



FIRST NATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS WORKSHOP - POLAND

24th MAY 2017

Winutes Version 1 06 2017





Table of Context

1. Meeting overview	3
2. Meeting agenda	4
3. The minutes	5
4. Evaluation form results	13





1. Meeting overview

One of the basic scope of the PROLINE-CE project is the development of sustainable and responsible land management and management measures and tools to mitigate and ultimately reduce, flood and drought, as part of the challenges of climate change.

Project implementation is largely based on the cooperation of Project Partners and Stakeholders, consisting mainly of exchanging experiences and discussions to develop a set of effective practices to strengthen the protection of drinking water resources and improve flood protection.

The main aim of the Workshop is:

- Introducing Stakeholders with the main assumptions of the PROLINE-CE Project,
- Presentation of current challenges related to water management in Poland and land management,
- Engaging Stakeholders in developing a transnational action plan for integrated and sustainable protection of water resources.

In the Stakeholders' meeting over 60 participants took part, including 29 stakeholders, 13 representatives of Project Partners PP10 and PP11, 6 representatives of Associated Partners ASP18 and 13 external experts for GPW. Stakeholders represented a.o. Regional Water Management Authority, Polish Geological Survey, State Forests Katowice, Regional Environmental Agency Katowice, Regional Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management in Katowice, local water suppliers, district sanitary-epidemiological stations, local authorities.





2. Meeting agenda

10:00 - 10:30	Rejestracja uczestników / Participants registration and proceedings handing	
10:30 - 10:40	Otwarcie warsztatów, przywitanie gości / Opening the workshop, welcoming the guests	
10:40 - 11:00	Informacja dotycząca realizacji projektu PROLINE-CE / PROLINE-CE project overview presentation	Joanna Czekaj GPW S.A.
11:00 - 11:20	Wyzwania związane z użytkowaniem gruntów w kontekście ochrony zasobów wodnych / Challenges of water resources protection regarding land use management	Norbert Jaźwiński ĸZGW
11:20 - 11:40	Gospodarka wodna na zbiorniach administrowanych przez Górnośląskie Przedsiębiorstwo Wodociągów w świetle obowiązujących instrukcji gospodarki wodnej / Water and flood management on reservoirs under GPW administration	Andrzej Siudy Kierownik zbiornika Kozłowa Góra / Head manager of Kozłowa Lake reservoir, GPW S.A
11:40 - 12:15	Przerwa kawowa / Coffee break	
12:15 - 12:30	Dobre praktyki w użytkowaniu gruntów i ochronie przeciwpowodziowej w kontekście ochrony zasobów wodnych / Good practices in land use and flood protection in the context of protection of water resources	
12:30 - 13:45	Dyskusja moderowana / Moderate disscussion	
13:45 - 14:00	Podsumowanie i zakończenie Warsztatów / Summary and conclusions and of the Workshop	





3. The minutes

The Workshop was opened by vice president of the Silesian Waterworks PLC, Mr. Mirosław Szemla. He welcomed a guests and underline the importance of the meeting due to one of the main aspect of the PROLINE-CE project: stakeholders' involvement and integration.



Fig. 1. Opening of the Workshop by vice president of the Silesian Waterworks PLC, Mr. Mirosław Szemla (photo: T. Sędor).



Fig. 2. The Workshop participants (photo: T. Sędor).





After the official opening of the Workshop, the plenary session started. *Ms. Joanna Czekaj*, project leader of Silesian Waterworks PLC (PP 11), presented the first presentation, which provided information on the planned activities, expected results and progress of the PROLINE-CE project.



Fig. 3. Joanna Czekaj, Leader PP11, presents Proline-CE project (photo: T. Sędor).

Another speaker was *Mr. Norbert Jaźwiński* (coordinator of the project for the KZGW, PP 10), who presented the current state of water management in the country and presented the results of SWOT analysis, the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of water management in speech entitled "Challenges related to land use in the context of protection of water resources".

		Ogúlens se m ⁵ /h			Stan zasolske eksplosterajnych se m/A: z utaronine				
					czwartoragdowych	necquisto- puleogeristich	Inadesoych	Harysych.	
Opident	E12 688	2 008 98E-48	10 934.00	E.42	1.026 402.36	210 163.27	276 888.62	135 251.13	
	19 943	91.172.58	413,54	0.57	61.594.57	20 805,13	3407.80	5365.28	
					198 031.00				
Polloks		77 983.00		2.35	-				
				5.96					
	17 294	107 681.42		0.79					
	11522	503.88.89		5.19	STATE OF THE PARTY				
					200				100
				Name and Address of the Owner, where the Owner, which is the	TO US				
			365.28	732	-			4505.60	
Warrando Mar Welkopolskie Earhodniopomur	24 203 25 826	130 467.11 188 235.77 172 280.45		5.40 6.51 7.52				30129	

Fig. 4. Norbert Jaźwiński, Leader PP10, during his presentation (photo: T. Sędor).





