WFD meets CAP - Towards the First River Basin Management Plan

Conference Summary

18/19 September 2008, Bonn

Prepared by

Maria Miguel Ribeiro (Ecologic)
Thomas Dworak (Ecologic)
Paul Campling (VITO)
Lisbeth Vranken (VITO)
Maria Berglund (Ecologic)

With contributions from

Pierre Strosser (ACTeon)

DISCLAIMER

Please note: The views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of the author(s) and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the European Commission or individual Member States.

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the information contained herein.

The information compiled in this paper is subject to rapid change.

The information presented is the status as of **October 2008**.

Table of Contents

1 Background to the Conference

As a result of a process of more than five years of discussions and negotiations, the EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) entered into force in 2000. The Directive sets a framework for the protection of all waters with the aim of reaching a "good ecological status" of all Community waters by 2015. The successful implementation of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) depends strongly on agricultural land use, which is mainly influenced by the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) (Herbke et al., 2006).

Acknowledging this, the Water Directors agreed in June 2004 to take action in the field of agriculture and water management by establishing the EU Strategic Steering Group (SSG) on WFD and Agriculture led by the UK, FR and the Environment Directorate-General of the European Commission with technical support from the Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development. During 2005-2006, the SSG mainly focused its activity on identifying the gaps between WFD requirements and what the existing CAP may deliver. Options were explored to bridge these gaps with detailed assessment of rural development programmes opportunities, the question of cross-compliance standards and the importance of water pricing.

Additionally, two major conferences were held in London from 20-21 September 2005[1] and Vienna from 3-4 March 2006[2], discussing the above mentioned reports. The conference from 20-21 September 2007 in Paris provided a forum to discuss the different approaches (e.g. voluntary versus mandatory measures) when designing the WFD River Basin Management Plans (RBMP) and different types of measures (economic, technical)[3]. Further, prospective questions, such as the impacts of new technologies and the effects of the EU Biomass Action Plan, were also discussed.

---

1 For more detailed information on the London conference and the individual presentations, please refer to http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/water/wfd/0509-conference/index.htm. (last accessed on 7th Sept. 2007).

2 The Vienna conference summary as well as all presentations can be downloaded from http://www.ecologic-events.de/cap-wfd/index.htm. (last accessed on 7th Sept. 2007).

3 Under the SSG activities of 2007/8 a Catalogue of measures was developed including several measures to address agricultural pressures. It can be downloaded at http://circa.europa.eu/Members/irc/env/wfd/library?l=/framework_directive/thematic_documents/wfd_agriculture

2 Aim of conference

The exchange of information and approaches is a top priority in the working program of the EU Strategic Steering Group (SSG). Thus, the 2008 conference on CAP & WFD in Bonn (18-19 September) again aimed to provide a forum to discuss different approaches concerning the elaboration of the River Basin Management Plans (RBMP) and the programmes of measures. Another objective was to show the further progress of the Member States in setting up the first RBMP.

In addition, the conference also aimed to develop ways to address the new challenges coming from climate change, bioenergy production and increasing water scarcity and droughts. The event allowed to exchange different experiences gained and lessons learned from the different approaches.

3 Session I: State-of-play of WFD and agriculture related issues

The conference was opened by Fritz Holzwarth (Germany Water Director), who called for more cooperation between the water community and the agriculture community to solve the upcoming problems (climate change, bioenergy use). He also pointed out the importance of cooperation between countries that share a river basin and the importance of sharing experiences among Member States (MS) in developing the different River Basin Management Programmes (RBMP). Only through cooperation can there be an agreement on the process and the targets of nutrient input reduction. The reduction goals imply that we are able to measure and use the same method to calculate the contributions across the EU MS. Therefore, consensus on the method and transparency are required. He further stressed the need to find arrangements with the detergent industry to reduce phosphorous emissions, especially in the Danube basin. Finally, Holzwarth introduced the following issues to be considered during the discussions:

- How to implement the programme of measures?
- How are we going to calculate what we are doing?
- What are the reduction goals for the 1st cycle?

