

EVALUATION REPORT

Final Version of 26/August/2021

Deliverable Number D.3.2.2

Project Acronym	CREW
Project ID Number	10044942
Project Title	Coordinated Wetland management in Italy-Croatia cross border region
Priority Axis	3 Environment and cultural heritage
Specific objective	3.2 Contribute to protect and restore biodiversity
Work Package Number	3
Work Package Title	Creation of the CREW Observatory and definition of the IT-HR cross border Strategy
Activity Number	3.2.
Activity Title	Definition of the IT-HR cross border Strategy for the protection of wetlands
Partner in Charge	IUAV
Partners involved	ALL PPs
Status	Final
Distribution	Public

Summary

Notes	3
Executive Summary	4
B. EVALUATION AND COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE WETLAND CONTRACTS	5
C. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE IMPLEMENTED WETLAND CONTRACTS.....	25

Notes

1) Activity 2 - Definition of the IT-HR cross border Strategy for the protection of wetlands

The reference for this Deliverable is the Activity n.2 of the Application Form.

The activity aims at developing the CREW cross border strategy for the protection and management of Italian and Croatian coastal protected wetlands. This activity has to be read in close connection with WP 4 (Implementation of Wetland Contracts in target areas). Indeed, on one side the cross-border priorities shared by the partners at the first stage of the project builds the base for the implementation of the local Wetland Contracts objectives and strategic scenarios (D.4.3.2), and on the other side the cross-border strategy will be eventually perfected through the evaluation of the tested pilot Wetland Contracts (D.4.3.4) at the last stage of the project.

2) DELIVERABLE 3.2.2

The D.3.2.2, or Evaluation report aims to compare Wetland Contracts pilot experiences.

Specifically, in this template, the report will compare each pilot activity results at the end of the WP4, and finally evaluate with a cross border approach the effectiveness of the implemented Wetland Contracts in reference to the following components and indicators: (i) biodiversity, water quality, ecosystem services, protection level; (ii) actors engagement (are the engaged actors key stakeholders for the focused process?); (iii) effectiveness of the tool; (iv) financial coverage for designed measures and actions; (v) positive and negative impacts.

3) Template

This template has been developed by IUAV (University of Venice) on the basis of UNICAM (University of Camerino) templates. It is inspired by and coordinated with the documentation elaborated in the Project WETNET financed under Interreg MED Cooperation Programme to increase information share, data and opportunities of confrontation.

Authors: Iuav University of Venice

Executive Summary

I. Approach to the comparative analysis

The comparison between the different Contracts processes has been conducted starting from geographical and morphological characters of the target areas. Similarities and differences of the involved wetlands have been highlighted, together with relevant aspects related to natural and cultural heritage, as well as specific criticalities.

Another important starting point for the comparison has been the stakeholders' maps, analysed in terms of number, typology and type of involvement of actors, public/private bodies and organisations.

Subsequently, CREW wetland contracts have been observed from the contents and products point of view.

In terms of the ambitions and aspirations that these contracts propose to achieve, a number of macro-objectives common to all target areas have been identified, indicating a common horizon among the experiences carried out. At the same time, some specific objectives have been recognised as elements of diversity and peculiarity among the areas, which emerged especially in the Territorial Labs.

Similarly, the proposed actions were also analysed, taking into account the types of activities, the socio-environmental aspects involved, the indicators characterising each action, the actors responsible and/or involved, the budget required and the resources available or to be found.

Finally, some considerations were made by looking at the timing of the implementation of the different action programmes, highlighting the timing and distribution over time of the different activities.

II. Overview

This document has been structured into two main parts: the first one explicates the evaluation and comparative analysis of the wetland contracts; the second one proposes a review of all the processes carried out and the tools produced.

Part B. EVALUATION AND COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE WETLAND CONTRACTS introduces the target areas and their similarities/differences, but also gives an analysis of the Contracts taking into account subscribers, objectives and actions, with an overview on actions and actors typologies, budget and timing of the Action Program.

Part C. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE IMPLEMENTED WETLAND CONTRACTS highlights common and different weaknesses and obstacles that Contracts processes have been faced, as well as present and future positive/negative impacts, verified or expected for the implementation of the tool.

