300 34 12,700 23,700 9.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDB 'Bor’</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6 Coal Mining &amp; Processing 30 4 3,500 6,100 11.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2,455 4,817</td>
<td>7 Subtotal 1,347 3,571 29,345 64,710 68.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2,455 4,817</td>
<td>7 Subtotal 1,347 3,571 29,345 64,710 68.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ANNEX II - 9: YUGOSLAVIA**

## PROJECT LIST FOR NATIONAL NUTRIENT REDUCTION ACTION PLAN

### EXISTING SITUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr.</td>
<td>DD IM “Neoplanta” (DP)</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS “Surcin”- Surcin</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP “Cerrex-Farmakop”-Vrbas</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP “1. Decembar”-FS “Nimes”</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS “D. Markovic”</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for farms and agricultural wastes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agriculture</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECTS READY FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN THE COMING 5 YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Funding Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>tons/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>5,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agriculture</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>5,133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wetlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Nutrient Emission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danube - Monostorski Rit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sava - Obedska Bara</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sava - Zasavica</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisa - Ludos Lake</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danube - Kovijski Rit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Wetlands</td>
<td>2,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

(*) Enlarging of existing WWTP and upgrading it for N & P removal
   The investment cost for upgrading of sewerage systems and pretreatment of industrial wastewaters are not accounted
   CW - civil works are completed 80%

(**) 1) The data concern on the period before 1992 when Industry was operated by 90% of full capacity
   2) As the industrial production was severely decreased after the year 1992, the pollution emission in the period 1994-97 was 55-65% lower than presented in the table
   3) Not all industries discharge wastewater directly into recipients. A part of it is retained in storages, retention basins or lagoons
### ANNEX II - 10: BULGARIA

**EXISTING SITUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>No Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Imple-</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mentation</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>period</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXISTING SITUATION PROJECTS READY FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN THE COMING 5 YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>No Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Imple-</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mentation</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>period</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR FIVE YEAR NATIONAL NUTRIENT REDUCTION ACTION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>No Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Imple-</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mentation</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>period</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>No Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Imple-</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mentation</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>period</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXISTING SITUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>tons/y</th>
<th>tons/y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>5,363.0</td>
<td>944.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>Craiova</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>Braila</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>Galati</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Zalau</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Piatra</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Campulung</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Deva</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Timisoara</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>Iasi</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>9783</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Municipalities</td>
<td></td>
<td>9783</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Antibiotice Iasi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>Arpechim Pitesti</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Somes Dej</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Olchim Rm. Valcea</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Fibres Savininesti</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Romfostochim</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ex)</td>
<td>Integrotir Arad</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ex)</td>
<td>Consuin Ulmeni</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>Sunprod Independenta</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>Consuin Beregsau</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weti.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balta Potelu</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area of Bucl. Danube</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Island Balta Greaca</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cafuri</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lower Prut</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>6154</td>
<td>615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>6154</td>
<td>615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,420</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX II - 12: MOLDOVA

### LIST OF PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR FIVE YEAR NATIONAL NUTRIENT REDUCTION ACTION PLAN

#### PROJECTIONS READY FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN THE COMING 5 YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Imple-</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mun.</td>
<td>Town Cahul</td>
<td>1 11</td>
<td>1. Cahul WWTP</td>
<td>52 11 20 33 53.8 2.9 50.9 2003</td>
<td>19.1 17.0 17.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town Ungheni</td>
<td>14 8</td>
<td>2. Ungheni WWTP</td>
<td>55 12 22 29 57.7 2.9 55.1 2001</td>
<td>17.2 15.3 25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Comrat</td>
<td>n/a n/a</td>
<td>3. Comrat WWTP</td>
<td>50 9 18 24 11.7 0.6 12.3 2004</td>
<td>3.8 4.4 3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Edineti</td>
<td>1 n/a</td>
<td>4. Edineti WWTP</td>
<td>57 11 13 17 8.9 0.5 8.5 2003</td>
<td>2.7 3.7 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Falesti</td>
<td>4 n/a</td>
<td>5. Edineti WWTP</td>
<td>65 7 12 9 4.5 0.2 4.3 2004</td>
<td>1.4 1.7 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Vulcansesti</td>
<td>1 n/a</td>
<td>6. Falesti WWTP</td>
<td>46 5 8 18 15.4 0.8 15.6 2003</td>
<td>5.5 6.0 3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Ungheni</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7. Vulcansesti WWTP</td>
<td>35 4 15 20 8.2 0.4 7.8 2002</td>
<td>2.9 2.9 2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Comrat</td>
<td>1 n/a</td>
<td>8. Nisporeni WWTP</td>
<td>30 4 12 21 15.2 0.8 14.4 2002</td>
<td>4.6 5.5 5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Edineti</td>
<td>1 n/a</td>
<td>9. Nisporeni WWTP</td>
<td>35 4 11 18 7.6 0.6 6.3 2004</td>
<td>2.1 3.2 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Falesti</td>
<td>4 n/a</td>
<td>10. Edineti WWTP</td>
<td>45 5 9 14 8.8 0.4 8.3 2003</td>
<td>2.6 3.5 2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Vulcansesti</td>
<td>1 n/a</td>
<td>11. Falesti WWTP</td>
<td>20 4 15 30 5.8 0.2 5.2 2003</td>
<td>1.8 2.2 1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Ungheni</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12. Falesti WWTP</td>
<td>45 6 14 26 8.9 0.5 8.4 2001</td>
<td>2.7 3.5 2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Comrat</td>
<td>1 n/a</td>
<td>13. Cupcini WWTP</td>
<td>15 3 12 29 12.2 0.6 11.6 2003</td>
<td>3.7 4.5 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Edineti</td>
<td>1 n/a</td>
<td>14. Nisporeni Costesti WWTP</td>
<td>15 2 12 27 7.2 0.4 6.6 2002</td>
<td>2.2 2.6 2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Falesti</td>
<td>4 n/a</td>
<td>15. Nisporeni WWTP</td>
<td>15 3 11 24 20.8 1.0 19.8 2001</td>
<td>6.3 6.0 5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>493 120</td>
<td>16. Nisporeni WWTP</td>
<td>584 89 203 338 246.7 12.8 234.3 2003</td>
<td>78.6 80.2 86.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>523 143</td>
<td>17. Nisporeni WWTP</td>
<td>848 119 248 458 296.7 17.8 279.3 2003</td>
<td>88.6 102.0 106.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>Town Falesti</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>18. Falesti WWTP</td>
<td>7 2 11 14 7.9 0.4 7.5 2003</td>
<td>2.3 3.2 2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town Lipcani</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>19. Lipcani WWTP</td>
<td>15 3 3 9 8.0 0.4 7.6 2004</td>
<td>2.4 3.5 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Ocniita</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>20. Ocniita WWTP</td>
<td>12.0 3 2 9 6.5 0.3 6.2 2003</td>
<td>2.0 2.5 2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village Cucoara</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>21. Cucoara WWTP</td>
<td>5 1 1 4 4.3 0.2 4.3 2005</td>
<td>1.4 1.6 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village Cioc-Maidan</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>22. Cioc-Maidan WWTP</td>
<td>4 1 0 1 5.5 0.2 5.3 2004</td>
<td>1.7 2.4 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village Costesti</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>23. Cioc-Maidan WWTP</td>
<td>4 1 0 1 7.0 0.4 6.7 2003</td>
<td>2.1 2.9 2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village Mereșeni</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>24. Mereșeni WWTP</td>
<td>3 1 0 1 6.0 0.3 5.7 2002</td>
<td>1.8 2.2 2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Falesti</td>
<td>4 n/a</td>
<td>25. Falesti WWTP</td>
<td>14 3 2 5 3.9 0.2 3.3 2003</td>
<td>1.1 1.3 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Lipcani</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>26. Lipcani WWTP</td>
<td>20 5 3 8 4.2 0.2 4.2 2001</td>
<td>1.3 1.5 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Town Ocniita</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>27. Ocniita WWTP</td>
<td>30 6 5 9 4.5 0.2 4.3 2004</td>
<td>1.4 1.6 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>40 7</td>
<td>28. Others</td>
<td>117 26 20 59 64.7 3.2 56.1 2003</td>
<td>19.8 26.1 18.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>47 9</td>
<td>29. Others</td>
<td>50 10 7 15 20.0 1.2 18.8 2003</td>
<td>8.0 8.0 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX II - 12: MOLDOVA

### LIST OF PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR FIVE YEAR NATIONAL NUTRIENT REDUCTION ACTION PLAN

#### Existing Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>BOD</th>
<th>COD</th>
<th>Total Inv.</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment / Cost</th>
<th>Imple-</th>
<th>Funding Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
<td>mil EUR</td>
<td>period</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,999</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agri.</td>
<td>Soil erosion</td>
<td>26,084</td>
<td>4,653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fertilizers use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>husbandry</td>
<td>18,780</td>
<td>4,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(incl. public sector)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,573</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>51,664</td>
<td>12,493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>76,164</td>
<td>19,993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wetl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Prut</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Yalpugh River valley</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Wetlands</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>76,734</td>
<td>20,145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROJECTS READY FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN THE COMING 5 YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment / Cost</th>
<th>Imple-</th>
<th>Funding Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BOD</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>tons/y</td>
<td>tons/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Afeforestation Programme</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Soil Conservation Programme</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Construction of manure treatment facilities (Carpini, Lipcani, Cazaclia, Larga)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Subtotal</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Total Agriculture</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 Lower Prut | 800 | 75 | 250 | 35 | 5.0 | 0.4 | 4.6 | 2002 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| 2 Subtotal | 5,600 | 605 | 1,050 | 185 | 60.0 | 3.2 | 56.8 | 18.0 | 21.8 | 20.3 |
| 3 Total Wetlands | 5,600 | 725 | 1,300 | 230 | 85.0 | 4.2 | 80.8 | 25.5 | 31.8 | 27.8 |

| 1 Total | 6,901 | 905 | 1,595 | 832 | 492.9 | 28.9 | 458.9 | 150.4 | 176.7 | 165.8 |
### EXISTING SITUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emission Source / Hot Spot</th>
<th>Nutrient Emissions</th>
<th>Nitrogen (N)</th>
<th>Phosphorus (P)</th>
<th>COD</th>
<th>Total Inv.</th>
<th>Increment</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Imple- mentation</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mun.</td>
<td>Uzhgorod WWTP</td>
<td></td>
<td>585</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chernivtsi WWTF facilities</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Izmail</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mukachevo WWTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vilkovo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vilkovo</td>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kilia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reni Sea Port</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kolomyia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>989</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td>486</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr.</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet.</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td>486</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECTS READY FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN THE COMING 5 YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Expected Reduction</th>
<th>Investment Cost</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N P BOD COD</td>
<td>Total Inv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uzhgorod WWTP</td>
<td>293 29 218 392</td>
<td>25.0 7.5 17.5</td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chernivtsi WWTF</td>
<td>65 25 318 0</td>
<td>8.7 3.2 3.8</td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Izmail WWTP</td>
<td>0 9 31 58</td>
<td>12.4 6.2 6.2</td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mukachevo WWTP</td>
<td>128 6 111 171</td>
<td>3.0 1.0 2.0</td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td>Int. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vilkovo flood prote</td>
<td>8.5 0.4 8.1</td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vilkovo sewerage system</td>
<td>2.4 0.1 2.3</td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vilkovo WWTF facili</td>
<td>6.5 0.3 6.2</td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kilia flood protec</td>
<td>1.3 0.1 1.8</td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reni Sea Port WWTF</td>
<td>2.8 0.1 2.7</td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kolomyia WWTF facili</td>
<td>1.0 0.0 1.0</td>
<td>2000/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>466 65 677 621</td>
<td>67.2 16.6 50.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Municipalities</td>
<td>466 65 677 621</td>
<td>67.2 16.6 50.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **N** refers to Nitrogen (tons/y), **P** refers to Phosphorus (tons/y), **BOD** refers to Biochemical Oxygen Demand (tons/y), **COD** refers to Chemical Oxygen Demand (tons/y), and **Inv.** refers to Investment Cost (mil. EUR).

The annex outlines the projects proposed for Ukraine's five-year National Nutrient Reduction Action Plan, detailing the existing situation and projects ready for implementation in the coming five years. It includes a detailed table showing the sector, emission source/hot spot, nutrient emissions, proposed projects, expected reduction, investment cost, and funding schemes.
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## ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>Danube Environmental Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB</td>
<td>Danube River Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRPC</td>
<td>Convention for the Protection and Sustainable Use of the Danube River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>Danube Watch - Magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Global Environment Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICPDR</td>
<td>International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>(environmental) non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIS</td>
<td>New Independent States of the former Soviet Union (here: Moldova, Ukraine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMTF</td>
<td>Programme Management Task Force (part of the ICPDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>(Danube) Pollution Reduction Programme of UNDP/GEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Regional Environmental Centre, Szentendre (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGP</td>
<td>Small Grants Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>(Danube) Task Force of the Environmental Programme for the Danube River Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wide Fund for Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 INTRODUCTION

Since 1992, the European Community has - through its Phare and Tacis programmes (Strategic Action Plan Implementation Programme), and the UNDP/GEF, in particular through its Danube Pollution Reduction Programme (1997-1999) - supported and facilitated the development and implementation of pollution abatement and environment rehabilitation projects in the Danube River Basin as well as of the Danube River Protection Convention.

A change came with the entering into force of the Convention in October 1998 and the installation of its Permanent Secretariat on the one hand, and the end of the UNDP/GEF PRP Programme and the EU-Phare and Tacis supports (October 2000) on the other. In order to ensure an efficient implementation of the Danube Strategic Action Plan and the Pollution Reduction Programme, a new GEF assistance is under preparation for the 2001-2005 period; a second part of this assistance will support similar activities in the Black Sea region.

This document is part of the preparation of a Danube Regional Project, which in turn forms part of the Black Sea Basin Programmatic Strategy aimed at sustainable human development in the Danube River Basin by reinforcing the capacities of the participating countries for effective regional co-operation, protection of international waters and sustainable management of natural resources and bio-diversity. This Danube Regional Project serves to strengthen the capacities of the ICPDR Secretariat in providing a regional approach for nutrient pollution reduction.

One of the immediate objectives of the Danube Regional Project has been defined as “awareness raising and reinforcement of NGO participation” in water management, trans-boundary pollution control and environmental protection.

In close communication with the ICPDR Secretariat and the Focal Points, as well as with the Country Programme Co-ordinators, public participation has been assessed in three of its aspects:

- The existing NGO structures (especially the Danube Environment Forum)
- Small Grants Programme
- Public awareness activities, including the magazine “Danube Watch” and the homepages of Danube PCU and ICPDR

For all three aspects, the objective of this project was to:

- evaluate previous GEF-funded activities
- prepare a concept for future public participation with the specification of the three themes’ components.

During the assessment, available documents (reports, concepts) on past and present projects and programmes were evaluated. Further, various meetings were held with the ICPDR Permanent Secretariat and the Danube PCU in Vienna, with the Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe in Szentendre (H) and its local offices in Ljubljana (Slovenia) and Bucharest (Romania), as well as with the Speakers of the Danube Environmental Forum (DEF) and WWF International - Danube Carpathian Programme. During field visits in Slovenia and Romania, NGO projects financed under the UNDP/GEF Danube PRP-Small Grants Programme were visited. The present report was prepared by Zinke Environment Consulting for Central and Eastern Europe, Vienna. Overall project guidance and support was provided by the ICPDR Permanent Secretariat.
2 EVALUATION OF THE SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME

2.1 General Results

Within the UNDP/GEF Danube Pollution Reduction Programme, a Small Grants Programme (SGP) was implemented by the "Regional Environmental Centre for Central and Eastern Europe" in Szentendre (H). Increasing public awareness and public participation was one of the main objectives of the PRP, and the provision of small grants to the NGO/Private sector was considered an efficient way to reach this goal.

The REC is a special institution initiated by the US government and established in 1991 to facilitate the institutional development of the NGO community in Central and Eastern Europe. The REC receives various (mostly governmental) grants and distributes them through competitive calls to NGOs, usually via its national offices located in all CEE countries. Over the years, the REC has built up comprehensive expertise in managing NGO support projects, both as a well-known and appreciated NGO partner and a reliable partner for donors. Through its national offices, the REC is able to have close and direct contact with NGOs during the entire project cycle. The REC often translates special donor requests into NGO language and vice-versa - NGO reports into donor language (e.g. from Hungarian into English).

The main goal of the UNDP/GEF PRP 1998-99 Small Grants Programme was to reinforce NGO participation on community-based pollution reduction measures and awareness-raising projects. The SGP should also strengthen small local NGOs and community initiatives.

Out of the 11 eligible countries, eight were chosen by the Danube PRP for this SGP (i.e. no SGP projects were awarded to CZ, SK and H, apart from D and A). UNDP/GEF provided a total of $ 200,000, i.e. up to $ 25,000 per country: For the NIS countries Moldova and Ukraine, UNDP/GEF funds were directly given to the UNDP offices. For the six CEE countries, namely Slovenia, Croatia, Bulgaria, Romania, Bosnia-Herzegovina and FR Yugoslavia, the REC ran the programme. Maximum available grant per NGO project was $ 5,000.

The REC provided comprehensive reports about the results of its UNDP/GEF SGP. The consultant visited both the REC headquarter as well as the country offices in Slovenia and Romania where a detailed look and personal visit to various project sites could be accomplished. Both countries were chosen as examples (one small and rich country from the upper Danube basin; one large, poor country from the lower basin), and within both countries, detailed project information was gained and two field projects were visited in each.

Grant proposals were invited by the REC and guidelines were issued with May 15, 1998 set as the deadline for submission. Local Advisory Boards in each of the 6 countries received and evaluated 98 project proposals, out of which - due to limited funds - only 55 projects (approx. nine per country, varying form $ 800 to $ 5,000) were selected on the basis of general NGO criteria and specific PRP criteria, as prepared by the REC. The funded activities can be connected to the following environmental fields:

✓ Environmental education and awareness raising to develop sensitive and active local people
✓ Integration of biological and landscape diversity objectives into water management
✓ Integration of biodiversity objectives into agriculture
✓ Monitoring of environmental quality
✓ Restoration, maintenance and conservation of key ecosystems (mainly wetlands) and species
✓ Promotion of sustainable rural development (eco-farming and -tourism)

Out of the 55 funded projects, the REC lists:
✓ 24 projects on awareness raising and education (mostly in BG and SLO)
✓ 17 projects on nature protection in the Danube watershed (mostly in HR)
✓ 8 projects on water quality research (mostly in B-H)
✓ 3 projects on water quality monitoring
✓ 3 projects on policy making (in SLO and YU).
Number of awarded projects by sector and country:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Slovenia</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Bosnia-Herz.</th>
<th>Yugoslavia</th>
<th>Bulgaria</th>
<th>Romania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Raising</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature protection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Making</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The projects started in summer/fall 1998 and ended by fall 1999.

2.2 Results from Slovenia

This was the first country visited by the public participation consultant. Ten projects proposed by Slovenia received from the REC grants from UNDP/GEF funds, with seven focusing on public awareness, two on nature protection and one on policy making.

The NGO community in Slovenia is well developed but suffers from major financial constraints (key donor organisations have suspended their support), which has forced the vast majority of NGOs to be rather passive. In addition, transboundary issues and co-operation are not yet a major concern. Therefore, institutional development of the NGO community on transboundary environment issues is critically needed.

During the trip, four projects were reviewed off site and another two were visited on site.

- **Project D08029 Revitalisation of the Krupa River Area**: This is located in a karst mountain area in south-eastern Slovenia where a big river source had for decades been polluted by PCBs stemming from a condensator plant. This news was shocking for the local people relying on good water quality. However, no direct health impact could apparently be verified. After the site had been cleaned some years ago, the SGP project ($2,000 for the NGO "Tourist Society Semic") aimed at improving local public awareness about the uniqueness of the nature area and the sensitive karst water system (multilingual info brochure with 3,000 copies; 18 tables built to illustrate a new learning pathway along the river), but also included the cleaning of the Krupa river banks. This helped to change the image of the area from a contaminated site to an attraction for tourists and a nice area to live in. The project helped to establish a new NGO "Ecological Society Semic" and to further improve cooperation of local people on water protection (e.g. accelerated construction of a sewage collector system).

- **Project D08035 What kind of tourism do we want on Kolpa river**: Kolpa river forms the border between Slovenia and Croatia and is largely still intact (national park project on Slovenian side), but subject to illegal sewage disposal and intensive recreational activities. The NGO "Fishing Society Crnomelj" used the $2,500 from SGP to increase the local awareness: From June to September 1998, seven littered areas along rivers banks were cleaned and a public awareness campaign was started to prevent further degradation (via national TV, local radio and newspaper). 200 posters and 2,000 info brochures were spread. A list of illegal sewage spots was given to the environment inspectorate, which resulted both in stopping a few of them and in contacts with the local industry. Yet, no complete improvement can be reported.

- **Four other projects reviewed during individual meetings at the REC office**: The "Water Detective" project is a most remarkable initiative which invites primary school kids (6-14 years) to make simple research and art on water and to report about it in papers, drawings and poems (published in local media). About 10,000 pupils from 140 schools (= 1/3 of Slovenia!!) have already participated. SGP helped with $3,000 to publish a booklet for teachers (100 pages, colour print, 2,000 copies), which was delivered to all primary schools in Slovenia.

The "Building Wetlands for Waste Water Treatment" project promotes constructed wetlands in rural areas. For $1,000 SGP support, two workshops informed over 100 people about this technology and
construction projects were initiated in four villages. However, only one village is currently ready to build a constructed wetland because there is yet no governmental incentive for this kind of waste water treatment.