The second welcome speech was held by Jean-Claude Vial (French Water Department), who expressed the interest of the French EU presidency regarding water issues[4]. Vial expressed the need for identification of coherent measures and better integration of the CAP and WFD. Specifically, he mentioned the conference should deal with the following questions:

- What type of measures to choose?
- And what means to adjust measures?
- Process to apply for exemptions and its relation to the costs of Programs of Measures (PoM).

After the welcome, three presentations where made regarding the state-of-the-play in relation to the WFD, agriculture policy and the impact of agriculture on diffuse pollution, biofuels and water use.

Stephanie Croguennec (DG Environment) presented the state-of-the-play with respect to WFD implementation and CAP. She reported on the state of WFD implementation, current issues related to the CAP health check, the sustainability criteria for biofuels production, the communication related to water scarcity and droughts and about the white paper on adaptation to climate change.

Regarding WFD the key challenges are:

- setting up environmental objectives,
- making the link with exemptions,
- integrating the WFD with climate change issues, and
- defining water pricing policies.

[4] Within the French presidency planned a conference to bring public in france to the discussion of the WDF, 13 & 14 Novembre 2008, organised by the Loire-Bretagne water agency.

The public participation on the RBMPs should start at the latest December 2008, followed by a conference (in 2009) to discuss final versions of RBMPs.

The CAP "Health Check" process resulted in proposals to better link water and CAP. These proposals are currently under discussion in the Council.

A new proposal for a directive on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources may be adopted by the end of 2008, in which it is expected at least a 10% share of renewable energy (primarily biofuels) in the transport sector by 2020. This may impact the objectives of the WFD. The sustainability criteria of this directive are under discussion by the Council and the Parliament.

The Communication on water scarcity and droughts presented in July 2007 contained several key challenges which must be tackled in a follow-up report to be presented by the end of 2008.

The white paper on adaptation to climate change aims to reduce the vulnerability of social, economic structures and ecosystems to the impacts of climate change. Water is a key issue in the adaptation debate. Some of the issues considered in the paper are: early action, more information exchange, and establishment of climate proof infrastructures such as green infrastructures (e.g. natural parks) and grey infrastructures (e.g. housing and energy infrastructure). This paper is to be presented by the end of 2008.

Martin Scheele (DG. Agriculture) gave a presentation about the state-of-the-play of the "health check" of the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP). The health check will address new challenges such as water scarcity and droughts, bioenergy and climate change. Further, the Commission aims to improve of the balance between the 1st and 2nd Pillar through increasing modulation to 8% per year.

Mr Scheele also addressed the issue of the polluter-pays principle, which is considered controversial. Are we paying farmers to avoid pollution or paying to encourage environmental improvement?

The last presentation was made by Marijn Van der Velde (JRC) on the role of agriculture in a changing environment, concentrating on the impact of biofuel crops on diffuse pollution and water use. Biofuels are complex because they are linked to several horizontal policies that have different objectives: energy, rural development, GHG emission control and environment improvement. Van der Velde presented several models that identify the impacts of climate change on crop yield, demand for water and nitrogen use efficiency. Van der Velde also drew attention to the need to better quantify water use in EU for irrigation and groundwater availability.

After all panellists had presented and answered technical questions participants had time to discuss general questions, namely:

- The size of the proposed buffer strips under the health check. The Commission intends to leave the definition to the MS which allows regional approaches;

- If the reference levels of water pollution are considered by society to be too low who should pay the costs for higher standards? Should the cost of poor water quality be imposed on the farmers or does this interfere with their land use rights? Where is the limit to demanding farmers to comply with WFD objectives? Who should decide?

- The extent to which the resurrection of the soil directive could help in the implementation of WFD as there is a strong link between soil and water.

- Request for a timeframe for the implementation of Art. 38 for the implementation of RBMP. DG Agriculture is still working on the measures.

- The use of taxation to reduce nitrates usage or measures to increase efficiency.