The document closes with a reflection on the role, including the potential role, of the observatory and a general assessment of the contract instrument and the processes that led to the subscriptions.

B. EVALUATION AND COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE WETLAND CONTRACTS

Chapter number and name		Contents
B. EVALUATION and COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE WETLAND CONTRACTS	I. Introduction:	<p>Pilot Areas</p> <p>The Pilot Areas represented in the project CREW "Coordinated Wetland management in Italy-Croatia Cross Border Region" are seven, four in Italy and three in Croatia, here indicated as:</p> <p>1-LV - Northern Lagoon of Venice (Iuav University);</p> <p>2-ML - Marano Lagoon (Comunità Riviera Friulana);</p> <p>3-OR - Ofanto River (Patto Territoriale Nord Barese Ofantino);</p> <p>4-SR - Sentina Natural Regional Reserve (Municipality of San Benedetto del Tronto);</p> <p>5-RP - Special ornithological Reserve Palud (Natura Histrica);</p> <p>6-VM - Veliko i Malo blato (Natura Jadera);</p> <p>7-DN -Protected natural areas of Dubrovnik-Neretva (The Public institution for the management of protected natural areas of Dubrovnik-Neretva County);</p> <p>The Pilot Areas are very different in size and from a morphological and functional point of view. All of them are vulnerable and fragile areas that need protection on different levels: biodiversity, water quality, ecosystem service, in the different context. Not only biodiversity and the presence of different floristic and faunal habitats, but also the combination of the natural heritage with the presence of a stratified social and economic culture, which has deposited artefacts, food culture, skills and practices over the centuries. As a double frontier of water and land, these territories are the subject of formal and informal practices and are therefore strongly regulated.</p>

		<p>Size</p> <p>In order of size LV, DN and ML, lagoons and delta river are the biggest pilot areas: LV is approximately 220 km², DN 200 km², ML 160 km².</p> <p>Then we have the protected ornithological reserved areas, VM of 4,61 km² and RP of 2,26 km². The smallest area is SR 1,77 km² linked to the Tronto river mouth environment. Its importance is linked to the fact that it is the only residual wetland area in the wide stretch of the Adriatic coastline, over 400 km long, between the Comacchio Valleys and Lesina and Varano lagoons.</p> <p>Morphology</p> <p>From the morphological point of view in LV and ML one of the main aspects is the excavation of canals that have changed the hydraulic dynamics, has kept the overall morphology sufficiently unaltered in the northern lagoon with a good level of meandering that guarantees the correct exchange between fresh and saltwater. The balance of the transformations of the salt marshes is negative in the most recent period, with accentuated erosion phenomena. Among these the main forcing seems to be subsidence (the local one deriving from a compaction of clayey sediment and peat), followed by the transit of boats and natural wave motion. The geomorphological characteristics of the areas have been largely modified by the action of man who has gradually recovered, through reclamation for agricultural or industrial uses, environments previously characterized by swamps that served as a link between the mainland and the sea.</p> <p>For the DN pilot area, Delta River is the largest river mouth in the country of Croatia and is one of the few remaining wetlands in Europe, consisting of remnants of Mediterranean wetlands with preserved coastal lagoons. Particularly prominent are reedbeds where many endangered species of animals live. In the area of the Neretva Delta, six geographically defined areas with a total area of 1.624 ha are protected with the Nature Protection Act</p>
--	--	--

		<p>For OR there are significant differences between the Ofanto Mouth and the Valley, and these determine different needs and priorities that have characterized the process. As a result, most of the activities outlined in the action plan have a single geographical target (Mouth).</p> <p>SR presents relict ecological conditions in an almost completely anthropized territory. Currently it has unique floristic characteristics and, above all, from the fauna point of view, it plays a decisive role for migratory avifauna, thus representing a strategic element for the ecological network, also in a vast area. RP is basically a shallow brackish wetland with highly variable ecological conditions (temperature, salinity, oxygen levels). Some 240 bird species have been recorded over the years, with some endangered and strictly protected species starting to nest there in recent years (<i>Himantopus himantopus</i> (VU), <i>Tadorna tadorna</i>).</p> <p>The reserve VM is uncommon because of the karst landscape of the area, the wetland area surrounded by reed offers a huge variety of accessible food resources for transiting birds.</p> <p>Relevant aspects</p> <p>All the pilot areas have been selected for different relevant aspects on natural and cultural heritage.</p> <p>UNESCO declared Venice and its lagoon a World Heritage Site in 1987, recognizing the presence of a widespread and diverse heritage: environmental and landscape, archaeological, historical, architectural and ethnological.</p> <p>The delta DN has been declared an area of the Natura 2000 ecological network of particular importance to the European Union as a Special Protection Area (SPA) and a Site of Community Importance (SCI), with a total area amounting to about 23.800 ha. DN is also a POP (areas of importance for the conservation and exploitation of the favourable status of wild birds of interest to the European Union as well as their habitats and areas important for the preservation of migratory species of</p>
--	--	--