The "Four Seasons" project was supported with $ 3,000 to organise training workshops for 100 teachers and agricultural students on water management, which were held at a perma-culture farm. Topics included river revitalisation, water on a perma-culture farm, water quality monitoring etc.

The project "Internal Inspection and Certification of Organic Farms" financed with $ 5,000 the introduction of an independent organic farms certification (IFOAM control system) in Slovenia. In 1998, 12 inspectors were trained and 25 farms applied, out of which 13 received the status of organic farms and 8 became farms in conversion. Today, the control system is fully operating. By the summer of 2000, 600 farms had already been certified and the first markets opened in Ljubljana and Maribor with products from those farms certified in 1998. In this case, the benefit for nutrient reduction is most evident and sustainable.

2.3 Results from Romania

Romania was the second country visited. It has much more wide-spread and prominent environment pollution problems. Nine SGP projects were financed, five of them dealing with public awareness and four with nature protection. Due to the big travel distances, only two projects could be visited:

♦ Project D05039 "Children and the Danube": The "Al. Borza Naturalist Foundation" in Braila in eastern Romania works for the protection and revitalisation of the Lower Danube floodplains (little Braila island). For the SGP support of $ 4,000, this group organised various ecological camps (including training of students to do environment education with children), a seminar "Hope for Danube" (where 300 kids hold a trial for the Danube) and water quality monitoring of the Danube and Braila city. Further, funds were used to produce small info bulletins (1,000 copies distributed to kids) and a book entitled "Only one Danube" (220 pages; 1,000 copies distributed to schools). As project effects, seven "Eco Clubs" were founded involving up to 500 children and teachers from various schools, and the NGO became the city's resource center for environmental education.

♦ Project D05022 "Involvement of Civil Society in Developing a Wetland Protection Plan for north-west Dobrogea": With $ 3,060 received, the ECOS Youth Organisation from Tulcea (entrance of the Danube delta) could launch new co-operation between the local authorities and people, aimed at reducing local pollution and at better protecting several large Danube wetlands upstream of the delta (part of the Green Danube Ecological Corridor). Altogether 40 actions were organised, including education programmes with young students from local villages, the printing and distribution of a wetland booklet (1,000 copies - 800 distributed), various local meetings, field trips, press releases etc. The SGP support also helped to raise other matching funds.

2.4 Results from Moldova

The short evaluation report indicates that the SGP started in September 1998 and that 28 project proposals were submitted to UNDP Moldova, where a Local Advisory Board of knowledgeable experts made recommendations to the UNDP Resident Representative. Five projects were eventually accepted (awards were 4 x $ 4,600 and one $ 4,050) which started in December 1998 and ended in July 1999.

The five projects were focusing on awareness raising among the local people (e.g. via map, video film, photo exhibition, brochures, pupil competition; educational CD-ROM for schools on the local fauna, TV/Radio/newspaper reporting; opinion polls, round-table discussions, an Environmental Guide promoting eco-tourism) but also on some concrete work (cleaning of the Prut river springs, tree planting, water quality monitoring). Local environment and health authorities as well as the Ministry for Environment were closely involved but the projects also helped to establish new links to business and research institutions. The existing NGOs were strengthened, and even new NGOs were established. In spring 1999, each granted NGO planted 400 trees in its project area, and in a NGO meeting on 8 November 1999, the NGO community was informed about the achievements, problems and experiences of this SGP.
2.5 Evaluation

The brief survey and intensive visits helped to identify the various strengths and weaknesses of the SGP programme. It is possible – although not very correct - to extrapolate the experiences of these example SGP projects to the entire list of projects supported by the UNDP/GEF SGP:

Strengths

- It seems that UNDP/GEF funds were used most efficiently: The amount of activities and outputs is very impressive for the very small amount of money received. This can be explained by the voluntary work that most NGO do and by their efforts to make the most out of the available support.
- Environmental education programmes, especially the training of teachers, have multiplying and lasting effects.
- Co-operation with the local media also increased public information/awareness and supported the credibility/strength/standing of the NGO in the eyes of the local public.
- All projects have some kind of environmental awareness objective, which secures a dissemination of environmental information and more sustainable impacts (e.g. change of behaviour).
- A number of projects were in fact co-funded, which made a bigger and/or more complex project feasible.

Weaknesses

- Too little funds per project were directed to concrete "pollution reduction" activities.
- Criteria to produce concrete pollution reduction were not strongly advocated in the call phase.
- There are limits on NGOs’ capacity and competence in implementing concrete action (e.g. activities which require legal permits, large funds, long negotiation processes, complex technical problems).
- The available time for this SPG was sometimes too short to achieve more comprehensive results.
- The PR for the actual donor (UNDP/GEF) was very weak.
- It was diplomatically unfortunate that three Danube basin countries were not eligible for this SGP.

Conclusion

- This SGP can be considered very successful; the available funds were in most cases spent in a very efficient way, with sustainable benefits.
- In terms of direct nutrient reduction, only a few projects could be listed (e.g. conversion of farms, cleaning of river banks) but all projects have indirect effects built in in terms of awareness raising, education and initiation of nutrient reduction projects. Regrettably, none of the projects produced a quantitative figure of such success.
- There is a need and opportunity in various projects to build up on the work done before in order to materialise and extend the beneficial outputs.
- Investing in NGO activities is in most cases very cost-efficient, since NGOs work close to the problem and to the target audience, their office costs and fees are very small; they have all possibility for flexible contacts. The failure rate is small and so are the potential financial losses.
- NGOs need to be better informed in advance about the background and objectives of the SGP.
- Selection criteria should be further developed (specified) and communicated when issuing the call for submission and should then become part of the contract and reporting.
- While many projects were already designed and executed with good PR work, future projects need to have special media components to better spread information about the environmental action.
- All Danube Basin countries are in need of such NGO projects; a future SGP should involve both the countries in transition as well as Germany and Austria where a complementing SGP should be established via domestic or "western" sources (GEF is not eligible).
3 EVALUATION OF NGO STRUCTURES UNDER THE DANUBE ENVIRONMENT FORUM (DEF)

3.1 Background

The involvement of NGOs in environmental policies in the Danube Basin dates back to the governmental conference in Sofia in September 1991 when Danube governments, donor organisations and NGOs met to discuss and launch the "Environmental Programme for the Danube River Basin". While NGOs were later excluded from the preparatory process of the Danube Protection Convention, a few of them were invited to participate in the Danube Task Force (WWF, IUCN, Equipe Cousteau and the Regional Environmental Center which later stopped being considered as NGO).

The need to establish something like a basin-wide NGO network or platform was soon realised and then followed up both by the NGO community, the REC and the Danube PCU (UNDP). There were problems associated with the fact that the NGO community was a very young, dynamic and largely inexperienced group, while the top-down efforts of installing one partner body for the Task Force (rather than having e.g. one NGO representative per country, resulting in 13 TF members) failed. Also, the TF was considered by some NGOs as a governmental forum, which they did not want to support in general (e.g. NGO critique of a lack of governmental policy towards sustainable development or true public participation; also: controversy over the Gabčíkovo hydrodam).

UNDP/GEF then funded several NGO consultation workshops which were organised via the REC in June 1992 in Bratislava (where a support for a so-called NGO Danube Forum was not granted by the NGO community), via WWF Austria & Global 2000 in September 1993 in Vienna (calling the TF to grant two seats for eastern NGOs) and via the NGO Danube Forum/Ecologist Youth of Romania on 17-20 February 1994 in Sinaia (RO) where eventually three interim NGO representatives were elected. At the 5th Task Force meeting in Regensburg (D) in July 1994, CEE NGO representatives together with western NGO representatives used the first opportunity since Sofia 1991 to raise their critical voice against a narrow-scope draft of the Danube Strategic Action Plan that according to them lacked broad ecological goals (this was appreciated by several delegations and helped to improve the draft SAP).

A major step forward was achieved in October 1994 at the Danube NGO International Meeting (supported by UNDP and the Danube Task Force) in Mikulov (CZ) when 31 NGO representatives agreed to the establishment of the "Danube Environment Forum (DEF)". Following this, the elected three DEF speakers were invited to Task Force meetings but over time failed to secure sustainable, competent participation and communication (this was partly due to the absence of follow-up baseline support to the DEF by UNDP/GEF after 1996). In 1995, NGO focal points in the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Croatia, Romania, Moldova and Ukraine organised meetings to promote NGO collaboration. On 1 December 1995, the DEF board met in Budapest to prepare the 1st General Assembly, which was held on 15-17 February 1996 in Kosice (Slovakia) with 75 participants from 51 Danube basin NGOs. After that, however, the activities of the DEF speakers receded and by 1997, there was no more activity within the DEF.

3.2 Reinforcement of NGO Cooperation in the DRB

Within the Danube PRP, a new effort was undertaken to reinforce and develop the NGO community in the region. This firstly focused on the national NGO communities and started with the training of NGO facilitators (10-19 March 1998 in Baden/A), who conducted from April to June 1998 national NGO consultation workshops (each 2 days long). They were organised by the REC in 11 Danube Basin countries and involved altogether 212 NGO representatives out of which five to eight NGO representatives per country were nominated to take part in the PRP National Planning Workshops, and three to four NGO representatives were nationally nominated and invited to the DEF Regional Consultation Meeting held in Szentendre (H) on November 12-14, 1998.
On this occasion, the 39 participants agreed to re-establish the NGO platform named "Danube Environment Forum". Again, three speakers were elected (for the upper, middle and lower Danube Basin parts) and an Interim DEF Secretariat became established in Bratislava at the office of the NGO Daphne. The speakers, together with the Secretariat, prepared the crucial institutional development steps (secretary; e-mail conference; new logo; project proposals for baseline funding submitted to PCU/UNDP). On March 18-19, 1999, the first DEF Board meeting was held in Bratislava, which prepared the DEF statute, the DEF registration, the national DEF structure and fund raising; this meeting was again funded by UNDP/GEF.

In April 1999, the official legal registration of DEF as an international organisation under the Slovak law was initiated (founding members were Daphne/SK. Union for the Morava River/CZ and Distelverein/A) which was accomplished in October 1999 (Memorandum of Foundation of DEF).

At the ICPDR-PMTF meeting on 12 June 1999, three project proposals on DEF institutional strengthening, public awareness raising and wetland restoration were presented (they later became part of the Project Brief for the Preparation of the GEF Danube Regional Project!). In November 1999, the DEF submitted its formal application to the ICPDR for being granted "observer" status, which was accepted at the ICPDR meeting on 22-23 November 1999 in Sinaia/RO.

3.3 Situation of the DEF today

In 1999, another fifteen NGOs from ten Danube countries applied for DEF membership and ten were granted it by the DEF Board at the DEF Strategy Meeting in Bratislava on March 6-7, 2000 (meeting funded by the Austrian Federal Chancellery).

Today, the DEF has 13 members representing 11 Danube Basin countries (i.e. in all except Hungary and Moldova). Another five NGOs have requested membership (status April 2000). In six countries, DEF also disposes of approved DEF National Focal Points (Austria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, FR Yugoslavia, Romania, Ukraine), for another five (B-H, BG, HR, D, SLO) this is under preparation during 2000. In Slovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania, there exist already active DEF networks with each more than ten local NGOs that benefit from the DEF information service provided by the Secretariat in Bratislava.

Except for the mentioned meetings and the invitation of DEF speakers to UNDP/GEF PRP or ICPDR meetings (e.g. at the Hernstein workshops, PMTF and Steering Group meetings, to the Ad-hoc Expert Group on River Basin Management), DEF has yet no institutional financial support; and all expenses such as registration, secretariat and communication are covered by the Secretariat, Speakers and DEF members. Still, efforts are under way to make possible the first general Assembly in 2000 (planned in Galati/RO).

Apart from WWF, DEF is the only relevant NGO in the Danube Basin that works on regional level on environment (water). It is recognised within the NGO community but yet not well known especially among NGOs working in other fields than water and nature. It is a fact that until today only very few NGOs in the region work on international level and that the importance of e.g. transboundary pollution problems posing a task for local NGOs became only evident with the Tisza accidental spills in early 2000.

Until this day, the DEF has not been able to establish national links in Hungary and Moldova. Hungary is a special case because a few NGO leaders with their negative experience of the early 1990s top-down NGO involvement process still today dominate the opinion about the DEF, the EPDRB and ICPDR. However, recent communication indicates that the DEF could enlist Hungarian and Moldovian members by the end of 2000.

The participation of NGO representatives at the 11 PRP National Planning Workshops in 1998 strengthened the participatory and communication process with governmental bodies. Representatives from local communities and science also contributed to an open assessment of environmental problems, policy objectives and measures to be undertaken. Participating NGOs also expressed their satisfaction with these workshops and their outcome. The only country where these workshops and NGO involvement were not successful is Hungary: For many years already, a few prominent Hungarian NGO leaders have not favoured the Danube regional process.

Further, it should be mentioned that a few NGO representatives (DEF, WWF) attended the two successful Danube Transboundary Analysis workshops in January and May 1999 in Hernstein (A).
3.4 Other NGO Involvement

To assess if and how NGO participation and awareness raising were reinforced by the UNDP/GEF Pollution Reduction Project, a Questionnaire was distributed to the national consultants asking them to respond to the following questions:

1. During the DPRP there were several activities related to public participation. In what respect did each government in the DRB notice an (beneficial?) impact from this? (was it through NGO participation in national workshops, through the Small Grants Programme or through the involvement of the DEF?)

Replies from most countries state that NGO participation in the National Workshops was viewed as a very positive experience (e.g. as a second, independent opinion, provision of new facts). Moreover, the SGP proved to be a successful contribution towards increasing NGOs’ level of expertise and local public awareness/environmental education activities.

2. What possibilities and needs do the governments suggest in order to improve public participation in the future? In particular, what should new NGO programmes focus on more (e.g. local field activities, public awareness raising via the media, direct cooperation of specific NGOs with government authorities on specific projects).

Based on the answers to this question, it seems that funds are the only limiting factor rather than knowledge or lack of cooperation with NGOs. It was felt as a pity that very rewarding NGO ideas and initiatives are not better supported. Future NGO SGP should focus on concrete local field activities and public awareness raising (e.g. introduction of phosphorus-free detergents), also to demonstrate the importance of local communities in solving global problems. Interest was also expressed in improving the involvement of NGOs and the public in governmental decision-making processes.

3.5 Conclusion

- It can be stated that the UNDP/GEF PRP in 1998/99 helped to raise awareness among a large number of national NGOs regarding the Danube Basin environmental problems and the role and tasks of the Danube Convention and its ICPDR.

- UNDP/GEF funds were decisive in re-institutionalising the DEF but were insufficient to sustain it. The DEF (through its elected speakers and Secretariat) was able to then establish itself as a legal body with elected speakers, board, secretariat, national representation in most Danube countries and various policy work. However, when viewed against the large NGO community and NGO competence available in the region, the DEF still seems to be weak in its structure, membership, communication and policy work (not forgetting that it has officially existed for less than a year only!).

- The future development of DEF still depends on outside funding (e.g. UNDP/GEF) which should focus on the following priorities:
  - Institutional development of DEF (more members, more internal and external communication, better information service by the secretariat, better communication and co-ordination of speakers, board & national focal points, more concrete outputs);
  - Strengthening the local NGO community interest in the Danube Basin policy issues, aiming at bilateral co-operation with the DEF international structure via national DEF Focal Points and their projects (awareness raising, education, wetlands, hot spots etc.) including annual national NGO meetings;
  - Promotion of the development and submission of NGO projects to the UNDP/GEF Small Grants Programme, i.e. the DEF should invite both its National Focal Points and the national NGO community to prepare respective proposals for nutrient reduction (e.g. via wetland restoration);
✓ Strengthening the DEF policy work through regular DEF board meetings and General Assemblies, the enlisting of DEF experts for Danube issues as well as active DEF participation at ICPDR meetings, workshops and training;

✓ Public awareness raising within the general public (local people) about the needs for local and transboundary water management, pollution prevention and mitigation, wetland conservation and restoration;

✓ Competent DEF engagement in important regional issues, e.g. Tisza spills (BMTF), Lower Danube Green Corridor, GEF Strategic Partnership etc.
4 EVALUATION OF PUBLIC AWARENESS RAISING

4.1 Background

The distribution of information and the raising of public awareness has not yet been a prominent activity of the Danube programmes since 1991. There have been a few press releases for the media (e.g. on the occasion of the signing of the Danube SAP in December 1994) but no real PR campaign. The most relevant activities were

- the release of the quarterly bulletin "Danube Watch" since December 1994
- the establishment of web-pages by the Danube PCU [www.rec.org/DanubePCU] and by the ICPDR [www.icpdr.org/DANUBIS]
- the request expressed to NGOs to engage in public awareness raising which has lately been indirectly successful through the NGO Small Grants Programme (1998-1999)

4.2 Evaluation of previous Public Awareness Raising Activities

4.2.1 Danube Watch

"Danube Watch - The Magazine of the Environmental Programme for the Danube River Basin" was launched in December 1994 by the Danube PCU. It is an independent quarterly magazine of 16 A4 pages bringing stories of mostly 1-3 pages on a whole range of environmental issues within the region with a focus on activities under the EPDRB and the ICPDR as well as on local issues related to environmental policy, protection, pollution and restoration (mostly written by journalists). Information is also brought to the reader in the form of interviews, statements by national government officials, local special authorities and NGOs. In other words, a big portion of the DW is written by involved officials and experts.

In 1995, a special brochure called "Action for a Blue Danube" presented the Environmental Programme for the DRB and its first results (24 pages).

After being published first in black and blue until June 1997, a re-launched DW in March 1998 appeared in a full colour version with shorter stories (still 16 pages).

In 1999, a new tender resulted in a change of publisher and a change of the design but a continuation of the content concept (June 1999).

With the 2/2000 issue (expected in September), the funding of Danube Watch by EU-Phare Programme and the UNDP/GEF will cease. How the magazine will be sustained beyond that point remains to be decided. The support for single issues by national donors, as in the case of no. 1/1999, funded by the Austrian Federal Chancellery, could be a bridging solution but cannot secure a regular publication of the magazine.

Danube Watch can be ordered free of charge from the Danube PCU and the ICPDR Secretariat. It is presently (July 2000) mailed to 6,400 addresses reaching an estimate of 10,000 readers:

- 7% government authorities and administration,
- 27% international organisations and IFIs,
- 25% R & D, professional training and universities
- 11% private individuals and NGOs,
- 17% civil engineers, scientists etc.).

It is obvious that Danube Watch reaches quite efficiently the specific target audience of the DRPC and ICPDR as well as a broader range of persons and institutions.

Danube Watch is the only available environmental magazine in and for this European region. This indicates its importance as a largely independent information source especially for regional issues and for the ICPDR (especially since 1998).

Danube Watch has a very positive image in the region as an interesting, attractive and instructive source of information. Readers to whom it is mailed respond unusually positive to the publisher.

Self-financing of Danube Watch

Several efforts have been undertaken over the past years and in particular since 1999 to sell advertising space to make the magazine financially independent and sustainable. For independent financing, ten full-page advertisements would need to be sold. However, potential advertisers have expressed very little interest, much below the minimum funds required for self-financing.

Reasons:

- The overall number of copies distributed and read is too small for companies doing advertisement. Potential donors such as banks, airlines, insurance and business companies have shown no interest.
- DW is still a special magazine through which the general public cannot be reached. Even though it is non-scientific, its content is relevant only for a restricted audience and not attractive for most local people (even if national editions would be produced);
- The region and sectors addressed cannot be well reached by business groups through such advertisements; experience gained over the past years has shown that direct lobbying and personal communication is more effective for these companies than public advertisements.

As a second alternative for the raising of funds, those interested in the magazine were contacted and asked if they could secure the publication of the magazine. An informal survey conducted by the publisher and Danube PCU/ICPDR has indicated that

- single readers would not be ready to pay as much (e.g. via paid order) as needed to simply cover the administration of these payments
- the governments in the region do not have respective budgets to share the cost of a regular publication (more than one issue is not feasible).

Therefore, for the coming years, the benefit of having and spreading Danube Watch in the region cannot be secured from sources within the region.

Recommendations to improve Danube Watch

The fact of another re-launch of Danube Watch in 2001 should be used to undertake further activities towards improving the magazine, namely

- Development of a general magazine concept including the magazine structure (e.g. pre-fixed cover stories, special pages for the ICPDR Secretariat, governments, NGOs, a news page, ICPDR President's comment, updated calendar of events, contact addresses etc.).
- The parallel publication on the ICPDR homepage should be continued as a complementing publication form to expand its outreach. However, the electronic version cannot replace the print version because the latter is received by a broader and more interested readership (the internet will for many years to come remain a very uncommon tool in downstream countries).
- A DW "Readers Online Forum" should be established via an interactive chat-page: given that the issues appear at rather long time intervals, the internet should be used to establish more short-term communication among the readers.
- The sub-title of the magazine should be changed from "Magazine of the EPDRB" to e.g. "Magazine of the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River”.
- The distribution of the magazine should be improved: mailing lists should be reviewed and updated and new readers should be included (e.g. from Romania, Moldova, Ukraine), the overall distribution concept should be re-assessed (e.g. via the central government, the DEF Focal Point, or one contracted student).
While it seems reasonable to have the editorial team located in Austria near the ICPDR, it should be financially advantageous to re-locate the printing from Vienna to a less expensive transition country, e.g. to printing companies in Bratislava, Brno or Győr.

Special DW editions could be produced to address certain reader groups or refer to certain events/occasions, e.g. national editions with many or all texts translated; an issue targeting children or high school or college students to complement a public awareness campaign; an issue presenting very obvious results of projects funded from the Small Grants Programme, etc.