4 Session II: National programmes of Measures

Pierre Strosser (ACTeon) presented the results of five EU case studies on water pricing. The study should contribute to a better understanding of the environmental and economic impacts of water pricing to farmers. Even if work is in progress, preliminary results show that a change in water pricing will impact farmers differently, depending on the regional conditions. The results also indicate that change in prices leads to changes in land use and cropping pattern, as an increase in price leads to a reduction of irrigated areas and a change in type of crops. This leads to a reduction of the farm gross value added, but water pricing can also bring additional direct and indirect benefits to other sectors. However, the main sources of uncertainty regarding the effects of water pricing are the future prices of agriculture products, the growing importance of local markets, climate change, control and enforcement of policy.

Mr Ryder (DEFRA) gave a presentation on the inter-play of WFD and the Nitrates Directive in the UK. One of the major problems in practical terms is the different time frame of both directives. While the WFD requires a programme of measures every 6 years, the Nitrate Directive requires one every four years.

Mr. Henneberg (RBC Weser) presented the main results of the case study of the river basin Weser in Germany. The case study analysed the impacts of measures in the reduction and quantification of nitrates and phosphates of the Weser catchment area. Results show that the implemented measures reduced the phosphorus emissions over a period of 20 years. The PoM also reduced N, but for nitrates this reduction is more subtle. Based on these findings, it is suggested to use 8-10 measures that have high degree of acceptance by farmers. Estimates of the costs of supplementary measures were made and for most of the river basin area costs are lower than 30 EUR/ha. In some regions, however, costs may be more than 90EUR/ha.

Sarah Feuillette (Agence d'Eau Seine-Normandie), in her example of the Seine-Normandy river basin, showed that the costs of reaching WFD objectives by 2015 would be very high and of low acceptance. The Seine-Normandy basin aims at reaching good status in 2/3 of its surface water bodies and 1/3 of its groundwater bodies. In the other water bodies, a delay exemption is asked for, justified in the case of disproportionate costs by a cost-benefit analysis conducted on coherent groups of water bodies. Feuillette presented the model used to justify exemptions for disproportionate costs. An analysis was also conducted at the basin level. The results show that the gap between benefits and costs is not so big, especially since all the benefits could not be assessed (for example the ones on biodiversity or on soils). An assessment was made of the (indirect) benefits to health, which if they are taken into account reverses the result (benefits become higher than costs). Feuillette concludes that the main problem is not how to justify disproportionate costs but how to finance the agricultural measures of the "realistic" program of measures. Available funds are far from being sufficient and the 8% modulation won't be sufficient. In her view, a different use of the first pillar should be studied.

After the presentation some technical questions where discussed with regard to:

- How to distinguish between the costs of basic and supplementary measures;
- Criteria used for disproportionate costs; and
- Relation between agriculture land abandonment and water pricing

No general conclusions can be drawn from the discussion.

5 Session IV: Results from the Working Groups

5.1 Working Group 1 - Supplementary measures

The working group started with a presentation by Lothar Nolte concerning the experiences with the selection of supplementary agriculture measures in the Lower Saxony region of Germany.

Lothar indicated that supplementary measures in Lower Saxony were necessary because the Nitrates Directive is not sufficient for dealing with sensitive areas in any cases unless the strictest level is applied to the entire state area. The latter would restrict agriculture in general disproportionally. He argued that the tandem of basic and supplementary measures allows for designing tailored programmes to comply with the timeframe introduced by the WFD. To have the cooperation of farmers, it was necessary to communicate issues and discuss measures – in Lower Saxony this stakeholder participation process was helped by a LIFE project. An interesting point raised concerning communication with farmers was that it was helpful to discuss issues and measures in terms of load reductions rather than concentration levels.

Lothar went on to describe the approach used in Lower Saxony to determine the target areas for reducing nitrogen. A range of cost-efficiency estimates for different measures was shown, which had been based on detailed research.

Finally, in terms of selecting types of measures, voluntary measures were given highest priority (cover crops, manure management, reduced tillage etc..). Additional regulatory measures will only being introduced if voluntary measures prove being insufficient. Financial instruments (e.g. introducing a N-tax) would distort the market if it was not applied at the EU level. Incentives to encourage N-efficiency improvements were on the other hand under consideration.

Following the presentation by Lothar Nolte a general discussion was started to answer some of the structured questions posed by the conference organizers.