Next speaker was *Mr. Andrzej Siudy*, the head of Kozłowa Góra and Goczałkowice, administered by the GPW S.A. He presented an extremely interesting presentation entitled "Water management in tanks managed by the Upper Silesian Waterworks Company in the light of the water management instructions in force", in which, based on examples of existing flood events, pointed out the need for rigid flood management instructions.



Fig. 5. Andrzej Siudy, Head Manager of Kozłowa Lake reservoir, during his presentation (photo: T. Sędor).

Another presentation, presented by *Ms. Joanna Czekaj*, was a review of the current best practices in land use management in the context of the protection of the water resources in the Pilot Area - Kozłowa Góra reservoir basin, from the source of the Brynica river to the dam section. Analysis of the available documents has highlighted the lack of regulation on good practices in forest management in the context of the protection of the aquatic environment.







Fig. 6. Joanna Czekaj, Leader PP11, presents the best practices implemented in the Kozłowa Góra reservoir's catchment (photo: T. Sędor).

Then a moderated discussion began, led by *prof. dr hab. Andrzej Witkowski*. Two groups of questions were presented to encourage stakeholders to discuss. First group covered issues related to the protection of drinking water in the context of spatial development and group 2 addressed the problem of protection of drinking water in the context of flood management.



Fig. 7. Prof. Witkowski starts moderate discussion (photo: T. Sędor).

Prof Witkowski pointed out that, in general, in EU countries dominate the idea of limiting water treatment to source protection, so as to protect water intended for consumption from pollution





by properly managing the environment to avoid, often very expensive, water treatment (example Denmark). During a vivid discussion, which fragments are shown in the pictures below (photos: T. Sędor), participants discussed, among other things, whether water quality was sufficient. What could possibly be changed? Do we drink tap water or bottled water?













The issues, related to group 1, which were raised by participants, were:

- 1. drinking tap water,
- 2. problem of water stagnation in the waterworks network and its influence on drinking water quality,
- 3. old, oversized and leaked waterworks network structure and its influence on drinking water quality,
- 4. water quality monitoring,





- 5. effectiveness of the water treatment,
- 6. drinking water quality regulations,
- 7. drinking water protection zones establishment
- 8. interest conflicts between administrator and responsible authorities concerning water resources protection charges

The participants proposals to improve protection of drinking water resources were:

- pay more attention to drinking tap water marketing recommendation for drinking tap water instead of bottled water could cause paying more attention of society to protect water resources,
- 2. more control points on the waterworks network to define leakages and help network management,
- 3. establishment individual, higher quality requirements and environmental goals for WB which are drinking water resources,
- 4. definition of additional, stringent requirements for investment located in protective zones,
- 5. paying more attention to ecological education of society,
- 6. need an individual approach to land use and water management in drinking water protection zones
- 7. application of mathematical modelling to improve water resources management and, consequently, its quality

Group 2 of discussed issues - flood mitigation and drought management, included:

- 1. interest conflicts between administrator and responsible authorities concerning flood protection charges,
- 2. gaps in prepared Water Law concerning responsibility and charges for specific usage of water,
- 3. possible influence of Climate Changes on water management,
- 4. problem with small retention management,
- 5. good examples of historical water management network in Pszyczna Forrest
- 6. current actions of State Forrest concerning small retention

The participants proposals to improve flood mitigation and drought management were:

1. improve Water Law in context of specific water usage,





- 2. take lessons from historical documents due to water management- example of Pszczyna Forrest,
- 3. paying more attention and taking more actions due to small retention management in Forrests.

Professor *Witkowski* noted that in the forests there is reduced infiltration, evaporation and evapotranspiration, so the retention capacity of forests is enormous, and in the context of taking over water during extreme weather events should be used. The professor thanked for the lively and creative discussion. At the end, he cited the word Tales of Miletus, from the 7th/6th century BC: *Water constitutes the principle of all things*.

At the end of the meeting *Joanna Czekaj*, the main organizer, thanked for participation in the discussion and the Workshops. She also expressed her hope for further, fruitful cooperation of Stakeholders and PROLINE-CE Project Partners in its implementation.





4. Evaluation form results

The participants completed the evaluation questionnaires, which were then collected and analyzed. The form included 14 questions, scoring on a scale of 1 (lowest rating) to 5 (highest rating). The average score from the questionnaires indicates, that the participants rated the meeting at 4.34 points. Detailed results analyzed 46 questionnaires are presented in the charts below.