### 4.2.2 Homepage

There are currently two internet addresses under which Danube region information can be found:

- **The homepage of the Danube PCU** (www.rec.org/DanubePCU)
  
  This is a comprehensive source of information covering all subjects and activities undertaken within the EPDRB over the last years. It brings broad or in-depth information about:
  - The Danube Protection Convention including the ICPDR
  - The organisation, structure and institutions under the EPDRB
  - The Geography and Nature of the DRB
  - Publications and Projects under the EPDRB (list and summary of implemented projects)
  - News and events
  - Useful links

  As the EU-Phare programme is ending its support, the Danube PCU office will be closed in October 2000 and this homepage will consequently be closed by the end of 2000 and incorporated into the ICPDR homepage.

- **ICPDR homepage**: http://www.icpdr.org/DANUBIS

  This is presently mainly serving as an intranet system for ICPDR members, containing many "confidential" data (e.g. various national data, reports, meeting minutes etc.). The information provided to external users is presently almost non-existing, even though there are important chapters listed:
  - Legislation
  - News and events
  - Administration
  - Agriculture
  - Disasters, accidents, risks: provides a lot of information from the Elbe and Rhine rivers!
  - Information
  - Pollution
  - Water

  The sensitivity of no-public-accessibility presumably stems from "pre-Aarhus Convention" times when many governments and authorities were (still are!) not used to or reluctant to open their files to inform the general public. With the Aarhus Convention ("on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making, and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters") and the EU Guidelines for Public Information in force, a substantial change of the ICPDR's access-to-information policy is overdue. The IC has on its agenda the revision of the homepage with a larger part of information to be publicly available ("Access Rights Concept" from July 2000) and is expected to improve the situation in the coming months. From October 2000 on, the ICPDR will incorporate the homepage of the Danube PCU (www.rec.org/DanubePCU) and integrate it into the Danubis homepage.
4.2.3 Other Public Awareness Activities

Apart from the already mentioned activities, two project components from the Pollution Reduction programme contributed essentially to awareness raising:

- The organization of National Planning Workshops using target-oriented methodology and a participatory approach,
- The implementation of community-based projects with the financial support of the GEF Small Grants Programme.

National Planning Workshops conducted in 1998 in the frame of the Pollution Reduction Programme in each of the central and downstream Danube countries, contributed in an essential manner to public awareness raising. In each national workshop, 30 to 40 experts from ministries, local governments, scientific institutions and national NGOs participated, carrying the message of pollution reduction and environmental protection to their respective departments, institutions and to the general public. At the decision making level, ministers, vice-ministers and directors were involved in the organization of National Workshops. Statements, interviews and speeches were brought by the mass media to a large audience.

The preparation, publication and implementation of community-based projects under the GEF Small Grants Programme has contributed equally to public awareness raising. Calls for submission of project proposals were publicly launched to all NGOs in the participating countries. The implementation of projects was reported by the local press, informing a large public about the initiatives taken by local NGOs to assure environmental protection and pollution control. Some projects were conceived for raising public awareness on specific environmental problems.

Conclusion

National Workshops and the implementation of the Small Grants Programme were essential elements to reinforcing public awareness at the grass-root level as well as the decision-making level.

Training programmes, workshops and the implementation process for the future Small Grants Programme should contain special components for “applied public awareness raising” through frequent and regular information of the public on “success stories” related to environmental protection, pollution control and especially on nutrient reduction projects.
5 CONCEPT PAPER FOR NGO ACTIVITIES, SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME AND PUBLIC AWARENESS

The overall idea is to increase public involvement in basin-wide nutrient reduction measures, including practical (replicable!) and community-based projects, education and training, monitoring and control or policy programmes. Awareness raising can effectively contribute to expanding the local perception of transboundary and regional issues and even boost the global understanding of environmental problems and solutions.

5.1 Concept for Small Grants Programme

Based on the discussions with the REC headquarter, the REC local offices in Slovenia and Romania as well as with the DEF speakers, WWF and local NGOs, it seems that benefits from SGP can be increased if the programme incorporates the following ideas:

• More substantial SGP projects by increasing the maximum grants and time to each 15-20,000 $: This will improve the relevance/capacity of each project and importance of possible outputs/ benefits/ impact e.g. for nutrient pollution aspects.

• Two project phases within the new SGP, with each lasting about 18 months, with experience from the first SGP phase used for the second phase: A small-grants project should not run beyond a maximum of two years. However, thanks to the long period of the new UNDP/GEF programme, two SGP phases can be implemented.

• The project calls should rather be issued on regional level, giving preference to the best ideas having the potential of producing basin-wide model results: As the issues tackled are not of essentially local or national character, there is no need to restrict the SGP to an even allocation of funds to all countries. The tender and the proposals should also reflect the character of the programme - both are regional.

• Each project proposal should be submitted in English and should indicate an English-speaking contact person: This will help to overcome the language constraints that many NGOs have while in fact English is not essential for the actual progress of most projects but only for its international communication.

• Preference should be given to SGP projects dealing with important model hot spots of nutrient pollution and transboundary aspects: While this should not be an exclusive condition (there may be excellent project proposals e.g. on diffuse nutrient pollution), the SGP should focus on the most prominent regional pollution problems. Many NGOs are already working on hot spot problems, others are open and interested in re-orienting their activities in this direction. In each project, the transboundary character of the pollution problem should be addressed, either by involving partners from neighbouring countries or by raising the awareness on the transboundary aspect from a national perspective.

• The projects selected and awarded should have demonstration and model character for the DRB. As the Danube PRP has shown (especially in its Transboundary Analysis), there are many similarities among local pollution problems and the constraints and barriers to overcome. The SGP offers an opportunity to implement small-scale, low-tech measures having significant pollution reduction effects, such as the introduction and expansion of organic farming, manure handling methods, constructed wetlands for rural sewage treatment, wetland restoration, more efficient pollution control and monitoring etc. For the end of the SGP, it is therefore important to summarise and widely spread the results gained and to share the practical experience with other parts of the DRB faced with similar problems (see below). This SGP may even become a policy guideline for governments looking for inexpensive ways to reduce their local and transboundary pollution problems.

• Identification of SGP project indicators able to measure the benefits/success in terms of nutrient reduction: It is important to give preference to those project proposals having developed and built-n indicators not only for direct pollution reduction measures (e.g. treatment of sewage; improvement or change of production processes) but also indirect indicators through education, training and awareness-raising projects (e.g. monitor the educated/trained persons’ daily behaviour prior and after; count the media reports and the reached audience over time; count new contacts to the polluting industry).
• Multi-stakeholder co-operation projects (one NGO together with e.g. industry, community, government agency): While the previous SGP already had many such projects, the role of cross-sectoral communication and co-operation should be further strengthened in this part of Europe. In this respect, NGOs are still considered as low-importance stakeholders, whose innovative spirit/motivation and pro-active role is not sufficiently recognised. On the other hand, such "promoted" co-operation can also improve the competence of NGOs on the technical level.

• Thorough pre-information of the SGP through national NGO meetings: This will deal both with the new SGP and its conditions and with more general, basic information about the relevance of the DRPC, the ICPDR, the DEF, the causes and effects of water pollution and the national and international efforts to mitigate them. The series of these meetings in all Danube countries would secure a higher general awareness about why this Danube SGP exists and what the NGO community can do and is invited to do. The meeting should end with a "project idea stock exchange" to foster new NGO contacts and better NGO project proposals.

• Project administration should secure:
  - Information about the SGP (pre-information meeting, call with submission procedures)
  - Contacting to the national NGO communities
  - Selection and awarding procedure (this should include one representative from ICPDR and WWF as independent bodies; DEF member organisation may want to also submit projects and should therefore not be involved at this level)
  - Contracting and reporting
  - Advise to NGOs on administrative aspects
  - SGP administration and reporting to ICPDR

• Project quality assurance service should be provided by a SGP co-ordinator who communicates with the NGO contact person and visits each selected project during the implementation phase. This is to support NGOs in solving various problems (technical, administrative, co-operation) and to secure a good orientation and progress of each SGP project with respect to the regional objectives. As the SGP experience has shown, such a service is needed and could happen both during the submission phase, at half way through the implementation and possibly also in the final reporting stage. This person would link between the ICPDR, the SGP implementing agency and the NGO community on non-administrative aspects.

• Final international presentation event where e.g. the five best projects would be presented to the public, the media and governments: It is assumed that many national and local governments would benefit from the results and experiences made in some of the practical projects. Due to the constraints of most government budgets in the Danube Basin, such small-scale but efficient pollution reduction and stakeholder co-operation projects would serve as models for other parts of the country and the Danube Basin. The time and location of the event could be linked to a regular ICPDR meeting.

• A complementing SGP should be initiated in Germany and Austria to also raise the local awareness about transboundary pollution problems in the upper part of the Danube Basin, which still substantially contributes to the nutrient loads of the Danube. The fact that GEF cannot support projects in these EU countries should not prevent similar nutrient reduction projects from being implemented there. The possible financial sources, size and character of the SGP and the number of projects supported should be assessed in winter 2000/2001 by the two country delegations. The ICPDR Secretariat, WWF and DEF may be involved in the SGP preparation and project selection.
5.2 Concept for DEF Activities

The institutional strengthening and capacity building of the NGO community in the Danube River Basin should focus on the structure of the Danube Environmental Forum.

**Justification:**

1. The DEF is one of the very few NGO networks in this region of Europe and it is the only one directly linked to the Danube Convention/ICPDR. Article II (DEF Objectives) of its "Memorandum of Foundation" provides the following definition of its objectives:

   a) "to promote international support to the future sustainable development of the Danube River region on issues such as biodiversity, land use, environmental education, etc.;"

   b) as the NGOs representative body to ensure future NGOs participation in the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River structures and other Danube institutions;

   c) to promote sustainable financial mechanisms ensuring permanent NGOs representation in the Danube River-related governmental programs."

2. NGOs, and in particular the DEF with its combined regional and local member structure, secure through their involvement in the ICPDR activities a high level of public information and public participation between the DRPC/ICPDR and the general public. Public awareness raising on specific environmental issues is one of the key objectives of all environmental NGOs, and consequently of the DEF. Therefore, the strengthening of the DEF will increase the capacities of the ICPDR in awareness raising and public information.

The support of the UNDP/GEF Danube Regional Project should therefore focus on **capacity building to secure better NGO co-operation, communication and representation:**

- **Institutional development of DEF:** It should support the main institutions and actors of the DEF to secure baseline funding and improve their efficiency and outputs, and specifically:
  - **DEF Secretariat:** improved service capacity for DEF members, other NGOs, ICPDR and the general public (information center for all persons and institutions interested in gaining information about the DEF work and access to NGO resources)
  - **DEF Speakers:** improved capacities to co-operate internally and with ICPDR
  - **DEF National Focal Points:** improved capacities to communicate with other local NGOs
  - **DEF meeting bodies:** regular meetings of DEF board and General Assembly.

- **Public awareness raising** (education, information and monitoring) is needed within the NGO community in the Danube basin and within the general public (local people) about the needs for local and transboundary water management, pollution abatement, wetland conservation and restoration. This should become a key activity especially of the DEF National Focal Points, as they can - from an independent side - complement governmental activities to tackle pollution and water protection problems. Unlike the Small Grants Programme, which will necessarily focus on local point issues (hot spots) and will, therefore, not address nation-wide issues, the DEF with its National Focal Points should run more general, nation-wide public awareness raising campaigns.

One simple activity of the DEF should be a regular publication of information via the "Danube Watch" magazine (via a special DEF page). The same applies to a **DEF homepage** which is already under preparation.

- **Policy work:** stronger involvement in the ICPDR and its working groups; more competent engagement in important regional issues (water-related environment sector); capacity building in local NGO communities; provision of experts, expert statements, studies and data (e.g. monitoring).
5.3 Concept for Public Awareness

The new UNDP/GEF Programme offers for the first time the possibility to link and complement various awareness raising activities under a joint umbrella. It is therefore proposed that public awareness raising activities should be conducted on various levels which can be partly interconnected. A special role is assigned to the NGO community, whose public awareness activities should be strengthened and more oriented to the nutrient pollution problem:

- **Via the Danube Watch magazine:** The “DW” magazine could increase its attractiveness since it is a unique and important source of information for the region. For the future, further development steps should include:
  
  ✓ Development and implementation of a new **Danube Watch concept** (magazine contents, production/printing/distribution) that would be prepared by the new publisher (new contract) in co-operation with the ICPDR Secretariat; the objective is a closer link to the GEF nutrient reduction programme and in particular to other awareness-raising activities (e.g. Small Grants Program, folder, homepage, DEF awareness campaign)
  
  ✓ Production of new, partly **Specialised Issues** of Danube Watch
  
  ✓ Introduction of a specialized “**DEF/NGO Forum**” in Danube Watch
  
  ✓ Installation of a DW "**Readers Online Forum**" on the ICPDR homepage (possibly as a link to the publishers homepage where the DW web-page will be established)

- **Via the ICPDR homepage:** Open access to information and decisions helps to create accountability and to support sound environmental policies. The recent improvement of the Danube PCU homepage and the upcoming inclusion into the ICPDR homepage will increase the number of its “visits” and potential users. Therefore, the homepage has a good potential to meet information and awareness-raising needs.

  The installation of a homepage makes sense only if it provides substantial information. So far, the ICPDR homepage is not accessible to the broad public and restricts simple and useful information from the Danube region contained in various new studies and data. This refers, for instance, to the UNDP/GEF PRP whose outputs are in fact attractive documents which will satisfy many needs of public interest and which have no reason to be kept internal (regardless of the fact that there is also a more complicated possibility to get a copy from the ICPDR Secretariat). As long as such information is not shown to the public, its support for such international donor programmes will remain very low (see e.g. the ongoing critique of Hungarian NGOs).

  For the future, i.e. with the start of the new UNDP/GEF programme at the latest, this has to be radically changed. It is hoped that the incorporation of the Danube PCU homepage will result in the immediate availability of most of the information not yet available on that homepage. Second, all new ICPDR documents which have already been approved for publication by the ICPDR body should then be published:

  ✓ General information about the geography and nature of the Danube Basin
  ✓ Information about the Danube Protection Convention, the ICPDR and its bodies
  ✓ Information about other legal frameworks including the EU Water Framework Directive
  ✓ Results from the projects conducted under the EPDRB including the Phare-SIP and the UNDP/GEF PRP (there is a tremendous amount of important and useful information from this programme in particular)
  ✓ Regularly updated calendar of events
  ✓ Regularly updated information about important issues such as the Tisza pollution spills, the Steering Group and Expert Working Group meetings (contact, mandate, tasks, annual reports, meeting minutes), the new UNDP/GEF Small Grants Program
  ✓ "Danube Watch" including its newly suggested "Readers Online Forum"
  ✓ Links to ICPDR members and observers (e.g. WWF, DEF)
• Via a new ICPDR information folder: This could be a concise coloured leaflet (e.g. A1 or A2 folded to A4 size; 40% photos and maps) which would briefly inform about the mandate, tasks and activities of the ICPDR and its various bodies, on the Danube Protection Convention and the overall environmental situation in the Danube River Basin.

This would be produced for the following target groups:

✓ For guests and correspondence between the ICPDR and national government focal points;
✓ At conferences, meetings, workshops where the ICPDR gives presentations;
✓ At public events organized or co-organized by the ICPDR.

The production of national versions may be appropriate but should rather become a (self-funded) task of the national government. Also, it could become part of the national public awareness raising campaigns run by DEF, in which case a degree of customazation would be needed (some local issues to be included).

• Via the Small Grants Programme: This would include

✓ a series of information workshops at the beginning of the SGP in each of the 11 eligible countries which would use half a day on raising the awareness of the national NGO community about the environmental pollution problems, Danube Convention, the ICPDR, DEF, the UNDP/GEF programme. It is assumed that over 300 NGOs would be addressed and directly informed through expert speeches, papers and other illustrative material that they would be able to use for their various activities.
✓ through the implementation of the SGP's local projects aimed at nutrient reduction activities. It is expected that these very concrete local activities would be communicated to the media and the local public, and at the end of the SGP to the international media to be invited to the SGP final event.

• Via an NGO campaign conducted by the Danube Environment Forum National Focal Points: As the DEF is the only region-wide network (apart from the ICPDR) which is committed to raising public awareness on the Danube environmental problems, it is the appropriate institution to run such a campaign. However, the DEF is still weak in its professional experience in the actual campaigning sector, i.e. how to develop and implement an international campaign. It is therefore suggested that a professional public awareness/communication expert should consult, train and support the DEF national focal points.

The campaign topics would focus on nutrient pollution and its monitoring/mitigation/reduction/prevention, with a mix of basin-wide aspects (e.g. transboundary river and pollution management, EU accession process and its implications) and national issues (e.g. on changing intensive agriculture, promoting constructed wetlands in rural areas, cleaning an important river stretch). Unlike the SGP, this campaign would have a more national character addressing the governmental efforts (water protection, bilateral and multilateral agreements, environmental education programmes etc.), the daily behaviour of consumers and model activities of the industry.

The campaigns are expected to run for two years, plus a six-month preparatory period and two months for wrapping up and evaluation. The public awareness/communication expert will cooperate with 3 local campaigners (e.g. two pollution experts, one PR/education person) working at the DEF national focal point. There should be a regional campaign meeting prior to the start of the campaign, involving two representatives from all DEF national focal points, to jointly prepare, harmonise and co-ordinate the overall campaign.
6 PROGRAMME COMPONENTS FOR THE GEF DANUBE REGIONAL PROJECT

6.1 Component Small Grants Programme (SGP)

- **Small Grants Programme** for implementation in two phases, $1,000,000 each:
  - Eligible: all environmental NGOs from 11 Danube Basin countries (CZ, SK, H, SLO, HR, B-H, YU, BG, RO, MD and UA)
  - Maximum grant per project: $20,000
  - Expected results: about 50 projects per call (theoretically appx. 4 per DRB country)
  - Administration by sub-contractor/implementing agency: 10 to 15% of the budget

Sub-Total SGP: $2,000,000

Suggested Timing for the SGP:

2001
- July: SGP preparation
- September: Pre-information meetings in 11 countries and call for submission
- November: Phase 1 submission, selection, awarding
- December: Contracting

2002
- January: Phase 1 projects start
- February: First quality assurance visits
- October: 2nd quality assurance meetings

2003
- June: Finalisation of Phase 1
- August: Evaluation of project results
- October: First regional SGP presentation event
- November: Phase 2 call for submission

2004
- January: Submission, selection, awarding
- February: Contracting
- March: Phase 2 projects start
- April: First quality assurance visits
- December: 2nd quality assurance meetings

2005
- September: Finalisation of Phase 1
- October: Evaluation of project results
- November: Finalisation of SGP
- December: 2nd regional presentation event

- **Recruitment of International/National Experts** for project evaluation and programme coordination preparation ($106,000):
  - Travel: 4 visits to 4 projects in 11 countries ($40,000):

Sub-Total: $146,000
• **National Pre-Information meeting**

Invitation (REC lists!) sent out to all NGOs known to work on water and environment issues, brief introduction into the meeting and request to think about potential projects.

**Day 1:** noon Arrival of participants
14:00 Introduction to Pollution problems of the DRB
   Information about the Danube Protection Convention, ICPDR, GEF program
   Response by the government (national activities)
   Response by the DEF (national focal point)
   Report about previous SGP (including presentation of 2 model projects)

**Day 2:** 9:00 The new SGP - objectives, structure/timing, criteria Discussion
   "SGP Stock-exchange": possibility to discuss project ideas and aspects
   both with other NGOs and with representatives from the ICPDR and
   SGP implementing agency
13:00 end and departure

**Sub-Total** (50 NGO representatives, 1 night, 2 meals and meeting facility): $55,000

• **“End of SGP” evaluation meeting**

Invitation to all NGOs who participated in the SRP and to cooperating Government agencies to evaluate the results of the SGP and to develop follow-up initiatives (programmes and financial support):

**Sub-Total** : 50 participants, 1 night, 2 meals and meeting facility: $44,000

**TOTAL Cost for 5 years** : $2,245,000

6.2 **Component DEF Structure Development**

**DEF institutional support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>secretary, office costs, web page</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers (3)</td>
<td>part-time office work (10 h/week), travel</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>room; accommodation, meals &amp; travel for 12 persons</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assembly</td>
<td>accommodation, meals and travel for 40 persons</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Focal Points</td>
<td>11 countries (not in D, A): fees and office; organiza-</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tion of annual national NGO meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per year</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL Cost for 5 years** : $500,000

6.3 **Component Public Awareness**

6.3.1 **Danube Watch magazine**

Cost of one edition, including preparation, editorial work, printing and mailing: $15,000

**Sub-Total for 5 years** : $300,000
6.3.2 ICPDR homepage with DEF/NGO page

To be developed and maintained by ICPDR

6.3.3 New ICPDR information Folder

Production of information folder (organisation, editorial work, folder design, selection of photos, adoption of maps, preparation for print etc.): $ 15,000

Printing of 3x10,000 copies (2001, 2003, 2005): $ 20,000

Sub-Total for 5 years: $ 35,000

6.3.4 DEF public awareness campaign

National and intern. public awareness/communication experts: $ 146,000

Travel: $ 40,000

1 regional co-ordination meeting: 2 DEF persons/country, 2 days $ 14,000

11 national campaigns: $ 280,000

Development and production of awareness raising materials $ 420,000

Sub-Total cost for 5 years: $ 900,000

TOTAL Cost for 5 years: $ 1,235,000

6.4 Overview of Programme Components

6.1. Component Small Grants Programme: $ 2,245,000

6.2. Component DEF Structure Development: $ 500,000

6.3. Component Public Awareness: $ 1,235,000
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1 INTRODUCTION

This Summary Report is an integral component for the preparation of the GEF/UNDP funded project entitled “Strengthening Implementation of Nutrient Reduction Measures and Transboundary Cooperation in the Danube River Basin”. The basic task of this preparatory work is to prepare a qualified material basis for the elaboration of a complete “Danube Regional Project” to be submitted to the GEF Council.