Before the questions were addressed it was pointed out that it was essential to know how to derive reduction aims, so a number of MS gave insights into how they approached assessing the gap between WFD targets for a pressure and the baseline. Some examples included comparing nutrient levels between coastal waters and rivers and matching surface water quality targets based on modelling techniques.

There was a discussion comparing basic and supplementary measures. In many newer Member States (and also some older Member States), authorities are still getting to grips with implementing the Nitrates Directive. It is therefore clear that Member States are at different stages of implementation. There was a remark to give basic measures sufficient time to assess effectiveness.

There were some very different views (and experiences) on the consultation process, ranging from “water authorities holding regular and useful local workshops with farmers and other stakeholders”, to “complaints about the non-transparency of the process and a non effective dialogue between water authorities and stakeholders”, to

“there is a view that consultation equates to confrontation when it comes to discussing the WFD”.

There was a discussion on whether there was a perceived link between the cost-effectiveness of measures and their acceptance by farmers. Measures to conserve or develop wetlands were seen as measures that could resolve a number of water management problems, but there were some doubts about the affordability of wetland creation. Measures to reduce fertiliser use seemed to be cost effective but were not well accepted by farmers. Promoting cover crops was also viewed as being a cost-effective measure, but in some cases there was poor acceptance because it caused inflexibility for particular farming systems (e.g., farms providing peas for the freezer food industry needed to meet tight deadlines). There was a recommendation, therefore, to have a more flexible approach to promoting this measure. In some cases it was reported that acceptance levels improved by holding workshops with farmers (advisory boards) and that financial incentives were useful for increasing acceptance. A case was reported of offering alternative upland areas as compensation for using valley bottom lands for developing wetlands.

In terms of providing comments on whether the bioenergy issue is being considered by Member States in the first RBMP, there were different points of view expressed. Farmer organisations are very supportive of giving more priority to bioenergy issues in the agriculture sector. The other point of view was that there are environmental risks identified in producing bioenergy and it was felt that the existing instruments are sufficient for the first RBMPs. There was a discussion on the sustainability criteria of bioenergy to address major shifts in land use, increasing risks of diffuse pollution, and farmers being less interested in agri-environmental measures because of higher prices for their products.

There were no comments from the participants on whether new economic instruments were being proposed for the RBMPs.

5.2 Working Group 2 - Exemptions

The working group started with a presentation by R. Holländer in which he described a methodology developed for assessing exemptions mainly for surface waters. The approach aims to be user-friendly and flexible.

In this approach, the costs of a program of measures have to be considered in relation to a standard. Therefore, they first look at what the standard costs of the programmes of measures are in a certain region. The costs relative to the surface or to the population density are taken into account rather than the absolute costs. Basic assumptions for developing the approach were that exemptions to meet the objectives of the WFD should not be the rule and that in the majority of cases the costs of the programme of measures will be appropriate. This implies that the costs are in general related to adequate benefits. Therefore, the costs of a programme of measures for a specific water body are compared with the median of the programmes of measures costs for all water bodies in an investigated area. This median value is the reference value. Of course, the reference value can not be taken as the threshold cost as the costs of half the programmes of measures are above the reference value.

To define the threshold cost we first look at the improvements in biological, physic-chemical, and chemical parameters realized by implementing the programmes of measures in that specific water body. If a major improvement will be realized, then the reference cost is multiplied by two to calculate the threshold cost. If a moderate improvement will be realized the reference cost is multiplied by one and a half to calculate the threshold costs.

Next the threshold cost is adjusted to take into account that a programme of measures leads to specific/additional benefits for a specific water body. So, the total benefit realized by a programme of measures is split into a target benefit and a special/additional benefit. The target benefit refers to the positive effects that result from achieving good status. The special benefits refer to all other positive effects (in addition to achieving good status) in this specific water body. To make a statement about disproportional costs, the extent of the special benefits has to be judged. If the special benefits for a specific water body are disproportionately high, then a disproportionate cost of a program of measure may be justified. To judge the special/additional benefit, an effect matrix is used to judge what the impact of the different measures within a program of measures is on different use categories. This allows calculating a factor with which the threshold cost should be adjusted to find the 'adapted' threshold cost for the programme of measures of a specific water body.

It becomes clear the methodology presented by R. Holländer does not require a monetary quantification of the benefits. Hence, a monetary valuation of all advantages of a programme of measure is not necessary.

The five step procedure of the methodology can be summarized as follows:

Step 1: Checking the suspicion of disproportionate costs on water body level

- look at relative cost (cost per surface, cost per inhabitant)
- use the median of cost in the investigated area as the reference value

Step 2: Comparing costs of measures with cost threshold values (Multiplier X reference value)

- If major improvements in the water body occur, multiply the reference value with 2 to arrive at the threshold cost
- If minor improvements in the water body occur, multiply the reference value with 1.5 to arrive at the threshold cost

Step 3: Checking relevance and extent of special benefit of a programme of measures for a specific water body.

- A programme of measures leads to a total benefit which consists of a 'target benefit' (=good status) and an specific/additional benefit in a specific water body'
- Use an effect matrix and look at the positive effect of the programme in 6 use categories.

Step 4: Adapting cost threshold values in relation to the identified special benefit

Step 5: Comparing cost of measure with adapted cost threshold values

The approach presented by R. Holländer was particularly useful as a threshold cost values were calculated at the level of the water body.

After the presentation, the different participants discussed in a 'tour the table' whether their country was asking exemptions and on what ground. It became clear that the majority of countries ask for exemptions. There is a clear tendency to say "Yes, we can meet the objectives of the WFD, but not by 2015". In that context, a country should be aware that WFD exemptions will not be an open door to fail meeting the obligations of other directives (such as the urban wastewater, nitrate).

MS typically ask for exemptions because natural conditions do not allow reaching the good status (especially in the case of ground water), for technical reasons and due to affordability issues. However, it was stressed that one should not only look at public funding. One should also look at what costs private agents can bear. To find funding, countries should not only look at the agricultural tool box, but also to other less straight forward, non-traditional ways to finance costs. Exemptions will only be granted if all financing options have been explored. They will not be granted because countries did not yet have enough time to explore the financing options. Technical conditions can be a reason to grant exemptions but not because a country was late in implementing certain measures.

5.3 Working Group 3 - supplementary measures

As WG I, WG III also focused on the issue of supplementary agricultural measures and how to select them. After a short tour the table, Francisco Mundo and Raffaella Zucaro gave a presentation on the Italian approach. In Italy supplementary measures will include a wide range of different measures (e.g. legislative and administrative instruments, negotiated environmental agreements, emission controls, recreation and restoration of wetlands areas, efficiency and reuse measures, construction projects, educational projects, research, development and demonstration projects). The presentation focused on some measures as an example and discussed the issues of acceptance, control and the selection process.

After the presentation the following four questions where discussed among the participants representing Luxemburg, France, Austria, Germany, UK, Netherlands, Finland, Estonia, Sweden, Italy and several stakeholder groups of the farming sector:

- How was the selection process organised – lessons learned?
- Which types of measures are applied mostly?
- Is there a link between the cost-effectiveness of the measures and their acceptance by farmers?
- The issue of bioenergy in the first cycle?

With regard to the first three questions the following conclusions can be drawn:

- In all Member States (MS) the selection process is organised via regional approaches (based on River Basins or administrative units). The farmers are/were involved in all cases as this is seen as an essential factor for success.

- Some MS developed national guidelines for the selection process. In other cases or to complement these approaches, expert consulting was important when selecting the measures.

- The measures applied by the MS are mostly technical measures (e.g. agri-environmental measures (AEM)). Only some MS will apply economic approaches. However, a wide range of measures is being applied by the MS. While some measures have been applied in one MS for years, others just started a discussion.

- Several MS will implement the measures by using voluntary approaches and rural development funding to compensate farmers. Some MS reported that in some cases voluntary measures will become mandatory under the WFD. (e.g. Luxemburg will take mandatory action if not 90% of farmers participate in AEM).

- In most cases the measures discussed to be included in the River Basin Management Plans are the same ones used before the WFD was in force. However, due to the several activities under the WFD (discussions with stakeholder, research activities, and modelling), measures are better targeted with regard to “hot spots” and effectiveness.