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the international water indicators, in line with emerging GEF policies - process, stress reduction and environmental status indicators, which will be used to track the short and long-term impacts of this project, prior and after the implementation of nutrient reduction action plan, within the Danube river basin.

The log frame of the project has been specifically designed in a way that lends itself to the straightforward identification of relevant process, stress reduction, and environmental status indicators.

The attributes identified as important in assessing the key indicators are:

(i) relevance
(ii) precisely defined and scientifically credible
(iii) easy to detect, record and interpret
(iv) sensitive to stress on the water pollution management, ecological or social systems or responsive to changes in time and/or space.

The evaluation of effectiveness of the project activities and outputs will depend on whether indicators have successfully been limited to the key areas of sustainability, how they have been defined, the amount of information they hold potentially, and only lastly, what survey and data collection methods are used.

Using indicators give a means of:

(i) measuring progress and identifying policy needs, as baselines to measure change from a certain date or state, or as targets to reflect tangible performance objectives
(ii) assessment of the gap between the current state and a reference state, and of effectiveness of measures which have been taken

The proposed indicators are divided in primary and actual indicators, given an estimation of whether they could be applied in the process of implementing of project activities.
2 PROCESS INDICATORS

In the context of the forthcoming Danube regional project (DRP) process indicators are quantitative measures against which aspects of policy reforms can be measured. The use of process indicators allows assessment of the significance of the procedures, activities or measures leading to the development of the legal and institutional frame for transboundary co-operation within the Danube river basin in implementing pollution control and nutrient reduction measures.

The main process indicators, which can be used to monitor the effects of legal and institutional reforms that are going to take place on the national and regional levels as a result of performing the proposed activities, include:

2.1 Implementation of international conventions

A range of national, bilateral, regional, and international agreements and conventions attempts to protect the Danube's aquatic ecosystem by establishing obligations for individual or joint effort compliance. The Danube River Protection Convention is the most significant legal frame for cooperation of the contracting parties to assure environmental protection of ground and surface waters in the Danube river basin. Out of 13 countries in the Danube river basin, eleven states and the European Commission have signed, and most of them have ratified the Danube River Protection Convention (DRPC) which came into force in October 1998.

The effective participation of actors involved in defining national priorities, in implementing regional and basin wide measures, and in ensuring adequate transboundary co-operation is considered as process indicators. In addition, this indicator can monitor the underlying processes leading to the DRPC implementation and evaluate the effectiveness of measures taken during the implementation process.

The proposed indicators can monitor the effectiveness of the efforts taken by the Danube countries to implement and to develop the necessary mechanisms for effective implementation of the Convention. The indicators can identify:

(i) what is changing (transboundary co-operation improved, institutional and legal reform in place, etc)
(ii) why is it changing (improve environmental quality status, etc)
(iii) why is it important (increase quality of life, etc)
(iv) what can be done about it (introduce good agricultural practices, create nutrient reduction mechanism, etc).

There are many ways of organising this type of indicators: according to the DRPC objectives, (sustainable water use, biodiversity conservation, benefit sharing, etc), by article of the DRPC (issue) or simply as a comparison over time (biological indicators are far more effective if they are measured against a baseline). The baseline can be set up having in mind the time of the DRPC's final ratification, before major interference by industrial or agricultural sector or as agreed by the countries, through a set of characteristics for the basin.

2.2 Implementation of bilateral or multilateral agreements

This indicator measures capacity of the Danube countries to implement the bilateral or multilateral agreements and assesses future requirements. Examination of the set of national reports, recommendations and actions, which will focus on measures taken for the implementation of those agreements, will indicate response indicators employed by countries in the preparation of these reports and suggest areas where capacity-building is required or strengthened.
2.3 Development and implementation of new policies, legislation and mechanism for compliance

There is a great body of laws, regulations and protocols on the national level. Environmental and water pollution control, fishing, shipping, and the protection of critical habitat are well regulated by most of the Danube countries. However, the complexity of these regulations, insufficient financing, fragmentation of institutional responsibilities, low national commitments, institutional weakness, conflict among parties, ambiguities in jurisdiction, and lack of enforcement capacity impede the implementation of their legal provisions. In addition, regionally, there are only very few structures which have the mandate, political authority, financial resources, or implementation capacity to enforce or carry out multiparty agreements.

The development of adequate national and regional legislation and the existence of compliance mechanism will facilitate measuring of project progress.

2.4 Use of compliance schedule as a policy tool in the new water legislation

At least until recently, governments across Danube transition countries had an implicit “take-it-easy” approach on enterprises, many of which were prohibited from borrowing and subject to other uneconomic restrictions. This has led to the authorities’ inability to impose penalties or set prices for environmental goods and services at economic levels to achieve acceptable emissions, and to enterprises’ indifference to operating with a valid permits. Instead, two approaches have been taken, investment co-financing and compliance schedules. There are several advantages linked to the use of compliance schedule which refer to the increased flexibility for polluters, provide opportunities for least cost solutions to compliance, reduced regulatory agency burden to implement and defining options for addressing past pollution damages.

As the transition countries are still favourable to the regulatory tradition, the indicators will measure:

(i) Creation of the institutional capacity to design programs of compliance
(ii) Introduction of a credible enforcement system
(iii) Existence of adequate tools for monitoring
(iv) Use of non-compliance fines
(v) Inspection resources available to detect violations

2.5 Introduction of legal and institutional reforms in transition countries

How far Danube countries have advanced in the preparation of legal and institutional environmental reforms closely parallels their economic and political development. However, in most transition countries in the Danube basin, the legislative and institutional reform process is not complete.

Since 1989, many changes have occurred in environmental legislation as a result of political and economic reforms and changes in ownership structures. Some countries changed nearly the whole set of environmental legislation immediately after 1989 as a result of the need to substantially change the approach towards environmental protection. The intention was to create a comprehensive, co-ordinated legal system that could allow application of cross-media regulations and new environmental protection instruments, such as EIA, compliance schedules and market-based economic incentives. The new policy instruments, both legal and financial, required developing and enacting a comprehensive environmental law. Broader implementation of financial instruments (realistic resource prices, pollution charges and fines, product charges, taxes on natural resources and tradable permits) require still more progress.
2.6 Improvement of institutional capabilities river basin committees

For the transition countries in the Danube River Basin, efficient and equitable allocation of waters, supply oriented physical actions which refer to water resources infrastructures and corresponding operating rules and sustainable financing options represent a challenging task for the policy makers and planners to foresee in time and adopt the social structures of water resources development, in the complex of rapidly transition context.

One of these structures are River Basin Committees which can co-ordinate the efforts of all those involved and represent all interests within a sub-basin which use the water resource and contribute to water pollution. This will lead to the improvement of the water quality and use, through increased decentralisation, democratisation and sustainable financing in the water sector. The purpose of River Basin Committees is to serve as a forum for co-ordinating the policies of integrated management of the basin water resources, avoiding the water users’ conflict of interests, establishing priorities in the achievement of the water pollution abatement investments, ensuring public participation in decision making, and encouraging new developments aimed at increasing the water use sustainability. The number of river basin committees, which will be created in the Danube countries and which are effectively working is a proposed measurable process indicator.

2.7 Establishment of inter-ministerial mechanisms for nutrient reduction

The inter-ministerial mechanism for pollution control and nutrient reduction shall be created at the national level by most of the Danube countries. Based on the existence of such national structures, the effects of implementing project activities can be quantitatively monitored.

2.8 Improve achievements of the ICPDR/ Expert Groups and Working Groups

With the view to strengthen regional cooperation, in response to the DRPC provisions, the Danube countries have established the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR). The ICPDR establishes the institutional frame for pollution control and the protection of water bodies and it sets also a common platform for sustainable use of ecological resources and integrated river basin management.

The Expert Groups established within ICPDR can take actions to identify and agree measures and propose strategies and approaches for implementation of pollution control and nutrient reduction, which will reduce emissions to the Danube River and Black Sea.

2.9 Adoption and implementation of EU legislation

Environment community policies are grounded on the concept of sustainable development, by integrating environment policies in the sector development policies of Member States.

To join the European Union (EU), the transition countries need to harmonise their legislative and institutional framework with EU requirements. Harmonisation is an effective way to improve the state of the environment in the Danube river basin. Further, the transition countries have not yet addressed harmonisation among themselves, limiting co-operation to bilateral agreements and conventions.
The Danube accession countries have committed into a process aiming the adoption of the environment *Acquis Communautaire*, as well as the creation of institutions required for its implementation and enforcement. The Program for the Adoption of the Environment *Acquis Communautaire* refers to the achievement of measures leading on short and medium term to the harmonization of national legislation with that existing in European Union, as well as the institutional development required to implement the environment legislation at the national level. The results of programs for harmonization of the environment legislation can be evaluated at the national level as one of the major impact of the project.

### 2.10 Adoption and implementation of National Environmental Action Plan

Danube countries have applied either strategic oriented (top-down) or action oriented (bottom-up) approaches when developing their environmental policy documents. The majority of countries started with the preparation of the strategic, long-term environmental policy papers and followed with action-oriented plans (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia). Other countries (Slovenia) prepared an action-oriented environmental program.

The Danube countries are engaged in a number of national or donors financed activities that are directly related to the developing of national environmental action plans that address the Danube issues. Each country will elaborate, update and implement a National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP) or a Strategic Action Plan (SAP), which will specifically address domestic problems and propose pollution control and nutrient reduction measures.

The relevant national policy documents (i.e. environmental strategy studies, action plans and programs), concentrate on the following issues: environmental policy development, implementation mechanisms, institutional strengthening, and improvement of legislative and regulatory framework, investment priorities and international co-operation.

NEAP/SAP represents a planning instrument which approaches the main environment concerns in line with those international conventions whereupon each individual country is part, as well as with the environment European Directives.

Currently NEAP is up-graded in line with the Program for the Adoption of the *Acquis*, turning this way into a basic element to meet the conditions required by the European Union integration.

### 2.11 Introduction of new principles and approaches

**Integrated water resources management**

A consensus has emerged that a more comprehensive approach to water resources management is needed -- one that is cross-sectoral, integrates ecological and development needs, and is based on holistic analyses of the carrying capacity of the water environment. In this approach, the river basin, groundwater system, coastal area, or large marine ecosystem typically serves as a management unit on which to base changes in the way that sectoral development activities are conducted and how priority environmental interventions are made. Such a comprehensive approach that integrates actions across sectors is new to most transition countries, difficult to implement, and even harder to achieve when actions must be co-ordinated among countries.

**Integration of environmental requirements into economic policies**

Current Danube countries policy promotes both environmental improvement and economic development. With the view that economic growth leads inevitably to increased environmental pollution, development of feasible methods for national economic policies that would more fully measure the environmental aspects of changes in productivity, assets, and welfare resulting from economic growth is one of the priority of the governments in Danube river basin.
This proposed indicator can measure the effects of:

(i) the linkages between voluntary international environmental standards (e.g. ISO 14000) and expansion of (or barriers to) international trade and effects on environmental quality
(ii) the effects of pollution control expenditures on national income and economic growth in each of the Danube countries
(iii) the relationship between environmental performance and profitability at the plant level including the impact of alternative approaches to achieving environmental compliance involving technology innovation and pollution prevention methods.

Polluter and beneficiary pays principle

In addition to drafting new and comprehensive environmental legal acts, the Danube countries are modernising their environmental regulations by eliminating gaps and improving the consistency of existing regulations. Framework environmental acts and their amendments include such principles as polluter pays, prevention and precautionary, beneficiary pays, etc. However, many of them remain just a declaration of intent and are not properly enforced.

In addition, EU environmental policy is an essential component of the Internal Market and takes into account the keeping of high environment standards by enforcing the broad accepted principles in the field and namely the material polluter liability, the prevention pollution at source and the assignment of liabilities of economic and social players involved at local, regional and national level. The beneficiary of water/environmental service must pay for the service.

The transition countries government's interest in this policy tool is motivated by the need:

(i) to encourage polluters to find low-cost or no-cost control measures to improve their environmental performance
(ii) to generate revenues for environmental fund
(iii) to send a clear signal that the country is following the international trend to place environmental policy on a polluter/beneficiary pay principle.

Innovative economic instruments (system of incentives and fines)

Direct environmental protection instruments include environmental standards, restrictions, compliance schedules, and permits. The countries mainly use monetary penalties to enforce environmental legislation. However, the concept of economic instruments (charges and fees) has not yet been fully implemented in the Danube transition countries. Environmental charges, fees and fines are generally more widely used than taxes. A few countries have adopted incentive financial instruments on a limited basis.

The proposed indicator is referring to the number of economic instruments introduced at the national level by the Danube countries.

Improvement of local communities/NGO participation, dissemination, communication and involvement in the decision making process

To ensure full participation and ownership of the programme by the Danube countries, in particular River Basin Management Plans and implementation of EU Water Framework Directive, ongoing consultations through open forum meetings with government representatives, district and local officials, and the public are strongly encouraged. In addition, direct dialogues and negotiations between private sector, non-governmental interests, and governmental representatives in the region will be an important aspect of the programme, to generate undertakings with tangible results. The number of NGO and the number of public hearings organised at the country level during permitting process may reflect a positive effect of the proposed project.
3 STRESS REDUCTION INDICATORS

In the context of the forthcoming Danube Regional Project, stress reduction means events, measures and actions which lead to actual reduction in pressure on the aquatic systems of the Danube river basin and on the Black Sea.

Bearing in mind what a regional Danube project can achieve, the most essential stress reduction issues and related stress reduction indicators can be outlined as follows:

3.1 Rehabilitation, upgrading and new construction of municipal WWTPS

Primary and actual stress reduction indicators:

- Aggregated “population equivalent” (pe) and anticipated annual reduction of N, P, BOD5 AND COD (t/year) of existing municipal WWTP, brought into appropriate operation by rehabilitation measures;
- Aggregated “population equivalent” (pe), and anticipated annual reduction of N, P, BOD5 AND COD (t/year) of existing WWTP, upgraded in terms of nutrient elimination technology;
- Aggregated “population equivalent” (pe), and anticipated annual reduction of N, P, BOD5 AND COD (t/year) of newly constructed WWTPS (split by mechanical, biological and advanced treatment technology).

In the case of adequate design and capacity the rehabilitation of existing WWTPS are usually the most cost effective measures with regard to nutrient reduction.

The implementation of advanced N+P elimination technology is in the majority of the middle and down stream DRB countries very critical, as the significantly higher operation cost lead usually to cost covering tariffs which are currently hardy to afford by the poorer segments of the population.

As the construction of new WWTPS has to take into account the criterion of affordability, a phased implementation with stepwise increasing treatment/effluent standards is usually the most appropriate strategy in the majority of the middle and down stream DRB countries.

The potential EU accession countries have (with certain transition periods) in any case to fulfill the requirements of the EU urban wastewater treatment directive.

According to the data provided by the draft “Five Year National Nutrient Reduction Action Plans” for the 13 DRB countries, the 156 proposed municipal WWTP projects have investment requirements of about EUR 3.4 billion and the following anticipated annual nutrient reduction:

- N: 31 500 (t/year)
- P: 7 400 (t/year)
- BOD5: 181 000 (t/year)
- COD: 351 000 (t/year).

3.2 Rehabilitation, upgrading and new construction of industrial WWTPS

Actual stress reduction indicators:

- Anticipated annual reduction of n, p, BOD5 cod (t/year) from rehabilitation and upgrading of existing WWTPS, and construction of new WWTPS.
According to the data provided by the draft “five year national nutrient reduction action plans” the 44 proposed industrial WWTP projects have investment requirements of about EUR 267 million and the following anticipated annual nutrient reduction:

- N: 3 400 (t/year)
- P: 3 700 (t/year)
- BOD5: 39 700 (t/year)
- COD: 78 700 (t/year).

The rehabilitation and construction of industrial WWTP are usually very cost-effective measures with regard to phosphorus and cod reduction; in addition they usually achieve significant reduction of particular toxic substances.

### 3.3 Rehabilitation, upgrading and new construction of point-source related agricultural WWTPS

Primary and actual stress reduction indicators:

- Number of different categories of animals (cattle, pigs, etc) connected to appropriate agricultural WWTPs;
- Anticipated annual reduction of N, P, BOD5, COD (t/year) from rehabilitation / upgrading of existing WWTP and new construction of WWTP.

According to the data provided by the draft “five year national nutrient reduction action plans” the 21 proposed point-source related agricultural projects have investment requirements of about EUR 113 million and the following anticipated annual nutrient reduction:

- N: 6 700 (t/year)
- P: 1 100 (t/year)
- BOD5: 9 500 (t/year)
- COD: 14 900 (t/year).

The rehabilitation and construction of point-source related agricultural WWTP are usually very cost effective point-source measures with regard to reduction of nitrogen.

### 3.4 Restoration or new creation of wetlands

Primary and actual stress reduction indicators:

- Area (ha) of restored or newly created wetlands;
- Anticipated annual reduction of N, P, BOD5, COD (t/year) from restoration of existing wetlands and creation of new wetlands;

According to the data provided by the draft “Five Year National Nutrient Reduction Action Plans” the 22 proposed wetland projects have investment requirements of about EUR 113 million and the following anticipated annual nutrient reduction:

- N: 6 700 (t/year)
- P: 1 100 (t/year)
- BOD5: 9 500 (t/year)
- COD: 15 000 (t/year).

The restoration and creation of wetlands are usually the most cost effective point-source measures with regard to reduction of nitrogen.
3.5  **Implementation of surface water related protected areas and adequate buffer zones between agricultural areas and surface water bodies**

Primary stress reduction indicators:
- Creation of surface water related protected areas (ha), (split by degree of protection);
- Creation of agricultural buffer zones along surface waters (length in km).

Actual stress reduction (measured in actual nutrient load reduction in surface waters) cannot be assessed in general terms.

3.6  **Implementation of agricultural management reforms aiming at appropriate, respectively reduced utilisation of agro-chemicals and manure**

Primary stress reduction indicators:
- Reduction of utilised chemical fertilisers (t/ha/year), (split by main crop categories);
- Reduction of utilised manure (t/ha/year), (split by main crop categories);
- Reduction of utilised pesticides (t/ha/year), (split by main crop categories).

Actual stress reduction (measured in actual nutrient load reduction in surface waters) cannot be assessed in general terms.

3.7  **Shut down of polluting production sites, respectively modernisation of outdated production technologies**

Primary and actual stress reduction indicators:
- Cases of shut down of polluting production sites (factories, mines, etc)
- Anticipated annual reduction of N, P, BOD₅ and COD (t/year).

Actual stress reduction (measured in actual nutrient load reduction in surface waters) cannot be assessed in general terms, but can be done on a case to case basis.

3.8  **Phase-out of phosphorus containing detergents**

Primary stress reduction indicators:
- Reduction of phosphorus components from utilisation of detergents / washing powders (kg /capita/year).

Actual stress reduction (measured in actual nutrient load reduction in surface waters) cannot be assessed in general terms. A rough assessment can be done on the basis of the number of population connected to centralised sewerage systems and municipal WWTPS with different effluent standards.

3.9  **Better enforcement of wastewater discharge permits in compliance with specified discharge parameters**

Primary stress reduction indicators:
- Number of discharge permits in compliance with appropriately specified discharge parameters.

Actual stress reduction (measured in actual nutrient load reduction in surface waters) cannot be assessed in general terms.
4 ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS INDICATORS

Environmental status indicators are information tools. They summarise data on complex and sometimes conflicting environmental issues to indicate the overall status and trends of Danube ecosystem. In the context of implementation of the proposed project activities, they can be used to assess national performance and to signal key issues to be addressed through policy interventions and other actions.

These indicators gauge the usefulness of nutrient reduction measures to human populations and aquatic ecosystem and assess the sustainability of use. Much of the utility value of water pollution control and nutrient reduction measures will be country-specific. However, indicators might track those elements of Danube ecosystem that - because they are traded on international markets or provide transboundary life-support services - are of regional or global importance. Two categories of environmental status indicators are proposed to measure the impacts of implementing nutrient reduction measures within the Danube river basin:

(i) indicators measuring ecosystem goods

(ii) indicators measuring ecosystem services.

4.1 Indicators measuring ecosystem goods

Human-caused changes in ecosystems generally result in a decrease of population sizes of many species, and an increase in populations of a few others. Both increases and decreases in comparison to the postulated baseline are significant and are sensitive measures for changes in the state of the biodiversity in a country, region or for a global comparison.

Ecosystem structure variables are most promising because they can offer a lot of information on the state of ecosystems over large areas. Identifying key-ecosystem structure variables that can indicate if the ecosystem is functioning correctly or not can capture many aspects of quality. For example, a measure of quality might be the total number of well-specified habitat types observed within a sample area.

Each country can chose its own, appropriate, bio-geographic or ecosystem-specific and standardised core set of quality variables. The core set can be gradually established by starting with a basic set of easily affordable measurable quality variables, providing a picture of the overall national or regional biodiversity state.

The indicators can measure the:

⇒ Water quality (water as an ecosystem good having economic value, to be used for water supply for various purposes)
⇒ Species risk
⇒ Percent of wild species with known medicinal uses
⇒ Biological diversity
⇒ Ecosystem communities
4.2 Indicators measuring ecosystem services

These include ecological processes that provide "life support" services to humans and environment, such as soil conservation and watershed protection. Also, this indicator provides an impression of the biodiversity losses or gains at the Danube ecosystem level as a result of industrial and agricultural activities and increased nutrient load.

- Percent of transboundary waters with increased water quality river class
- Percent of transboundary watershed area assessed as "low risk of environmental pollution"
- Self-regenerating and man-made area as percentage of total area with reference to wetlands restoration
- Annual land use change from self-regenerating area into agriculture
- Share of rivers dammed or channelled in order to reduce erosion and agricultural run-off as the percent of the whole river per country
- Amount of agricultural area lost in 10 years due to pollution and erosion as percentage of agricultural area brought into agriculture in the same period, per country

4.3 Standard Operational Procedure for Monitoring of Benthic Macroinvertebrates in the frame of Transnational Monitoring Network

The main purpose of the SOP for monitoring of the benthic macro invertebrates in the frame of the Trans National Monitoring Network was to find common methods for sampling, analysis, numerical evaluation and presentation for bio monitoring that can be applied over the entire Danube river basin. The SOP covers macro invertebrates only and is focused on the numerical evaluation for the system of saprobity by means of the Saprobic Index. This system is adopted for the internationally agreed sampling stations and does not apply necessarily to national monitoring networks. Other biological groups of aquatic ecosystem are exclude like algae, water plants, fish, birds and mammals as well as river related (semi) terrestrial systems of riparian vegetation and flood plains. However, it is recognised that these elements are an integral part of the river ecosystem. So the macro invertebrates sampling and biological assessment is a first step in the development of a more comprehensive ecological assessment of river quality.

The SOP covers sampling (choice of sampling site, period of sampling, frequency, sampling device), collections, preservation, transport, taxa identification, quality assurance and quality control, numerical evaluation and classification/presentation of results.

The most of Danubian countries are interesting in the revising of the set of bioindicators.

- In Germany, the activities on the Danube are co-ordinated by Bayerisches Landesamtfur Wasserwirtschaft (Water Research Institute for Bavaria). The List of the Water Organisms Taxa published in 1990 contains general information of the water organisms, the way of evaluation of abundance, calculation of saprobic index and other needed information. The list has 4246 records – organisms – from many selected aquatic organisms.

- In Austria, the revised list of benthic fauna has been recently published. Austria has a long experience with biological assessment of water quality that is compiled in the Fauna Aquatica Austriaca, a comprehensive species inventory of Austrian aquatic organisms with ecological notes. On a routine basis macro invertebrates, phyto-benthos and ciliates are sampled in rivers and the Saprobic Index is calculated. Results are classified and presented in yearbooks in geographical from with a colour coding or river reaches. Furthermore a far more detailed and complex evaluation is applied for specific purposes in which the aquatic ecosystem is thoroughly described for abiotic and biotic components.
• In Bulgaria, saprobity is determined by Pantle & Buck index for the Transnational Monitoring Network (TNMN) sites only. The German DIN norm is used to calculate the Saprobic Index. Also quality classes are defined for macro zoobenthos species diversity (Shannon), matching degree and dominating degree. In the national network a biotic index is in use which is adapted from the Irish Q-value. Every 5 kilometres of a river is assessed. The biological quality is divided into 10 classes. This method has been chosen for its cost-effectiveness and relative ease in required determination skills.

• In Czech Republic, there is a long tradition in using the saprobity system for routine monitoring of rivers, just like in Austria. Regular measurements are made from the sixties in the national monitoring network. Since 1975 a more detailed assessment is made. Besides routine monitoring some projects are executed. At the moment a biological monitoring prediction model for macro invertebrates (called ‘Perla’ (a stonefly species) is being developed following the RIVPACS approach. This model can make a prediction on the natural reference community at a certain site when some abiotic features are known. The prediction is based on a database with target communities, which is nearly completed. The actual sampled community at that site can then be compared to the predicted one. The difference is a measure for the extent of ecological stress. For the river Morava, a Danube tributary, a survey of population species diversity of fish and benthos is included.

• In Hungary a biotic index has been developed in the past, adjusted from the western European biotic indices. However this assessment is not supported by the government and hence not implemented into a routine monitoring practice for rivers. For TNMN the Saprobic Index is based on indicators outline by Gulyas (1998).

• Slovenian water authorities use the Saprobic Index method (Pantle & Buck, modified by Zelinka & Marvan) for bio monitoring. The index and classification is based on the examination of periphyton and macro invertebrates at the sampling site. (Sampling according to ISO 7828(E), 1985, ISO 8265(E), 1988). A basis for Slovenian biological evaluation of the water quality of running waters are the as complete as possible species identification of organisms composing the communities, their semi-quantitative determination (abundance scale 1-3-5) as well as the knowledge of their ecology. In some cases it may become appropriate to complement the Saprobic Index with a personal evaluation of specific conditions of the water and the riverbed.

4.4 Preliminary set of indicators for the Danube River Basin

4.4.1 Existing sets of indicators in the Danube River Basin

Within the framework of the International Commission for the Protection of Danube River (ICPDR) and the Monitoring, Laboratory and Information Management Expert Group (MLIM/EG), some years ago, an inventory was made amongst Danube countries on water quality classification methods. These methods were compared with the current practices in some EU-countries. Basic conclusion of that comparative analyses was that the applied surface water quality standards forming the basis of classification of water bodies in the different riparian countries are not compatible and as a consequence of the differences in principles and values, the regular classifications of the countries can not be compared directly and can not be used for basin-wide considerations.

Biological monitoring and assessment of water quality in Danube river basin has a fairly long tradition, especially with respect to system of saprobity. However, the monitoring and assessment by the system of saprobity can be done in several ways and allows some variation between countries, like the biological group that is considered, different saprobic index values and valences for one species, the method of sampling, counting of individuals and calculation of the Saprobic index.
Besides the saprobity system some other developments on bio monitoring are going on in Danube river basin. Biological assessment can consist of many aspects because of the complexity of the aquatic ecosystem and presence of several biotic components or groups that indicate different aspects. Therefore, from the point of view or living parts of the river ecosystem the following aspect can be distinguished:

- bacteriological assessment (Faecal coliformes or Escherichia coli, Salmonella, saprophytes);
- assessment of trophic status (i.e. chlorophyll-a concentration, phytoplankton species composition);
- ecotoxicological assessment by means of bioassays in the laboratory (acute and chronic test with crustaceans (Daphnia magna), algae (Scenedesmus quadricauda,) and fish, Microtox, Toxkits like Rototox, Thamnotox). But also accumulation laboratory experiments and field measurements and i.e. measurement of PCB in fish in river Morava;
- saprobiological assessment using phytobenthos (periphyton), macroinvertebrates (macrozoobenthon), phytoplankton.

### 4.4.2 Preliminary set of indicators for the Danube River Basin

Most Danube countries apply the Saprobic index for evaluation and presentation of water quality based on macroinvertebrates (macrozoobenthon) for the running watercourses. Various indices and class limit values are in use. The species indicator list varied also, due to country specific additions or modifications. The saprobity is often classified in 5 classes (x,o,b,a,p), but the water quality classification by means of the Saprobic index in 4 main classes, in some cases completed with 3 in-between classes giving a total of 7 classes.

Based on the available information and recommendations of projects for the Danube River Basin and in line with new proposed European Water Framework Directive, some communities of organisms have been compiled.

Running water courses are covered by the communities of benthic fauna - macrozoobenthos (macroinvertebrates, zoobenthos, zoobenthon), benthic flora – periphyton (phytobenthos) and macrovegetation (water macrophytes). This groups of water organisms are a good indicators of a long term changes in the river, as well as the indicators of pollution point sources. Their use for the assessment of biotic conditions is spreaded in most of Danube countries. Stagnant waters (e.g. large reservoirs, riparian lakes) should be monitor from the plankton (phytoplankton and zooplankton) and macrophytes point of view. This biological assessment system reveals a measure for the ecosystem stress due to organic substances and related oxygen consumption. The saprobity system uses species-specific indicator values, which indicates the tolerance for organic load. Measurements of water fauna and flora should be based on the qualitative (species diversity) and quantitative (abundance or relative (estimated) abundance) investigation.

The applied taxonomic level of identification is governed by the objectives of the biomonitoring. It is recommended to perform identification of taxa at species level whenever possible. However, for distinct groups determination literature and keys may not cover species level for all orders, families or genera.

For calculation of the Saprobic Index often an estimate of the abundance is sufficient. When this method is applied the exact number of individuals per species in the sample is not known and cannot be used for other purposes. It is advised to count in principle real numbers. Afterwards it is still possible to make a classification in abundance. Obtained data can be processed by the calculation of Saprobic Index and assessed by the agreed classification scheme.

The presentation of the ecological status as a result of monitoring biological quality elements is to be presented into 5 classes. The next table present a proposal for classification of Saprobic Index of natural rivers in Danube basin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ecological status</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saprobic Index</td>
<td>&lt;1.8</td>
<td>1.81-2.3</td>
<td>2.31-2.7</td>
<td>2.71-3.2</td>
<td>&gt;3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The preliminary set of indicators contains about 6,000 aquatic organisms corrected and modified according to the published sources of references. The organisms have been divided into five groups: zoobenthos (macroinvertebrates, macrozoobenthon), periphyton (phytobenthos), phytoplankton, zooplankton and water macrovegetation (water macrophytes).

Bioindicator study performed in Yugoslavia in the frame of UNEP/Habitat BTF and ICPDR on 23-28 August 1999 is a good contribution to the knowledge of benthic macroinvertebrates of the Yugoslavian stretch of the river Danube as well as the accumulation capacity of the benthic species, mainly mussels.

Primarily the results on bioaccumulation should be considered as excellent. Based on the outcome of concentration of the mercury, PAHs and PCBs in the mussels' samples it can be said that the results are in a good correlation with the concentration of the mentioned pollutants in sediment. Two mussel species have been analyzed from the accumulation of pollutant point of view. *Anodonta anatina* was more frequent organisms than *Sinanodonta woodiana*.

The analyses of the pollutants in the benthic organisms will be included into the program of the Joint Danube Survey. In addition, the next phase of the Trans National Monitoring Network of the Danube River Basin will include analyses of the organic and inorganic pollutants in the biota.

As for the species diversity the number of identified taxa at the individual sites ranged from 6 to 21 depending on the pollution and substrate condition as well. Mainly the snails and mussels have been found in the investigated stretch of the Danube.

Beside the species diversity, additional data are needed for presentation or/and classification of the biological status. For calculation of Saprobic Index an estimate of abundance is sufficient. When field estimates of certain species of groups have been made, they should be proportionally added to the species that are positively identified and counted.

Because of the differences in the biogeochemical characteristics of the Danube river itself and in the related sub-catchments of the tributaries along the Danube, it is important to monitor and characterise the specific biotic and abiotic compartments in the particular areas. Differences in the biodiversity of the aquatic life and in the chemical composition of the abiotic compartment sediment call for reliable information on the specific characteristics.

Effective water quality management requires appropriate monitoring programme to identify significant pollutants affecting the health of the aquatic life and limiting the intended water uses, particularly public water supplies. The appropriate monitoring programme should provide reliable, quality assured (checked and verified), validated data: (a) on the abundance of different aquatic organisms, biological population, on the biodiversity in the aquatic ecosystem; (b) on the type of the pollutants affecting, harming the aquatic life and intended water uses; and (c) on the concentrations of these pollutants in the different compartments, matrices in the aquatic environment. Implementation of the monitoring programme should provide these data in the selected matrix at all representative sampling sites/positions with appropriate sampling frequency allowing quality/pollution assessment, pollutant load calculation in space and time.

It is very important to distinguish the natural background and the anthropogenic input in the case of pollutants also occurring naturally, to establish baseline levels for man-made (synthetic) pollutants and to evaluate pollution trends in space and time. Establishment of historical trends, comparison of pollutant concentrations in samples collected at present and in the past, requires availability of appropriate samples (reference materials) on long-term basis.

There is a need to establish the biological sample bank for the Danube river basin, where the biological reference samples will be collected at representative sites of the selected areas of the river basin. The samples will be preserved and kept in the sample bank for the following purposes: (a) for later scientific (i.e., taxonomic) revision and comparative purposes, according to newly arising questions; (b) organs of selected organisms, (e.g., mussels, fishes) will be freeze-dried, grounded, homogenised for chemical analysis, to be used as biological reference materials; (c) education and training; and (d) quality assurance.
The collected samples will be appropriate for estimating long term environmental changes and will include types of samples representing:

- communities (the sample contains species assemblages) such as phytoplankton, zooplankton and periphyton,
- species (species are sorted, taxa are separated) such as benthon and fish.

The selection of referential sites will include:

- undisturbed (unpolluted) sites indicating high biodiversity and characterised by clear water indicator taxa, representing high quality, reference conditions for ecological status assessment, and
- sites representing special pollution situation.

The characteristics of the processed samples will be documented, archived in a computerised data bank, the processed, preserved sample and/or the selected individuals of different species will be put in the sample bank and stored there in such a way that the sample bank can serve the request of the participating laboratories for five years at least.

After sample collection and preparation, the biological specimen sample bank will be used for education, training purposes for biologists in the Danube river basin as capacity building.

It will be also particularly important to prepare specific organisms (species) unique in the Danube river basin in addition to the common species, with contribution from the biologists of individual Danube countries.
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Annex 9: Danube / Black Sea Basin Strategic Partnership

Addressing Transboundary Priorities in the Danube/Black Sea Basin:

A Strategic Partnership

Introduction:
The GEF, its Implementing Agencies, the European Community and others are working together to assist the 17 countries in the Danube/Black Sea basin in addressing their top priority transboundary waters issues. The GEF Secretariat, UNDP, the World Bank and UNEP, in consultation with other key donors, the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River, the Black Sea Commission and the Danube and Black Sea Secretariats/PIU, have prepared this strategy paper in order to:

• Describe the collaboration among the Implementing Agencies, funding partners and Danube/Black Sea basin countries in the first “GEF Strategic Partnership” to a geographic area in the International Waters focal area;
• Inform the GEF Council on the approach being taken by the GEF Implementing Agencies in the Danube/Black Sea basin;
• Provide a framework for interagency and inter-governmental cooperation and coordination in addressing transboundary issues in the Danube/Black Sea basin;
• Help to leverage and coordinate additional inputs to the region from other donors;
• Provide guidance and orientation for the development of the Danube and Black Sea GEF Regional Projects;
• Serve as a tool to assure coherence between donor activities and the policies and strategies of the respective Conventions;
• Provide guidance to assure coherence between donor activities and the objectives and work programs of the respective Secretariats;
• Establish a common agreement among the countries and Agencies for objectives and programmatic indicators that will be utilized to measure progress over the five year program.
• Support the efforts of EU accession countries in the Danube/Black Sea basin to comply with EU Water Directives (nitrate, phosphate) and the forthcoming Water Framework Directives.

This basin-wide, multi-stakeholder collaboration is needed to accelerate on-the-ground implementation of measures and to consolidate gains made in jointly reversing nutrient over-enrichment and toxics contamination of the Danube/Black Sea basin (see Annex 2) under the Global Programme of Action (GPA) for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities. The participating countries have the opportunity to shorten by one-half the time frame for significant environmental improvements that have taken 2-3 decades to accomplish for other transboundary waterbodies in Europe and North America. This draft was shared and discussed with the countries at the recent Black Sea basin-wide Stocktaking meeting as part of preparing their collaborative projects for consideration by the GEF Council in May, 2001.

Objectives and Programmatic Indicators:

Objective 1:

In support of the implementation of the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan and the "Common Platform for Development of National Policies and Actions for Pollution Reduction under the Danube River Protection Convention", and taking into account the mandate of the Sofia and Bucharest Conventions, Danube/Black Sea basin countries adopt and implement policy, institutional and regulatory changes to reduce point and non-point source nutrient discharges, restore nutrient ‘sinks’, and prevent and remediate toxics “hot spots”.

Indicators: By 2005, 100% of participating countries introduce one or more policy or regulatory measures (including phosphorus-free detergents) to reduce nutrient discharges in the agricultural, municipal, or industrial sectors, to restore nutrient sinks (wetlands, flood plains), and to prevent and remediate toxics “hot spots”, and 50% adopt multiple measures, towards goals of maintaining 1997 levels of nutrient inputs to the Black Sea, and substantially reducing toxics contamination in the basin.
Objective 2:
Countries gain experience in making investments in nutrient reduction and prevention and remediation of toxics “hot spots”.

Indicators: 100% of participating countries implement one or more investments in agricultural, municipal, land use or industrial sectors for nutrient discharge reduction, nutrient sink restoration, and prevention and remediation of hot spots of toxic substances, some with GEF assistance, by 2005 to accompany expected baseline investments.

Objective 3:
Capacity of the Danube and Black Sea Convention Secretariats is increased through permanent status, sustainable funding, and development of international waters process, stress reduction and environmental status indicators adopted through Convention processes.

Indicators: PCU/PIU functions evolve into Convention Secretariats (Danube already in place; Black Sea effective September 2000); payments of contributions by all contracting parties made for 2000 and pledged for the period beyond project duration; nutrient control, toxics reduction and ecosystem indicators assessing processes in place, stress reduction, and environmental status, are developed, harmonized and adopted for reporting to Secretariat databases by 2005.

Objective 4:
Country commitments to a cap on nutrient releases to the Black Sea at 1997 levels and agreed targets for toxics reduction for the interim, and possible future reductions or revisions using an adaptive management approach after 2004 are formalized into specific nutrients control and toxics discharge protocol(s) or Annex(es) to the respective Conventions or via other legally binding mechanisms.

Indicators: Countries adopt protocols or annexes to their two conventions and/or develop legally binding “Action Plans” regarding nutrients and toxics reduction commitments as part of their obligations under the Global Programme of Action for Protection of the Marine Environment for Land-Based Activities by 2005 towards agreed goal to restore the Sea to 1960’s environmental status. For the Danube, such a commitment will be contained in the revised Nutrient Reduction Plans (coherent with the ICPDR Joint Action Programme) and developed in accord with the application of the relevant EU Water Directives.

Objective 5:
Implementing Agencies, the European Union, other funding partners and countries formalize nutrient and toxics reduction commitments into IA, EU and partner regular programs with countries.

Indicators: Regular programs of IA’s and EC support country nutrient and toxics reduction commitments during 2000-2005 as part of expected baseline activities and incorporate them into CCF (UNDP), GPA Office Support (UNEP), CAS (WB), and EU (Accession support) by 2005.

Objective 6:
Pilot techniques for restoration of Danube/Black Sea basin nutrient sinks and reduction of non-point source nutrient discharges through integrated management of land and water resources and their ecosystems in river sub-basins by involving private sector, government, NGO’s and communities in restoration and prevention activities, and utilizing GEF Biodiversity and MSP projects to accelerate implementation of results.

Indicators: All countries in basin begin nutrient sink restoration and non-point source discharge reduction by 2005 through integrated river sub-basin management of land, water and ecosystems with support from IA’s, partners and GEF through small grants to communities, biodiversity projects for wetlands and flood plain conservation, enforcement by legal authorities and holistic approaches to water quality, quantity and biodiversity of aquatic ecosystems.
The Danube/Black Sea Basin: A Strategic Partnership

To accomplish the objectives summarized above aimed at addressing Danube/Black Sea basin pollution reduction, with particular attention to nutrients and toxic substances, in the most efficient and coordinated manner possible, the GEF and its Implementing Agencies are proposing a strategic programme of capital investments, economic instruments, development and enforcement of environmental law and policy, strengthening of public participation, and monitoring of trends and compliance. The programme would include both GEF and non-GEF (EC, EBRD, IA regular programs, etc.) elements.

Operationally, within the GEF International Waters and Biodiversity focal areas, the interagency Strategic Partnership proposed for the Danube/Black Sea basin includes eight principal elements:

Elements of the Strategic Partnership:

1. A GEF Black Sea Regional Project implemented in cooperation with the Black Sea Commission;

2. A GEF Danube River Basin Regional Project implemented in cooperation with the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR);

UNDP and UNEP propose to develop and jointly implement these two regional capacity building projects aimed at addressing transboundary environmental degradation in the Danube/Black Sea basin through policy and legal reform, public awareness raising, and institutional strengthening. Each project will be operated through or closely linked to the respective Black Sea and Danube Secretariats in Istanbul and Vienna. The two projects will each focus on the following areas within the Danube and Black Sea convention countries, with the GEF lead agency shown for each:

a) Actions to revise and/or create legally binding nutrients and toxics reduction protocols/action plans to the Black Sea Convention in accordance with the Global Programme of Action to Protect the Marine Environment from Land Based Activities (UNEP). For the Danube, strategies and measures for nutrient reduction will be reflected in the ICPDR Action Plan, which will be endorsed and thus become legally binding to the contracting Danube countries under the Danube River Protection Convention (UNDP).

b) Activities to develop and implement policies and legislation aimed at addressing sectoral causes of nutrient and toxics releases, such as phosphate detergent phase-out, agricultural reform, cleaner production in industry, etc. (UNDP);

c) Policy and legislative reforms aimed at promoting the protection and restoration of critical nutrient sinks, particularly wetlands and floodplains (UNDP);

d) Strengthening of the institutional capacities of the Black Sea and Danube Secretariats to build in long-term capacity to understand, address and monitor levels and impacts of transboundary nutrients and toxics (UNDP);

e) Public awareness raising in support of basin-wide nutrient and toxics reduction efforts (UNDP);

f) Harmonization of water regulatory standards (in line with EU regulations and new Convention protocols, where applicable) among the Danube/Black Sea basin countries to include similar nutrient and toxics reduction provisions (UNDP);

g) Development of Black Sea and Danube River basin Monitoring and Evaluation indicators harmonized among countries for process, stress reduction and environmental status indicators (UNDP);

h) Strengthening of the Information System to allow interactive information exchange and update and development of public area for specific topics of nutrient reduction (UNDP);

i) Support to further development of NGO activities at national and regional level (UNDP);
j) Establishment of Small Grants Fund to reinforce community based actions for nutrient reduction with particular attention to agricultural reform projects, wetland restoration and use of lagoons for nutrient reduction (UNDP);

k) Feasibility studies for a nutrients emission trading system at the national and regional levels. The Black Sea project will coordinate an overall study for the Black Sea basin as a whole while the ICPDR/KfW will carry out a study specific to the Danube River Basin towards the possibility of developing economic instruments for nutrient management in the Danube River Basin (UNDP).