- It is also clear from the discussion that the political framework of the CAP is most crucial for implementing measures and for the second cycle..

- The issue of cost effectiveness and acceptance was only briefly discussed and only some general statements were made. In several cases, the more cost effective a measure is, the less accepted it is. But acceptance seems more important than effectiveness for certain MS. There was also a statement that mandatory measures are often more cost effective.

The last question about bioenergy was discussed very briefly in the working group. Several MS discussed the issue, but in most cases the issue was not considered to be relevant or too little data is available to address bioenergy issues in the first RBMP cycle. However, all participants agreed that bioenergy is an issue for the 2nd cycle.

Other issues that were discussed:

- The role of property rights and water use has to be investigated further. This does not only refer to the right of water abstraction, it refers also to the limits on land use and land management activities related to water pollution.

- Further, under the 2nd cycle of the RBMP there is a need to take into account the relation between climate change and the selection of seeds. With climate change it is likely that farmers use more pesticides because of a more humid and unstable climate and because of the fact that crop varieties are often not adapted to local micro-climate conditions. This lack of adaption and resilience is also a result of national seed controls which do not consider regional circumstances and of excessive homogeneity in varieties and in crops.

5.4 Working Group 4 – Exemptions

Working Group 4 discussed the use of exemptions to the environmental objectives of the Water Framework Directive, focusing on criteria to justify their use such as uncertainty, affordability and disproportionality. In addition to the questions provided by the conference organizers, the group also added questions regarding process, level of ambition and implication of uncertainty. Article 9 issues were not discussed.

Two presentations served to kick off the discussion. Kevin Andrews presented the UK approach. He first discussed the approach taken at national level (i.e. impact assessment, consultation on new diffuse pollution powers) and then at river basin level (i.e. compliance assessment, source apportionment, proportionality). In the UK measures are separated into 4 categories: measures already happening; new measures that will happen; new measures that may happen at (a) national and (b) national, RBD targeted; and new measures that may happen – local, RBD agreed. He then discussed the steps taken to identify current or planned measures as well as an analysis of the measures for their potential to reach objectives and their cost-effectiveness (with regard to proportionality). He also talked about the potential need to introduce alternative objectives in light of technical infeasibility, disproportionality of costs and natural conditions. Andrews also brought up the aspect of uncertainty (from understating compliance to quantifying costs and benefits) and how it influences selection of measures.

Mario Cerutti gave the second presentation regarding the use of exemptions in the Meuse Transboundary River Basin. He first gave a general overview of the river basin and its current status regarding WFD implementation. He then talked about the main environmental issues related to agriculture in the River Basin (eutrophication of surface water and diffuse pollution of groundwater) and the need for transboundary coordination to achieve objectives. Through modelling, it is clear many exemptions are needed in the RB as environmental objectives will not be achieved by 2015 or by 2021. The principle exemption requested is an extension in the deadline. In the Meuse RB, mainly natural conditions explain the need for exemptions but also disproportionate costs.

Following the presentations the group members discussed which criteria are applicable for exemptions: uncertainty, budgets, natural conditions, proportionality and affordability. Level of ambition was also discussed: the level should be set higher and then reduced if the objectives cannot be met.

Based on the discussion, four key conclusions were made:

1. For agriculture uncertainty is a key criterion. Uncertainty affects all other criteria regarding the using of exemptions. Furthermore, it affects the decision which measures to use to address agriculture concerns or whether additional measures are necessary, as outcomes are not guaranteed. There is uncertainty regarding budget issues and affordability as well as the use of alternative sources of funding. It was concluded, however, that uncertainty alone cannot justify exemptions. R&D is therefore needed to address uncertainty concerns.

2. CAP is a relevant tool to address exemptions although it is uncertain to what extent. There is uncertainty regarding the benefits CAP can bring and whether additional measures targeting agriculture will have an impact. It was also discussed that agri-environmental measures can be beneficial but the issue is how to get farmers to apply for voluntary measures. CAP was also discussed in terms of its potential use for funding, but alternative funding sources need to be explored beyond CAP.
3. Coordination is necessary to address uncertainty and disproportionality. Regarding disproportionality, there needs to be a consensus on how to measure the cost-benefit ratio as well as to agree at what ratio disproportionality occurs. More coordination is also needed to bring actors from both environment and agriculture together. Transboundary coordination in the form of bilateral agreements for groundwater was discussed.
4. Tied to coordination is the need for transparency of assessments. What criteria are being used: quantitative and/or qualitative. The justification for exemptions needs to be as clear as possible.