3. The World Bank-GEF Partnership Investment Facility for Nutrient Reduction

The Partnership will finance incremental costs associated with the reduction of nutrient loads and discharges into the Danube River, its tributaries, the Black Sea and other rivers which feed it. Three types of projects (or combination thereof) would be eligible for financing under the Partnership:

a) Wetland restoration or creation, that reduce nutrients discharge or loads;

b) Reform and improvement of agriculture and land management practices with impact on nutrient use and/or diffuse discharges through run-off;

c) Wastewater treatment in small communities (normally with a population less than 100,000) and small industries or large ones if opportunity exists.

The Partnership would finance specific components of World Bank or bilateral financed projects. Baseline costs would be covered by a combination of national financing, a World Bank --- or other IFI ---loan and grant funds from other sources. The GEF financed component would leverage additional funds (including national funds) in at least a 1:2 ratio against the amount of the GEF grant. Self-standing GEF-financed projects without a corresponding World Bank loan or bilateral financing could be also considered, in exceptional cases, if important policy reforms would be accomplished by the GEF grant or where national funding, in cash and in-kind, is at least as large as GEF funding (i.e. 1:1 ratio).

Eligible projects must have: (i) the endorsement of the country’s GEF focal point; (ii) be included in the country’s Black Sea or Danube National Environmental Program and selected as a priority investment; (iii) form part of the Regional Environmental Program, as approved by the respective Commission; and (iv) the proposing country be up to date on contributions to the Black Sea and/or Danube Secretariat(s). This would include an explicit recognition from the countries that the transboundary control of nutrients is a priority issue in their NEAP/NAPs.

As in the case of all GEF financed projects, eligible projects will be prepared, appraised and implemented under the same terms as a regular World Bank project and subject to the standard World Bank review process before being submitted to the GEF Secretariat. Therefore, institutional requirements, sustainability, financial, economic, social and environmental conditionality normally required in World Bank projects would also apply to Partnership projects.

Whenever a project has additional global benefits, such as biodiversity preservation (i.e. through the recovery of a Ramsar site), the existence of such additional benefits would be a positive factor, but not constitute an eligibility criteria, even though it could lead to additional incremental GEF resources. In any case, nutrient removal is the essential eligibility condition for all projects.

The World Bank is preparing the Partnership Investment Facility for Nutrient Reduction proposal for consideration at the May, 2001 meeting of the GEF Council. A figure of approximately $60 million would be reserved for nutrient reduction investments under the Strategic Partnership as described above. Additional contributions will be solicited from bilateral donors. If approved, the World Bank could then vet projects directly through the GEF Secretariat without having to bring each separate project to Council. Two concepts, Bulgaria Wetland Restoration and Romanian Agricultural Reform, have already been approved as likely components of the investment programme. The GEF Secretariat would review and approve projects based on the criteria summarized above.
The World Bank will also promote the Investment Partnership, the investments it supports and the Strategic Partnership in its country dialogues, include the Black Sea and Danube perspectives in relevant World Bank Country Assistance Strategies (CASs) as they are updated, and promote policies that address nutrient reduction as part of country dialogues. These activities will be closely coordinated with related and supporting activities planned under the Black Sea and Danube Regional Projects.

4. **The GEF Dnieper Basin Environment Programme (DBEP):**

The Dnieper River transports some 20,000 tons of nitrogen annually to the Black Sea, further exacerbating the Black Sea’s eutrophication problem. A GEF project to assist the riparian countries of the Dnieper River (Russia, Belarus and Ukraine) in the development and implementation of a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and a Strategic Action Programme for the Dnieper River basin was approved by GEF in March, 1998 and commenced full implementation in September, 2000. Inter alia, the project will assist the Dnieper basin countries in identifying, prioritizing and addressing both point and non-point sources of nutrient and toxics pollution to the Dnieper and the downstream Black Sea, through legal, policy and institutional reforms and priority investments. The GEF Dnieper project is designed to enable full coordination of project activities with the Danube/Black Sea basin Strategic Partnership.

5. **Georgia: World Bank GEF Agricultural Development Project II**

The overall development objective of the project is to increase agricultural production sustainably, while reducing pollution of natural resources. The project includes reforms targeting prevention of nutrient releases. It represents the first phase of a ten-year Program, to be implemented in three phases, for the reform of on-farm agricultural and environmental practices. Under phase one, GEF would support the costs of implementing measures aimed at improving on-farm environmental practices, such as storage and management of manure water quality monitoring, which over the long term would reduce nutrients from entering the Black Sea.

6. **GEF Biodiversity and Medium-Sized Projects in the Danube/Black Sea basin**

GEF Biodiversity and Medium Sized Projects in the Danube/Black Sea basin to address nutrients and toxics hot spots and nutrient sinks, test different approaches and catalytically accelerate on-the-ground results. These include:

**Biodiversity Projects:**

- Integrated Coastal Management Project, Georgia (World Bank; WP entry 7/98)
- Danube Delta Biodiversity, Romania (World Bank; WP entry 4/92)
- Biodiversity Conservation in the Azov-Black Sea Ecological Corridor, Ukraine (World Bank; WP entry 1/98)
- Danube Delta Biodiversity, Ukraine (World Bank; WP entry 4/92)
- Integrated Biodiversity Conservation and Wetland Management for the Mid-Pripyat River and Floodplains (UNDP, PDF-A)
- Integrated Management of the Carpathian River Basins (GEF project concept, OP12)
Medium-Sized Projects:

Transfer of Environmentally Sound Technology (TEST) to Reduce Transboundary Pollution in the Danube River Basin (UNDP; MSP concept approved by GEF December, 1999; brief approved by GEF August, 2000; implementation commenced February, 2001; UNIDO as Executing Agency)

Building Environmental Citizenship to Support Transboundary Pollution Reduction in the Danube: A Pilot Project in Hungary and Slovenia (UNDP; MSP approved November, 1998; implementation commenced April, 2000; Regional Environment Centre as Executing Agency)

7. Nutrient control and reduction Projects executed by European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) under the new GEF ‘Expanded Opportunities for Executing Agencies’:

EBRD’s main focus is to identify bankable investment projects together with supporting activities to facilitate these investments. EBRD contributes to pollution reduction in the Danube and Black Sea Basin by financing projects particularly in the municipal and industrial sectors, and by applying environmental appraisal procedures and international environmental standards to all of the Bank’s operations in the region.

Danube Pollution Reduction Programme: Financing of Pollution Reduction Projects by Local Financial Intermediaries (IA: UNDP):

The main objective of the project is to facilitate principally small and medium sized private sector investment projects in the industrial and agricultural sector. The project would identify mechanisms, using the Bank’s local financial intermediaries within the relevant countries to provide to the private sector financial resources, including loans and GEF grants for eligible components for the reduction of pollutants that are responsible for the degradation of the aquatic environment in the Danube River Basin and the Black Sea. Considering the pilot character of the investments, the proposed project will initially concentrate on Slovenia.

8. Accelerated implementation of environmental management programs for mining related “hot spots” identified by the Danube SAP and TDA.

This activity would support accelerated actions to address "hot spots" in the Danube River Basin and other basins associated with mining operations and tailing ponds. This would allow for targeted investments, consistent with ICPDR proposed actions for prevention and control of accidental pollution, to improve emergency warning systems, develop preventive management programs and undertake selected priority investment actions. The activity would complement ongoing UNEP and EU activities to support the development and implementation of medium and long-term preventive measures for management of operating, decommissioned and abandoned tailing dams at priority “hot spots” in the Danube River Basin. This would provide a mechanism to enhance joint efforts in the Tisza River basin and other areas where similar "hot spots" exist and there is a significant need for improved preventive management programs.
Non-GEF Activities which support the Strategic Partnership:

**European Union**

The European Union is a major political and financial actor in the Central and Eastern European and NIS area mainly through its enlargement and NIS relations’ policies.

The enlargement of the EU to the ten candidate countries of Central and Eastern Europe will involve:

- The adoption and implementation by these countries of the EU environmental legislation and standards as a prerequisite for their entry into the Union
- The financial assistance by the EU to these countries toward the development of the infrastructures necessary for the implementation of the EU legislation

The financial assistance will involve primarily the pre-accession financial instruments PHARE and ISPA.

In March 1998 the Commission, the World Bank and the EBRD signed a Memorandum of Understanding on pre-accession financing. This was updated in March 2000 to take account of the new pre-accession financial instruments (ISPA and SAPARD) and to extend co-operation to cover the NIS countries.

The Memorandum includes commitments to:

- Co-ordinate project implementation;
- Implement co-financing projects jointly which foster the adoption of the EU legislation;
- Identify future co-financing opportunities which could foster accession;
- Be as flexible as possible with the delivery of the grants.

The PHARE-funded Large Scale Infrastructure Facility (€ 250 million for 1998-99) was developed to co-finance accession-related projects in transport and environment with the international financing institutions (IFIs). Realising that environmental projects would take much longer to put together than transport ones, DG Environment of the European Commission co-operated with the World Bank to develop a pipeline of viable projects to enable environment to take a reasonable share of the new Facility, screening all projects for accession relevance. The result was a substantial list of environmental co-financing projects for 1998 and 1999 (50% of the total Facility).

The ISPA instrument has some €500 million a year to spend on environmental infrastructure investment over the period 2000-06. The minimum size of projects is normally € 5 million, and there is money for project preparation. Although the ISPA Regulation does not formally require co-financing with the IFIs, this is greatly encouraged. ISPA needs a project pipeline, while the grants could make it easier for the IFIs to lend to the accession countries.

DG ENV is developing a Priority Environmental Investment Programme for Accession (PEPA), which aims to develop investment strategies, priorities and a project pipeline for all Community sources of finance and potentially non-Community such as the World Bank. World Bank officials have participated actively at a number of meetings to promote this project.

The EU has concluded Partnership and Cooperation Agreements with each one of the Newly Independent States. In this context it is providing financial assistance through the use of the TACIS programme. The new TACIS Regulation foresees greater assistance on environmental pre-investment activities.

To date Phare and Tacis have contributed about € 18 million to the Black Sea Environment Programme and about € 8 million to the Danube Environment Programme. The latest € 4.6 million Tacis programme to the BSEP is ending in 2000. It gave support to the Black Sea Implementation Unit and to BSEP Activity Centers in Georgia, Russia and Ukraine.
Under the new Tacis Regional Programme 2000 currently under preparation the European Commission is planning on a € 12 million Black Sea Investment Support Programme for 2001-2003. The overall objectives of this programme will be:

**Investment support**

Co-financing with IFIs of pilot investments yielding significant environmental benefits. These might include the following in particular:

- Waste water treatment (including nutrient removal)
- End of pipe industrial discharge treatment (including upstream industrial facilities and oil terminals)
- Grants to new industrial facilities designed to minimise polluting discharges
- Landfills to replace marine waste dumping
- Prevention/remediation of oil spills from shipping
- Construction of harbour facilities

The investments should be available for all riverine countries and would include up-stream as well as coastal sites. Tacis should provide both technical assistance, including project preparation, and investment grants in the form of interest subsidies or otherwise.

**Institutional support**

Continuation of the work of the Black Sea Commission is of crucial importance for concerted action of the riparian countries to tackle the problems of the Black Sea.

Support may also be included to the three Activity Centres in order to fulfill the regional coordinating role for which they have also been designated. These are:

- Batumi, Georgia: biodiversity monitoring and development of strategy;
- Odessa, Ukraine: water quality monitoring and development of strategy;
- Krasnodar, Russia: coastal zone management.

EU is also anticipating a project on Nutrient Management in the Danube River Basin and its impact on the Black Sea (total cost 3.5 million €) as part of its 5th Framework Programme.

It will be important to seek the close cooperation of the EU programmes in the Danube and Black Sea areas with those of the GEF, the World Bank, the EBRD etc. so that synergies can be found in the execution of these programmes.

**European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)**

EBRD has carried out pre-investment regional and sector studies in the Danube River Basin and technical co-operation projects in Hungary and Romania. The Bank’s main focus is to identify and to promote investment projects together with supporting activities to facilitate these investments. The Bank attaches particular importance to promoting environmentally orientated operations in line with its mandate, both through ”stand-alone” operations with primarily environmental objectives, such as upgrading of waste water management and solid and hazardous waste management, and also by financing environmental improvements in the industrial often as part of a larger-scale restructuring and modernization investment.
EBRD municipal environmental infrastructure projects under implementation:

Municipal Utilities Development Programme (MUDP) I and II, Romania:
Water and wastewater sector loans to two programmes covering 6 and 10 cities, respectively. As well as improving the water quality of the Danube River and the Black Sea, the municipal infrastructure investments will also bring the water companies in line with EU environmental standards.

Maribor water and waste-water BOT project, Slovenia:
Loan to finance construction of a wastewater treatment plant in Maribor, Slovenia’s second largest city. The project will have a major positive impact on the water quality of the Drava River.

Budapest Waste Water Services, Hungary:
The Bank has invested in the partly privatised Budapest Municipal Sewerage Company (BMSC). BMSC has subsequently developed an environmental action plan which will bring the facilities into compliance over time with both Hungarian and EU environmental standards.

Zaporozhia-Water Utility Development & Investment Programme, Ukraine:
The project is financing investments in the water supply and waste-water sector and enhancing the financial and operational performance of Vodokanal, the municipally owned water and waste-water company of Zaporizhia. The project will reduce discharges of untreated waste water into the Dnieper river and, ultimately, the Black Sea.

Brno-Modrice Waste-Water Treatment Plant, Czech Republic:
Loan to the water utility of the city of Brno to finance the extension and upgrading of the Brno-Modice waste-water treatment plant and part of the city’s sewerage network, contributing to the further reduction of the pollution of the River Svratka.

Zagreb landfill rehabilitation, Croatia:
EBRD has funded the rehabilitation of one of the largest uncontrolled landfills in Europe to bring the landfill in line with EU environmental standards. The project includes a leachate collection and treatment facility to prevent discharge into the Sava River, a tributary to the Danube.

EBRD municipal environmental infrastructure projects under preparation:
- Sofia Water, Bulgaria
- Zagreb Waste-water treatment plant, Croatia
- Municipal Environment Loan Facility, Romania
- Sevastopol Water, Ukraine
- Municipal Utilities Development Programme, Ukraine

EBRD industrial projects under implementation:

Slovalco Aluminium Smelter, Slovak Republic:
EBRD made a loan and took equity to enable the company to complete the construction and operation of a new smelter and to shut down inefficient and polluting aluminium smelters and plants. Slovalco is now in full compliance with EBRD’s environmental covenants and is a “zero emission plant”, with all process waters being recycled and no wastewater discharges being discharged from the site.

Ambro/Sical, Romania:
An EBRD loan to Ambro to modernise its pulp and paper production facilities is also resulting in improvements in environmental conditions at the plant, including improvements in the treatment of black liquor, waste-water and sludge.
Further examples of EBRD-supported industrial projects under implementation in the water and wastewater management sector in the Danube catchment area are:

- Egis (pharmaceutical industry), Hungary
- Borchodchem (chemical industry), Hungary
- TVK (chemical industry), Hungary
- Petrom (petro-chemical industry), Romania
- Somatra zink smelter, Copca Mica, Romania
- ALRO aluminium smelter, Slotina, Romania
- Phoenix copper smelter, Baia Mare, Romania
- Policlor (print and ink factory), Bukarest, Romania, and Ruse, Bulgaria
- PIRDOP copper smelter, Bulgaria
- Sodi (Solvay-processing), Bulgaria
- Celhart (pulp and paper), Bulgaria.

The Bank has also undertaken environmental investments in the agribusiness sector focusing, typically, on the control of waste-water discharges, the improvement of waste-water treatment and the protection of groundwater.

**UNDP Country Cooperation Frameworks/Regional Cooperation Frameworks**

UNDP is supporting the Strategic Partnership through interventions under both its Environment and Governance focus areas. Under Environment, during the pilot phase Danube and Black Sea projects UNDP provided over $2 million in support to Danube/Black Sea basin issues through projects such as:

- Ukraine: Improving Environmental Monitoring Capacity ($1.099 million; 1995-1999)
- Ukraine: Environmental Impact Assessment Demonstration ($138,000; 1997-2000)
- Russia: Water Quality Evaluation and Prediction in Areas Affected by the Chernobyl Accident ($278,000; 1997-2000).
- Georgia: Capacity Building for the Ministry of Environment ($620,000; 1998-2000).

The Danube/Black Sea Basin Strategic Partnership has a strong focus on facilitating legal, policy and institutional reform in support of transboundary pollution reduction. These new laws, policies and institutions can only be effective if they have the appropriate level of trust, legitimacy and credibility in civil society. In addition, as has been the case in the West, environmental protection is being propelled more and more by public demand. UNDP is supporting the empowerment of individuals and NGOs with skills and information to increase their involvement in the environmental policymaking and enforcement processes. During the Danube and Black Sea pilot phase programs, UNDP provided assistance totaling nearly $6 million to the Black Sea basin countries in support of governance, democracy and public participation. Sample projects included:

- Regional Umbrella Program to Support Democracy, Governance and Participation in Europe and the CIS ($2.153 million, 1997-1999)
- Georgia: Capacity Building for the Ministry of the Environment ($0.620 million, 1998-2000).
- Regional Programme on the Environment and Development ($1.8 million, 1997-1999). National Agenda 21’s, policy reforms, institutional strengthening, public participation and networking, strengthening of inter-sectoral cooperation.
In addition, through the GEF Small Grants Programme in Turkey, UNDP supported a survey of monk seals and their habitats along the Black Sea coast, a coastal management programme in the Black Sea province of Trabzon, and a small scale Waste Water and Sanitation Project in the town of Hacimahmutlu.

Through its ongoing support to Environment and Governance in the Central European and CIS countries, UNDP will continue to provide the framework for successful implementation of the key reforms envisioned under the Strategic Partnership. During the five year period of the programme, UNDP will support, inter alia, the following projects which support the goals of the Strategic Partnership:

- Implementing Local Agenda 21’s in Turkey: Phase II (includes 3 Black Sea provinces of Trabzon, Samsun and Zonguldak); ~$100,000.
- Turkey: National Programme for Environmental Management and Sustainable Development (includes efforts to combat desertification); $100,000.
- Management Planning for Conservation of Fen Mire Biodiversity in Belarus (Dnieper River Basin), $143,000.
- Ukraine: Promoting and Strengthening Horizontal Cooperation (supports Ukraine’s process of triple transition to statehood, democracy and a market-oriented economy by acquainting Ukrainian government officials and policymakers with relevant reform experiences in other countries of the region, Asia and Latin America); $65,000.
- Support to Economic, Social and Administrative Reforms in Ukraine (aimed at facilitating the implementation of the government’s economic, social and administrative reform programme by providing timely and effective expertise to develop and implement policy reform initiatives); $704,000.
- Czech Republic, Slovakia and Slovenia: National Capacity Building for Sustainable Development (institutional strengthening, integration of SD principles into selected sectoral policies and programmes, enhancing SD awareness); $300,000.

In addition, the GEF SGP will increase its links with the Black Sea Environment Programme through projects in the Biodiversity and International Waters focal areas. 7 of 33 recently submitted project concepts have direct relevance to Black Sea environmental issues, including protection of the Mersin Fish (*Huso*), a threatened species; raising public awareness to prevent Black Sea pollution; and a small size waste water treatment project in Samsun.

Other Programs:

- World Wildlife Fund: Lower Danube Green Corridor
- Preparation of an Annex to the Danube River Protection Convention for the protection of ecosystems and nature conservation

Future Considerations Under the Strategic Partnership.

Two activities not addressed in this Strategic Partnership will be considered in more detail at a later date and initiated under the Black Sea Regional Project. The first is the Black Sea-Bosphorus Straits-Mediterranean Sea Marine Electronic Highway (MEH) Feasibility Study, and the second an International Waters Fisheries Component. Regarding the MEH, the Black Sea GEF project identified shipping as a transboundary issue and mechanisms needed to support environmental management, and the Secretariat is in a position to set environmental management shipping guidelines, but this effort lends itself to a private sector initiative. A Black Sea transboundary fisheries component will also be considered and integrated into the Strategic Partnership, once selected preparatory activities have been completed by the Black Sea Regional Project.
Annex 1

Transboundary Issues in the Danube/Black Sea Basin

It is widely agreed that regional scale eutrophication driven by excess nutrient inputs, primarily from riverine sources, is the major transboundary issue impacting the Danube/Black Sea basin. As a result of the pollution source inventory conducted during the preparatory work for the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan, it has been possible to gather data on the inputs of dissolved nitrogen and phosphorus compounds to the Black Sea (as of 1995). To the best of our knowledge, some 14% of total nitrogen are from Bulgaria, 27% from Romania, 12% from Ukraine, 10% from the Russian Federation, less than 1% from Georgia, 6% from Turkey and about 30% from the non-coastal countries (Austria, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Former Yugoslavia, Germany, Hungary, Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia). In the case of phosphorus, the figures are Bulgaria, 5%; Romania, 23%; Ukraine, 20%; Russia, 13%; Georgia 1%; Turkey 12% and 26%, for the remaining countries, a similar story to that of nitrogen.

According to the GEF Operational Strategy (p.48-49), the GEF strategy is to meet the agreed incremental costs of:

Implementing measures that address the priority transboundary environmental concerns.

Control of land-based sources of surface and groundwater pollution that degrade the quality of international waters….High priority is also placed on abatement of common contaminants such as nutrients,…

The Black Sea Strategic Action Plan states (p.10):

29. A Black Sea Basin Wide Strategy, negotiated with all states located in the Black Sea basin, should be developed to address the eutrophication problem in the Black Sea. The objective of the Strategy should be to negotiate a progressive series of stepwise reductions of nutrient loads, until agreed Black Sea water quality objectives are met. Such a Basin Wide Strategy may also be required to ensure the reduction of inputs of other pollutants into the Black Sea, in particular oil.

30. Given that the Danube is the largest single source of nutrient inputs into the Black Sea, it is imperative that strategies for the reduction of nutrients be adopted for this river.

The Common Platform for the Development of National Policies and Actions under the Danube River Protection Convention (DRPC) (chapter 3.2.4) states:

The eutrophication by nutrients from land-based sources of pollution is one of the most serious environmental problems of the Black Sea, one of the key explanations for its environmental decline and the principal cause for the degradation of the Black Sea environment. The main causes of negative regional effects on the Black Sea ecosystems include:

- Pollution by untreated municipal and industrial wastes,
- Pollution from agricultural activities,
- Reduction of wetlands and forested areas.

In the framework of the DRPC implementation the following goals and objectives have to be achieved:

Strategic Goals:

- to improve aquatic ecosystems and biodiversity
- to maintain and improve water resources quality and quantity (sustainable use)
- to prevent, reduce and control water pollution from point and diffuse sources, in particular where hazardous substances and nutrients are involved;
- to prevent and control transboundary impact and contribute to the Protection of the Black Sea from land-based pollution sources

---

Specific objectives for the main sectors:

- to ensure biological and advanced waste water treatment in the municipal and industrial sector
- to promote the use of BAT and the adoption of BEP in all industries, particularly those involving hazardous substances
- to promote the adoption of BEP and sustainable land use in agriculture

As a result of the severe economic downturn in the region following the political upheavals of the early 1990’s, the near collapse of the industrial and agricultural sectors in the Danube/Black Sea basin countries has resulted in some modest short-term reductions in nitrogen and phosphorus inputs to the Black Sea from the Danube and probably other rivers. In recognition of this “window of opportunity” to catalyze improvements in the status of the Black Sea ecosystem, the Joint Danube-Black Sea Technical Working Group identified the following goal for the next seven years:

The long-term goal is for all Black Sea basin countries to take measures to reduce nutrient levels and other hazardous substances to such levels necessary to permit Black Sea ecosystems to recover to similar conditions as those observed in the 1960s.

As an intermediate goal, urgent control measures should be taken by all countries in the Black Sea basin, in order to avoid that discharges of nitrogen and phosphorus to the Black Sea exceed those levels observed in 1997. This will require countries to adopt and declare strategies that permit economic development whilst ensuring appropriate practices and measures to limit nutrient discharge, and to rehabilitate ecosystems which assimilate nitrogen and phosphorus. This target, monitored and reported annually, shall be reviewed in 2007 with a view to considering further measures that may be required for meeting the long-term objective.

The strategy put forth below integrates the technical, policy, legal, institutional and investment frameworks summarized in the preceding sections.

Addressing Danube/Black Sea Basin-wide Eutrophication through Reduction and Sequestering of Nutrient Releases:

The Joint Danube-Black Sea Technical Working Group identified four key measures which could be taken to reduce nutrient discharges to the Danube/Black Sea basin. These include:

1. Reform of agricultural policies to reduce non-point source run-off of fertilizers and manure (buffer zones, manure storage clamps, erosion control, organic agriculture, etc.);
2. Improved municipal and industrial wastewater treatment to capture nutrients, particularly using alternative technologies with low capital and O&M costs (e.g. constructed wetlands, advanced integrated ponding systems, etc.);
3. Rehabilitation of key basin ecosystems (e.g. wetland restoration) to enhance their capacities as nutrient ‘sinks’;
4. Changes in consumer practices (including use of phosphate free detergents), including legislation (where needed), enforcement and public awareness.
Preserving the Danube/Black Sea basin Environment: A brief history

The Black Sea was formed only seven or eight thousand years ago when changing sea level sent Mediterranean water through the Bosphorus valley into what was until then a large freshwater lake. Human populations emerged and flourished in the basin, with little apparent negative impacts on the Sea or the rivers that feed it. Though not very biologically diverse compared with open seas at similar latitudes, the Black Sea developed remarkable and unique ecosystems, particularly in its expansive northwestern shelf where the sea is relatively shallow. Today, the Danube/Black Sea basin encompasses 17 countries and supports a population of over 160 million people over an area of about ...square kilometers. Over the last 30-40 years, as a result of rapid and largely unsustainable development, industrialization and the ‘green revolution’, the Black Sea and many of the rivers that feed it have become severely degraded, with effects including:

- Loss of species diversity;
- Severe eutrophication over large areas (particularly in the NW shelf) due to excess inputs of nutrients;
- Declining water quality due to persistent inputs and levels of hydrocarbons and other chemicals from both marine and land-based sources;
- Landscape degradation due to unplanned coastal and watershed development;
- Introduction of exotic species (at least 26 in the Black Sea) with major impacts on the ecosystem and on commercial fisheries;
- Overfishing which together with the environmental factors led to a decrease in the diversity of Black Sea commercial species from 26 species to 6 in less than two decades;
- Increased frequency of outbreaks of waterborne diseases such as cholera and frequent beach closures due to poor coastal water quality.

Donor and National Activity:

Recognizing the declining status of the Danube/Black Sea basin environment, in recent years both the governments of the region and the international community have taken steps to remediate the degradation of the Danube/Black Sea basin and to prevent future impacts through a variety of reforms. Beginning in 1993, the Black Sea Environment Programme (BSEP) was created with both donor and national funding, including major inputs from the GEF and the European Union’s TACIS and Phare programs. The BSEP focused on enabling activities, capacity building, and the preparation and approval of regional and national ‘Strategic Action Plans’ (SAP’s). The BSEP focal areas included Emergency Response, Pollution Monitoring, Biodiversity, Integrated Coastal Zone Management, Fisheries, Database Management and Geographic Information System, Environmental Economics and Investments, NGO’s, Information and Communication and Policy and Legislation.

Similarly, in 1991, GEF, the European Union and the countries of the Danube River basin created the Environmental Programme for the Danube River Basin (EPDRB), designed to support the Danube countries in their long term objective of improving the environmental management of the Danube river basin. EPDRB supported SAP and NAP preparation, monitoring, collection and assessment of data, emergency response systems, pre-investment studies, institutional strengthening, capacity building and reinforcement of NGO activities.

Concurrently, GEF and other donor-supported environmental protection activities have been underway in other Danube/Black Sea Basin rivers, including the Dnipro (GEF), Dniester (various), Don (World Bank) and Prut (Tacis) Rivers, and the Sea of Azov (Dutch).
Legal Framework:

Both the Black Sea and the Danube, the largest river in the basin, have developed and ratified international conventions (Black Sea Convention, Danube River Protection Convention) whose objectives pertain to the prevention of pollution of the Danube/Black Sea basin. The Danube River Protection Convention came into force in October, 1998, the Black Sea Convention in February, 1994. A number of the basin countries are also parties to the UN Economic Commission for Europe’s Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes. Most countries are also party to several other relevant conventions, including the Convention on Biological Diversity, Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention). At the national level, numerous policies, laws and regulations exist relating to protection of Danube/Black Sea basin resources, but exhibit a wide range of implementation, compliance and enforcement. In most countries, legislation to address some of the priority problems, especially transboundary ones, identified by the programs noted above is still in its infancy. In the Danube River Basin, most countries, especially those in the accession process to the European Union are actually revising their policy and legal frame for environmental and water protection to be coherent with EU water directives.

Policy Framework:

The BSEP was the first programme to develop a systematic approach to policy development through the application of a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and a Strategic Action Plan (SAP). The Black Sea SAP, contains 59 specific commitments on policy regarding measures to reduce pollution, improve living resources management, encourage human development in a manner which does not prejudice the environment, and take steps towards improving financing for environmental projects. In adopting this plan, the Black Sea governments have committed themselves to a process of profound reform in the manner in which environmental issues are addressed in the Black Sea and its basin. Preparation of National Action Plans to operationalize the SAP at the national level is also underway.

Concurrently, the Environmental Programme for the Danube River Basin adopted a Danube River SAP in 1994 (revised in 1999 as a Common Platform for National Policies and Actions under the DRPC) which provides direction and a framework for achieving the goals of regional integrated water management and riverine environmental management expressed in the Danube River Protection Convention. The most recent GEF intervention in the Danube sought to operationalize elements of the SAP and Convention through the preparation of a Pollution Reduction Programme (PRP) which was completed in July, 1999. Over $5 billion in investments, primarily at the national level and targeting ‘hot spots’, were identified and project files prepared.

Preparation of a Strategic Action Programme and support to its implementation is also planned in the Dnipro River Basin through UNDP-GEF and IDRC assistance.

Institutional Framework

Several emerging or operational institutions have key roles to play in the identification and implementation of activities aimed at the remediation and protection of the Danube/Black Sea basin waters and ecosystems. Key among these are the Commission on the Protection of the Black Sea Against Pollution and the Secretariat of the Black Sea Commission, and the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River and its Permanent Secretariat, each with responsibility for coordinating implementation of the respective Conventions. The Danube Secretariat and the ICPDR Expert Groups (Monitoring, Laboratory, Information Management Expert Group, Emission Expert Group, Accidental Emergency Warning and Prevention Expert Group and Ad-hoc Expert Group for Implementation of EU Water Framework Directives and River Basin Management) are fully operational and financially sustainable whereas the Black Sea Secretariat has experienced repeated delays in overcoming political and bureaucratic challenges to its establishment. It is hoped that these will be overcome shortly (April, 2000) and the Black Sea Secretariat will come into existence in late 2000 or early 2001. In addition, donor-supported activities have resulted in the creation of non-permanent institutions such as the Black Sea PIU and Danube PCU responsible for coordination of the respective environment programmes.
Investment Framework:

Both the Black Sea and Danube Environment programmes have supported the identification and preparation of investments aimed at remediating and preventing environmental degradation in the Danube/Black Sea basin. Collectively, the 13 countries of the Danube River Basin invested approximately $560 million in municipal and industrial wastewater treatment, agricultural water pollution reduction, wetlands protection and water resources management in 1997-98. An additional $4.29 billion in water sector investments is planned for the next 2-5 years. For the Black Sea riparians, a total of nearly $100 million in water sector investments are underway or near completion.
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Introduction

This study was prepared by a legal consultant to the United Nations Environment Programme / Regional Office for Europe (UNEP/ROE) in the framework of the PDF-B project “Strengthening the Implementation of Nutrient Reduction Measures and Transboundary Cooperation in the Danube River Basin” of the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

The main purpose of the study is to provide recommendations to UNEP on which legal steps are required in order to enhance the implementation of the Global Programme of Action (GPA) in the Danube River basin, with particular focus on the issue of pollution by nutrients.

The paper includes:

- An introduction to the problem of eutrophication in the Danube River and in the Black Sea;
- Description of legal/policy response required or actually undertaken;
- Assessment of implementation of the GPA in the Danube River basin;
- Recommendation of proposed actions to be considered by Danube Basin Countries and stakeholders.

The paper was drawn up in consultation with key stakeholders, such as the Secretariat of the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (Secretariat of ICPDR), UNEP/ROE, and the UNEP/GPA Coordination Office. Scientific advice was provided by Professor Helmut Kroiss of the Technical University in Vienna in Austria.

Pollution by Nutrients in the Danube River Basin and in the Black Sea

The Danube and Black Sea Basins

On its way from the Black Forest to the Black Sea, the Danube crosses 11 countries, more than any other river in the world, representing a high diversity of cultural, economic and social characteristics. The Danube is the second largest river of Europe, its catchment area comprises areas in 17 countries and over 800,000km², which are part of the Black Sea catchment area of an estimated 2,300,000 km². Therefore, the Danube provides for a large part of the input of water - and of pollution - from rivers to the Black Sea.

Eutrophication in the Black Sea

The last decades have seen a considerable increase in the input of nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus) and into the Black Sea. As a result of eutrophication, excessive alga growth has been observed in areas of the Danube delta and of the Black Sea. The lack of oxygen in the water led to decrease in fish stocks and marine living resources. The peak of eutrophication was reached in the early 1990’s. This situation led to the awareness that there is an urgent need for action in order to improve the ecological situation by controlling the release of nutrients into the aquatic environment.

---

1 Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities, adopted in Washington DC on 3 November 1995
**Recent improvements**

Since 1992, an improvement of the ecological situation has been observed in the Black Sea. Alga growth has decreased and stocks of certain fish species are slowly recovering. This improvement was mainly due to two factors. In the more upstream countries, efforts that started in the past decades in wastewater treatment and in implementing new agricultural policies are showing effect, resulting in stabilization and reduction of nutrient input. Nevertheless, further efforts will be necessary in agricultural policies as well as wastewater treatment in order to reduce the input of nutrients.

The other, more important factor was the economic transition of the Central and Eastern European Countries. Economic decline resulted in a significant reduction (e.g. estimates of about 15% reduction in total input of N and P to the Danube between 1988/89 and 1992) of pollution from nutrients, mainly due to decrease of agricultural and industrial activity. As economic recovery takes place, it will be a challenge to stabilize and further reduce input of nutrients to a sustainable level.

**Main Sources of Nutrients**

The main sources of nutrients entering the Black Sea from the Danube come from agriculture (>1/2), from communal discharges (>1/4), from industry and from background sources. Discharges can be from “point sources” (e.g. from communal wastewater discharge, agricultural point source) or from “diffuse sources”, such as from agriculture/groundwater infiltration or erosion.

The scientific knowledge about the interrelations of hydrology, pollution and water quality of the Black Sea and Danube basins is constantly improving. The Transnational Monitoring Network (TNMN) and the resulting Danube Water Quality Model (DWQM) produced results, which can provide a sound basis for policy decisions. Nevertheless, many important factors still remain to be solved, e.g. with regard to an exact assessment of national shares of nutrient input into the Danube River.

**Towards a Common Policy Response to Pollution by Nutrients and other Pollutants in the Danube River Basin**

**Background**

The Danube basin comprises some of the most performing economies of the European Union, as well as countries with economies in transition, some of them just recovering from a conflict situation. Nevertheless, as demonstrated by the report prepared in the framework of this GEF PDF-B project, many DRPC countries are either implementing / approximating to EU legislation, others are planning to harmonize their legislation with the EU acquis. Two countries are already members of the European Union (Germany, Austria), some are harmonizing their legislation with a view of joining the EU in the near future (Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovenia) or later (Slovakia, Croatia, Romania and Bulgaria).

FR Yugoslavia and Bosnia Herzegovina find themselves in a special situation, but nevertheless, have expressed their interest of harmonizing their legislation to the EU law and

2 “Existing and Planned policies and Legislation relating to Nutrient Control and Reduction”, Draft Summary Report for Danube Regional Project, ICPDR-UNDP/GEF, June 2000 e.g., Table 14.5 “Planned Schedule for Approximation of National Legislation to EU Legislation”
policies. Moldova and Ukraine have also expressed the interest of taking into account the aspect of harmonization with EU policies in the development of national policies in the framework of cooperation with the EU in the field of environment protection.

**Policy approach of relevant EU legislation**

The current state of EU legislation is marked by one major event: the recent adoption of the “European Water Framework Directive” (WFD) of 18 July 2000. The Water Framework Directive will reform the EU water policy, setting out a new common approach to water management, as well as common objectives and principles, common definitions and basic measures. It is designed to prevent further deterioration and to protect and enhance the quality and quantity of aquatic ecosystems.

Key elements of the Directive relevant to the reduction of pollution by nutrients or other substances include:

- Protection of all surface waters, including maritime coastal waters, and groundwaters in their quality and quantity with a proper ecological dimension;
- Emissions and discharges to be controlled by a combined approach (see below);
- Integrated river basin management across administrative and political borders with coordinated programmes of measures, including the establishment of River Basin Districts and River Basin Management Plans.

The EU Water Framework Directive in its Article 10 stipulates a combined approach to be taken for the control of discharges from point and diffuse sources into surface waters. This combined approach includes:

- Emission controls based on Best Available Techniques (BAT);
- Relevant emission limit values;
- In the case of diffuse impacts the controls including Best Environmental Practices (BEP).

Control measures are set out more specifically in several EU Directives, to which the Water Framework Directive makes reference. These directives include, amongst others, the Directive concerning integrated pollution prevention and control (IPPC-Directive), the directive concerning urban waste water-treatment and the directive concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources (“nitrate directive”).

The following table gives an overview of the most relevant EU legal acts:

---

3 Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy

---
Table 1:
Examples of relevant EU-legislation and underlying principles:

• Water quality standards  
• “Good surface water status” to be achieved within 15 years  
• Use of notions of “Best Available Techniques” and Best Environmental Practices for point and diffuse sources  
• River Basin Districts and River Basin Management Plans to be established. |
|---|---|
• Identification of “sensitive areas”, where there is a requirement of appropriate treatment of waste-water for the removal of nutrients |
| Council Directive 91/676/EEC of 12 December 1991 concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources | • Reduction and prevention of emission from nitrates from agricultural sources  
• Designation of “vulnerable zones”.  
• Establishment of codes of “good agricultural practice” and “action programmes”. |
• Installation permit shall include emission limit value for relevant pollutants  
• Emission limit value shall be based on best available techniques (BAT). Additional measures to be taken if required by environmental quality standards |
Targets and timeframes of WFD:

- Prevent deterioration of surface and ground waters;
- Achieve good surface and groundwater status within 15 years of entry into force of WFD;
- Review of the environmental impact of human activity and Economic Analysis of water use within 4 years of entry into force of WFD;
- River Basin Management Plan completed by end of 2004, reviewed every six years.

**Integrated River Basin Management**

One of the main innovations of the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) is to create a single system of water management: the river basin management on the European level, following and complementing positive examples of initiatives taken forward by the States concerned for e.g. the Rhine or Danube basin. This policy is based on the recognition that the best model for a single system of water management is management by river basin – the natural geographical and hydrological unit – instead of according to administrative or political boundaries.

This development is also of particular relevance for the Danube basin. Therefor, several provisions of the WFD merit special consideration.

**Establishment of River Basin Districts**

The “River Basin District” is the main unit for management of river basins under the WFD. It is composed of the “area of land and sea, made up of one or more neighboring river basins together with their associated groundwaters and coastal waters” (Article 2 para. 15). The EU Member States shall identify river basins and assign them to river basin districts.

A river basin covering the territory of more than on EU Member State shall be assigned to an international River Basin District (Article 3 para. 3 of the WFD).

**Conclusion:** The Danube Basin will be assigned to an “International River Basin District” by EU and accession countries.

Paragraph 5 of Article 3 stipulates a principle of cooperation for River Basins Districts, which extend beyond the territory of the EU. In this case, the Member States concerned “shall endeavour to establish appropriate coordination with the relevant non-Member States, with the aim of achieving the objectives of this Directive throughout the River Basin District. For international River Basin Districts the Member States concerned shall together ensure this coordination and may, for this purpose, use existing structures stemming from international agreements.

According to Article 18 of the DRPC, the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR) can, in addition to affairs explicitly entrusted to the International Commission, “deal with all other affairs the Commission is entrusted with by mandate from the Contracting Parties”.

**Conclusion:** ICPDR could perform coordination of International River Basin District with EU member and non-member countries, when entrusted by mandate from the DRPC Contracting Parties.
River Basin Management Plans

Article 16 of the WFD requires that for each River Basin District a River Basin Management Plan should be elaborated. In the case of an international River Basin District extending beyond the boundaries of the Community, Member States shall endeavour to produce a single River Basin Management Plan.

Where this is not possible, the plan shall at least cover the portion of the international River Basin District lying within the territory of the Member State concerned. The River Basin Management Plan shall cover various elements, which are listed in Annex VII of the WFD.

Conclusion: Danube Countries could consider establishing a joint International River Basin Management Plan for the Danube River basin.

Scope of application

As already stated in the preamble of the WFD, “an effective water policy must take account of the vulnerability of aquatic ecosystems located near the coast and estuaries or in gulfs or relatively closed seas, as their equilibrium is strongly influenced by the quality of inland waters flowing into them”. Consequently, according to Article 1 of the WFD, the “purpose of this Directive is to establish a framework for the protection of inland surface waters, transitional waters, coastal waters and groundwaters”, thereby including “coastal waters” into the territorial scope of application of the WFD.

Furthermore, the definition of “surface water” in Article 2 paragraph 1 of the WFD also includes coastal waters. Paragraph 15 of Article 2 stipulates that “associated […] coastal waters shall be included into the River Basin District. “Coastal waters” are defined by Article 2 paragraph 7 of the WFD as “surface water on the landward side of a line every point of which is at a distance of one nautical mile on the seaward side from the nearest point of the baseline from which the breadth of territorial waters is measured, extending where appropriate up to the outer limit of transitional waters”.