6 Session V - Final remarks & way forward

The session was chaired by Peter Gammeltoft who outlined the next steps in the WFD implementation process and also highlighted the different new challenges ahead. This included:

- the public consultation process that is required from the 22 December 2008;
- the importance of water pricing not only as a requirement of the WFD, but also in order to address water scarcity;
- the use of exemptions which have to be applied to individual water bodies. He further stressed the need for satisfactory justifications addressing cost and benefits. He made clear that uncertainty is not a satisfactory justification for not reaching WFD objectives; there will be always uncertainty; and
- the importance of considering climate change, while ensuring that it does not become an excuse for non-action.

7 Annex 1: Final Conference Programme

Thursday, 18 September 2008:	
12:00	Registration
13:30	**Session I - Opening** **Chair:** Water Director France (Jean-Claude Vial)
15 Min	• Welcome by the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (Fritz Holzwarth, German Water Director)
15 Min	• Welcome (Jean-Claude Vial, French Water Director)
10 Min	• Technical introduction to the Conference (Thomas Dworak, Ecologic)
20 Min	• State-of-play of WFD and agriculture related issues (Stephanie Croguennec, DG ENV)
20 Min	• State-of-play of agricultural policy Health Check (Martin Scheele, DG AGRI)
20 Min	• The role of agriculture in a changing environment - diffuse pollution, biofuel crops and water use (Marijn van der Velde, JRC)
20 Min	Plenary Discussion
15:30	Coffee Break
16:00	**Session II - Presentation of national Programs of Measures** **Chair:** Chris Ryder, DEFRA, UK
20 Min	• Water Pricing: Results from 5 EU case studies (Pierre Strosser, ACTeon)
20 Min	• MS 2: Interplay of WFD and Nitrates-Directive (Chris Ryder, DEFRA, UK)
20 Min	• Measures: reduction and quantification, example from Germany (Simon Henneberg, RBC Weser)
20 Min	• Making use of exemptions, example from France (Sarah Feuillette, Agence de l'Eau Seine-Normandie, France)
20 Min	Discussion
30 Min	**Last Speech before closing:** *Rural Area – Future Development and Perspectives* (Lutz Ribbe, EURONATUR)
18:30	Closing of Day 1

20:00 Evening reception **Invitation from the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety**	
Friday, 19 September 2008:	
8:30	**Session III – Parallel Working Groups** **Chair:** German Water Director (Fritz Holzwarth)
WG I:	Programmes of Measures - Focus on the supplementary agricultural measures included in the programmes of measures process of selection and types of measures *Moderator: Kor van Hoof (BE)* *Speaker: Lothar Nolte (D)*
WG II:	Programmes of Measures - Focus on the use of exemptions in relation with agricultural activities approach taken at river basin level *Moderator: Sindre Langaas (SE)* *Speaker:Robert Holländer (D)*
WG III :	Programmes of Measures - Focus on the supplementary agricultural measures included in the programmes of measures process of selection and types of measures *Moderator: Claude Neuberg (LUX)* *Speaker: Francisco Mundo (IT)*
WG IV:	Programmes of Measures - Focus on the use of exemptions in relation with agricultural activities approach taken at river basin level *Moderator: Pierre Strosser (ACTeon)* *Speaker: Kevin Andrews (UK) and Mario Cerutti (Meuse-Maas Commission)*
11:30	Coffee Break
12:00	**Session IV – Report-back from Working Groups** **Chair:** Head of 'water and marine environment' Unit, DG Environment (Peter Gammeltoft)
	Report-back from the Working Groups (Rapporteurs: Ecologic Vito team) Plenary discussion
13:00	**Conclusions and the way forward**
13.30	**Lunch Buffet**