Conclusion: The quality of coastal waters of participating countries should be taken into account in the International River Basin Management Plan.

Environmental Objectives and Water Quality Status

According to Article 4 paragraph 1 subparagraph (a) (i) of the WFD, “Member States shall implement the necessary measures to prevent deterioration of the status of all bodies of surface water”. Subparagraph (a) (ii) stipulates that “Member States shall protect, enhance and restore all bodies of surface water […] with the aim of achieving good surface water status at the latest 15 years after the date of entry into force of this Directive”.

Conclusion: The International River Basin Management Plan should contain targets and timeframes, including transitional provisions, for the reduction of the pollution by nutrients (and other pollutants).
Protected Areas

According to Article 6 of the WFD, “protected areas” shall be established in each River Basin District. Such protected areas shall include, in particular, “nutrient sensitive areas, including areas designated as Vulnerable Zones under the nitrate Directive and areas designated as Sensitive Areas under the urban waste-water Directive (Paragraph 1 - iv of Annex IV of the WFD).

According to Article 3 paragraph 2 of the nitrates Directive, all known areas of land in their territories which drain into nitrate polluted waters and which contribute to pollution shall be designated as “vulnerable zone”, requiring special action programmes.

The urban waste-water Directive requires that freshwater body, estuary or coastal water which are found to be eutrophic or which in the near future may become eutrophic shall be identified as “sensitive areas” (Annex II-A). Discharges from urban waste water treatment plants (of agglomerations of more than 10,000 persons) situated in the catchment area of a sensitive area, and which contribute to the pollution of such area, are subject to emission limits regarding concentration or for percentage of reduction of nutrients (Article 5, paragraph 5 of urban waste-water Directive).

Conclusion: Danube countries could consider establishing Vulnerable Zones and Sensitive Areas within the basin as Protected Areas under the International River Basin Management Plan.

Table: Some of main innovations of WFD vs. Danube River Protection Convention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WFD</th>
<th>DRPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope of application</strong></td>
<td>Hydrological river basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inland surface waters, including transitional waters and coastal waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Groundwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality standards and objectives</strong></td>
<td>“Good surface waters status” within 15 years (Article 4 paragraph 1 WFD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>River Basin Management Plan</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protected Areas</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation of the Global Programme of Action

Requirements of the Global Programme of Action (GPA)

The Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA) was adopted by 108 Governments and the European Commission in 1995. It is the response of the international community to the fact that a large part of the pollution of the world’s oceans (estimated 80%) is caused by human activities on land. Therefore, marine protection is an issue of everybody, living in a coastal or landlocked country.

By adopting the GPA, States declared that the protection and management of the global water resources has to be based on a basin wide approach. This means that all countries lying within the catchment area of a hydrological basin of a water resource should cooperate to protect the water resource in question.

The GPA is aimed to be “a source of conceptual and practical guidance to be drawn upon by national and/or regional authorities in devising and implementing sustained action to prevent, reduce, control and/or eliminate marine degradation from land based activities”.

The GPA gives recommendations for action at the national level, and at the level of regional and international cooperation. Furthermore, the GPA provides guidance for “recommended approaches by source category”, including a chapter on nutrients, which are of particular relevance for this study.

The objectives of the GPA with regard to nutrients are to:

- identify marine areas where nutrient inputs are causing or are likely to cause pollution;
- reduce nutrient inputs into the areas identified;
- reduce the number of marine areas where eutrophication is evident,
- protect and restore areas of natural denitrification.

Action at the national level

Recommendations for Reduction of Pollution from Land Based Sources

On the national level, the GPA lists activities in the following fields, which are valid for reduction of all pollution from land-based activities, some of them being of particular relevance also for nutrient reduction:

- Identification and assessment of problems, such as identification of contaminants and of sources of degradation (e.g., point sources and diffuse sources of pollution), as well as identification of “areas of concern” (ecologically sensitive areas);
- Establishment of priorities for source categories and areas affected;
- Setting management objectives for priority problems, including goals, targets and timetables;
- Identification, evaluation and selection of strategies and measures, including e.g. implementation of best available techniques and best environmental practices, product substitution, waste treatment etc.
GPA Recommendations for Nutrient Reduction

With particular regard to the source category of nutrients, the GPA recommends different national action, policies and measures to be taken at the national levels. The GPA requires:

- the identification of areas where nutrient inputs are likely to cause pollution;
- the identification of point sources and diffuse sources of nutrient input;
- the adoption of appropriate cost-effective policy instruments, including regulatory measures, economic instruments and voluntary agreements, such as activities relates to sewage treatment, integration of best environmental practice (BEP), best available techniques (BAT), integrated pollution prevention and information campaigns;
- to strengthen capacity on the local level (urban development and agriculture);
- scientific research;
- to protect and restore potential natural sinks such as wetlands.

Implementation enhanced by DRPC

A thorough assessment of the nutrients problem and of the action required or undertaken at the national level is included in the report “Five Year National Nutrient Reduction Action Plan”, which has been prepared in the context of the PDF-B phase of the present project. The following table gives an overview of the implementation of some of the key elements of the GPA at the national level regarding nutrients:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Identification of point / diffuse sources of nutrient input</th>
<th>Nutrient Reduction Plan adopted</th>
<th>Completion of Appropriate Policy instruments</th>
<th>Product substitution of P-free detergents</th>
<th>Need of legislative changes identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td>Control planned</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>No plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>No plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td>No plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR Yugoslavia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>No plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td>In discussion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td>No plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>No plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td>No plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be concluded that the implementation of the GPA is on the way, mainly driven by activities under the DRPC as well as the process of approximation of legislation to EU policies. For example, under the current GEF PDF-B project an exhaustive assessment of sources of nutrient pollution has been prepared, in order to provide the basis for the development of “national nutrient reduction plans”.

All of the Danube countries with two exceptions identified a need for legislative changes on the national level, in order to implement the planned policy reforms for nutrient reduction. The implementation of appropriate policy tools is just at the beginning.

---

A number of measures at the national level remain to be implemented. An effective implementation of a strategy, including identification of problem, establishment of objectives and implementation of activities in line with the guidance contained in the GPA, will be enhanced by the elaboration of national nutrient reduction plans.

Conclusion: Work on elaboration of National Nutrient Reduction Plans has been started under the umbrella of the ICPDR.

Action at the Regional Level
GPA Recommendations for Reduction of Pollution from Land Based Sources

The GPA recognizes that “regional and subregional cooperation and arrangements are crucial for successful action to protect the marine environment from land-based activities”. The objective should be to “strengthen and, where necessary, create new regional arrangements and joint actions to support effective action, strategies and programmes.

The GPA recommends the following activities:

- Participation in international regional and subregional marine and freshwater agreements or arrangements. Where necessary, existing agreements should be strengthened or new ones being negotiated;
- Effective functioning of regional and subregional arrangements, including securing of funding and cooperation with multilateral financing agencies, adoption of programmes of action, information clearing house, inter-institutional cooperation, cooperation between secretariats and conventions;
- Adequate secretarial support for regional and subregional agreements.

GPA Recommendations for Reduction of Pollution by Nutrients

Specifically for the issue of eutrophication, the GPA recommends:

- the establishment of common criteria for the identification of eutrophication problems;
- the identification of marine areas where nutrients are causing pollution;
- the identification of areas for priority actions;
- the estimation of uniform approaches to the calculation of anthropogenic nutrient input with the aim of improving estimation of these inputs;
- the development and implementation of programmes for reducing nutrient input, paying particular attention to the agricultural sector;
- to establish mechanisms for assessing the effectiveness of the measures taken; and
- to develop strategies for reducing eutrophication.

Assessment of Implementation

There are two regional conventions in force, which have direct relevance for the protection of the Black Sea:

The Convention on the protection of the Black Sea against pollution was adopted in April 1992 in Bucharest and came into force in 1994. It is not a basin-wide convention, but covers the six Black Sea riparian States.
It is supplemented by a Protocol on the Protection of the Black Sea Marine Environment against Pollution from Land Based Sources, which is an integral part of the Convention.

The assessment of the implementation of the GPA through the Black Sea Convention and the identification of legislative needs is subject of a detailed report prepared by Mr. I. Zrazhevski, consultant to UNEP under the framework of this PDF-B phase. One of the questions arising is whether an assessment of the Black Sea Protocol on land based sources would indicate that it requires amendment in order to enhance implementation of the recommendations of the GPA.

The Danube River Protection Convention (DRPC) was adopted in 1994 and entered into force in October 1998. Its scope covers 13 Danube River countries, most of which have already ratified the Convention. The DRPC is based on the basin-wide approach. As a river basin convention it is “land based” by nature; therefore, its provisions can be directly compared to the LBS Protocols of Regional Seas agreements, including the Black Sea Convention and the Barcelona Convention.

Several subsidiary bodies have been established under the DRPC, which address many of the recommendations of the GPA.

- Accident Emergency Prevention and Warning System Expert Group;
- Emission Expert Group;
- Monitoring Laboratory and Information Management Group;
- Strategic Expert Group; and

In order to provide an overview of the legal and institutional framework and measures of implementation, a comparative analysis can be done of the above-mentioned regional instruments. The table below lists some of the recommendations of the GPA and the relevant provisions/implementation measures in the two LBS Protocols felt more relevant and the DRPC, as well as the new European system of the WFD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basin Management Approach</td>
<td>Not yet in force</td>
<td>In force</td>
<td>Entry into force expected 2000</td>
<td>In force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Coastal” convention. Black Sea Convention is open for accession by other States.</td>
<td>River Basin Districts, including associated coastal waters, to be established</td>
<td>Implemented by Articles 1,2 and 3 of the Convention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint Ad Hoc Technical Working Group ICPDR-ICPBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Ad Hoc Technical Working Group ICPDR-ICPBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAT/BEP</td>
<td>Annex IV Protocol</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Article 10 WFD</td>
<td>Annex I DRPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation in Monitoring</td>
<td>Article 8 of Mediterranean Protocol</td>
<td>Article 15 of Black Sea Protocol</td>
<td>Article 8 WFD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonization of emission limitation</td>
<td>Article 7: Common guidelines, standards and criteria to be developed</td>
<td>Article 6: Common guidelines, standards and criteria to be developed</td>
<td>Article 10 WFD “Combined approach”</td>
<td>Article 7 DRPC: Emission limits and water quality objectives to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Article 11 controls for priority substances and priority hazardous substances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations of related EU Directives</td>
<td>Emission expert group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Strategic Action Plan adopted for nutrient reduction</td>
<td>Not yet</td>
<td>To be developed under present project</td>
<td>River Basin Management Plan to be produced (Article 13 WFD)</td>
<td>Joint Action Plan to be developed under proposed project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information clearing house</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of programmes with other international agencies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Danube River basin - which forms an important hydrological “sub-basin” to the Black Sea basin – is almost entirely covered by the DRPC. The assessment of the implementation of the GPA in the Black Sea basin shows that the DRPC presently offers an appropriate legal framework for the implementation of the GPA on a regional level. The DRPC contains similar provisions, which are contained in the LBS Protocols examined, and which are sometimes more far-reaching than the LBS provisions, e.g., by implementing a basin wide approach for its sub-basin. Therefore, as far as the Danube River basin is concerned, it can be noted that presently the DRPC is supplementing the Black Sea Convention.

Furthermore, the adoption of a common policy approach in line with the EU legislation is providing a considerable impetus to harmonization of policies and to implementation of pollution reduction in the Danube River Basin.

On the side of practical implementation, considerable work remains to be done. The proposed Danube Regional Project proposes implementation measures to be undertaken, which will provide for a reduction in nutrient transport to the Black Sea of estimated 27% for Phosphorus and 14% of Nitrates.

The GPA requires the development of a regional strategy for reduction of pollutants including nutrients. Such action plan should contain the identification and assessment of the problem, the fixing of objectives (such as clear targets and timeframes), measures to achieve these objectives and a mechanism in order to review the effectiveness of the measures taken. Until presently, many activities have been undertaken, but no such regional action plan – which could serve as a common platform for implementation of nutrient reduction measures on the national level - was adopted.

Close co-operation with stakeholders, such as the International Commission for the Protection of the Black Sea (ICPBS), will be required in order to ensure full compatibility of this process with related work currently undertaken, such as the (possible) development of an amended Protocol on land-based sources to the Black Sea Convention. UNEP will continue to play a catalytic role in order to enhance this process.

Conclusions:
- Most of the action recommended by the GPA is taken by DRB countries in the framework of participation in the DRPC, including its Commission and subsidiary bodies, and by implementing a common policy approach;
- The necessary secretarial support is provided by the Secretariat of the ICPDR;
- Common platform of action for implementation, such as a Joint Action Programme for the Danube River basin, should be developed and adopted in order to implement pollution reduction measures following the recommendations of GPA.

**Action at the international level**

**GPA Recommendations for LBS Pollution**

Activities at the international level, which are recommended by the GPA, fall into the following categories:

- capacity building, including the mobilization of experience in support of national and regional action, as well as a clearing house mechanism;
- mobilization of financial resources, including the GEF;
- international institutional framework, with UNEP playing a catalytic role between the institutions concerned;
- additional areas of international cooperation, such as waste water treatment and management as well as Persistent Organic Pollutants
GPA Recommendations for Reduction of Pollution by Nutrients

Specifically for the issue of reduction of pollution by nutrients, the following activities are recommended at the international level:

- Participation in a clearing-house for providing information about BEP / BAT to reduce or eliminate causes of eutrophication;
- Strengthening of international programmes for capacity building for identification of areas where eutrophication is causing or is likely to cause pollution, Nutrient control and removal technique, application of BEP in aquaculture and agriculture;
- Technical cooperation for reduction of release of nutrients, including environmentally sound land-use techniques, planning and practices,
- Provision of forums for establishing criteria for determining the circumstances in which nutrients are likely to cause pollution,
- Maintaining existing international quality assurance and quality control procedures relevant to eutrophication.

GPA Strategic Action Plan on Sewage

In the period 2000 – 2001 a major mandated task of the UNEP/GPA Co-ordination Office is to forward and coordinate the implementation of the GPA Strategic Action Plan on Municipal Wastewater. A Global Conference Process is part of this action plan.

The main aim of the Strategic Action Plan is to initiate and facilitate a process, which leads to the development and implementation of national strategies on sewage. An innovative element of this strategy is the exploration of possibilities for public-private partnerships. There are a number of economic sectors, such as tourism, mariculture, and urban development, which can benefit from a healthier environment.

At present, pre-investment studies to identify suitable socio-economic opportunities are being carried out, with the support of the UNEP/GPA Coordination Office, in four regions: the East Asian Seas, the South Asian Seas, Eastern Africa, and the South-East Pacific. In addition, a number of case studies on the environmental, social, and economic benefits of addressing sewage are under preparation.

At a later stage, the UNEP/GPA Coordination Office, in partnership with governments and organizations such as the World Health Organisation, United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat), and the United Nations Development Programme, will be promoting development and implementation of national strategies on sewage.

Public Participation and Compliance


The Guidance on public participation in water management gives recommendations in the field of public participation in decision-making and recommends the development of a

---

6 Published by United Nations, New York and Geneva, 2000
communication strategy for each catchment area. Many of these recommendations are taken into account within the respective regional systems of the Danube and the Black Sea Conventions. UNEP could contribute to this aim by developing a Black Sea basin-wide communication strategy for public awareness, promoting the issue of the reduction of pollution of the Black Sea in the Danube basin and vice versa.

The Framework for Compliance recommends the establishment of a compliance review procedure in agreements on transboundary waters in order to facilitate compliance more effectively, as well as to introduce non-confrontational, non-judicial and consultative procedures to review compliance and resolve disputes. So far, no agreement on transboundary waters in the ECE region is currently following developments in global environmental agreements and providing a compliance review procedure.

**Assessment of Implementation**

A great part of this action is taken into account by the work under the DRPC as well as the Black Sea Convention. The proposed regional project will be a good example for international cooperation undertaken.

A crucial element is the cooperation between the two Commissions, which has led to the setting up – with the assistance of UNDP/GEF and UNEP - of a Joint Ad Hoc Technical Working Group in 1997. One outcome of this cooperation is the preparation of a draft Memorandum of Understanding between the two Commissions, which has not yet been signed.

Taking into account the number of activities, which are planned in relation to Danube and Black Sea Conventions and their close interrelation, further strengthening of this successful co-operation is crucial. UNEP is called upon to play a “catalytic role” in this process.

Furthermore, the synergies between the work of the UNEP GPA Co-ordination Office and the Danube / Black Sea Commissions should be further strengthened and exploited. Part of this cooperation could be the consideration of the future GPA Strategic Action Plan on Sewage, which could be appropriately undertaken in a Joint meeting. Furthermore, it is important that the GPA recommendations will be taken into account when implementing activities in the framework of the Danube and Black Sea Regional projects, e.g. by implementing joint pilot projects. Of particular interest will be to draw upon the experience of the GPA Coordination Office in enhancing public-private partnerships.

UNEP could contribute to the promotion of public awareness on the protection of the Black Sea and Danube by developing and implementing one basin-wide communication strategy, promoting the issue of protection of the Black Sea in the Danube basin and vice versa. The Framework for Compliance should be brought to the attention of the Danube and the Black Sea Countries.

**Conclusions:**

- Cooperation between Danube and Black Sea Commissions should be continued and strengthened through the work of the Joint Ad Hoc Working Group and the signature and implementation of a MoU between the Black Sea / Danube Commissions;
- UNEP shall continue to play a catalytic role between the institutions concerned;
- GPA Strategic action plan on Sewage shall be considered by Danube and Black Sea countries in a joint meeting and integrated into implementation activities under ICPDR and ICPBS, e.g. by the joint implementation of pilot projects.
- UNEP should develop a common communication strategy for Danube and Black Sea basins;
- The Framework of Compliance with Agreements on Transboundary Waters should be brought to the attention of and considered by the Joint Ad Hoc Technical Working Group or a joint meeting.
Summary of Conclusions:

- The Danube Basin will be assigned to an “International River Basin District” by EU and accession countries;
- ICPDR could perform coordination of International River Basin District with EU member and non-member countries;
- Parties of DRPC could consider establishing a joint International River Basin Management Plan;
- The coastal waters of the participating Danube River Basin countries would have to be taken into account in the International River Basin Management Plan;
- The International River Basin Management Plan should contain targets and timeframes, including transitional provisions, for the reduction of the pollution by nutrients (and other pollutants);
- Danube countries could consider establishing Vulnerable Zones and Sensitive Areas within the basin as Protected Areas under the International River Basin Management Plan;
- Work on elaboration of National Nutrient Reduction Plans has been started under the umbrella of the ICPDR;
- Most of the action recommended by the GPA is undertaken by DRB countries in the framework of participation in the DRPC, including its Commission and subsidiary bodies, and by implementing a common policy approach;
- The necessary secretarial support is provided by the Secretariat of the ICPDR;
- There is a need of establishing a common platform of action for implementation, such as a Joint Action Programme for the Danube River basin;
- Cooperation between Danube and Black Sea Commissions should be continued and strengthened via the work of the Joint Ad Hoc Working Group;
- UNEP shall continue to play a catalytic role between the institutions concerned;
- The MoU between ICPDR and ICPDS should be signed and implemented;
- GPA Strategic action plan on Sewage shall be considered by Danube and Black Sea countries in a joint meeting and integrated into implementation activities under ICPDR and ICPBS, e.g. by the joint implementation of pilot projects;
- UNEP should develop a common communication strategy for Danube and Black Sea basins;
- The Framework of Compliance with Agreements on Transboundary Waters should be brought to the attention of and considered by the Joint Ad Hoc Technical Working Group or a joint meeting.
Recommendations

Parties to the DRPC may consider:

- to develop and implement a Joint Action Programme for the Danube River basin, which should serve as a common regional platform for implementation. The Joint Action Programme shall be elaborated with the participation of the ICPBS (or in consultation with the Joint Danube-Black Sea Technical Working Group), in order to achieve complementarity between the Joint Action Programme and the amended Protocol on LBS possibly to be developed under the Black Sea Convention. The Joint Action Programme should include clear objectives and timeframes for reduction of nutrient pollution.

- The Joint Action Programme should aim at establishing a joint International River Basin Management Plan, including the coastal waters of the participating Danube River Basin countries and establishing Vulnerable Zones and Sensitive Areas within the basin as Protected Areas under the International River Basin Management Plan. ICPDR should perform the coordination of the International River Basin District with EU member and non-member countries.

- The Cooperation between Danube and Black Sea Commissions should be continued and the MoU between ICPDR and ICPDS should be signed and implemented. UNEP shall continue to play a catalytic role between the institutions concerned.

- GPA Strategic Action Plan on Sewage shall be considered by Danube and Black Sea countries in a joint meeting and integrated into implementation activities under ICPDR and ICPBS, e.g. by the joint implementation of pilot projects. The Framework for Compliance with Agreements on Transboundary Waters of the ECE/UNEP Network of Experts on Public Participation and Compliance shall be considered by the ICPDR-ICPBS Joint Ad Hoc Technical Working Group or a joint meeting.

- UNEP/ROE should develop a common communication strategy for the Black Sea and the Danube.

Activities for consideration to be undertaken by UNEP

UNEP should inform the Danube and Black Sea Countries (or members of the Joint Danube-Black Sea Technical Working Group) on its activities and call for a meeting. The meeting should consider this report and the similar report for the Black Sea, comment on both of them and recommend UNEP/ROE the follow-up actions. As regards the development of a Joint Action Plan for Danube River basin Countries, the meeting should elaborate on policy issues and advise on the indicators assessing effectiveness of the Joint Action Plan.