		<p>birds, especially wetlands of international importance) and RAMSAR AREA - humid habitats are included in the list of wetlands of international importance (Wetlands Convention, 1971)</p> <p>RP has been proclaimed in 2001 Special ornithological Reserve, and VM in 1989.</p>
	<p>II. Subscribers:</p>	<p>The Wetland Contracts have been signed by 135 stakeholders in the 7 pilot areas.</p> <p>These include:</p> <p>1 Ministry (Croatian Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development);</p> <p>8 Regions (Abruzzo, Basilicata, Campania, Friuli Venezia Giulia, Marche, Puglia, Istrian County, Zadar County, Zazablje County);</p> <p>6 Provinces (Ascoli Piceno, Avellino, Barletta-Andria-Trani, Foggia, Potenza, Teramo);</p> <p>22 Municipalities (Ascoli Piceno, Carlino, Cavallino Treporti, Jesolo, Kula Norinska, Latisana, Lignano Sabbiadoro, Marano Lagunare, Martinsicuro, Metkovic, Musile di Piave, Muzzana del Turgnano, Opuzen, Rovinj, Palazzolo dello Stella, Pocenia, Pojezerje, Porpetto, Precenicco, Ronchis, San Giorgio di Nogaro, Zažablje);</p> <p>32 other Territorial Institution (Agency for watershed of the Adriatic sea, Agency for Public Health of Istria County, Anbi Veneto, Archaeological Museum of Istria, ARPA FVG, Assonautica, Central Apennine District Basin Authority, Comunità Riviera Friulana, Consorzio di Bonifica Veneto Orientale, Consorzio di Bonifica Acque Risorgive, Croatian Water Agency (Hrvatske vode), Croatian State Inspectorate, County Fire Department, County Police Department, Croatian Forests (Hrvatske šume), District basin authority of the Eastern Alps, Italia Nostra ,GAC-FLAG, LegaCoop FVG, Hutovo Blato Nature Park, Museum of the City of Rovinj–Rovigno, Natura Jadera, PromoTurismo FVG, Provveditorato Interregionale OO. PP. Triveneto, Public Institution Natura Histrica, Tourist Board of the City of Rovinj-Rovigno, Tourist board of the Municipality of Bale–Valle, Tourist</p>

		<p>board of the Municipality of Kanfanar, Touristic Board Povljana, Tourist Board of Ploce City, Regional Agency DUNEA, WWF Italia);</p> <p>9 Universities and Research bodies (University of Camerino, Iuav University of Venice, University of Padua, University Ca' Foscari, Co.Ri.La, University Juraj Dobrila in Pula, Croatian academy of science and art - Department of ornithology, Institute for agriculture and tourism Poreč, Engineering Faculty in Rijeka, University of Trieste - Department of engineering and architecture);</p> <p>41 Associations and organizations (AATO5, Amici del parco di San Giuliano, Archeoclub d'Italia, Archeoscuola, Baštinik, Biom, Brkata sjenica, Ekos Club, ClimAct, Prometheus Open Food Lab, Confraternita Serenissima, Venezia Nativa, La Salsola, Toci!, We are here Venice, OTS, Polo San Giuliano, Vela al Terzo, Mare Vivo Veneto, WigWam, WWF Venezia e territorio, Tra Mar e Laguna, WWF Adria, VeGAL, FIAB Mestre, Hunting association Rovinj, Hunters Alliance of Zadar County, Association Volim Vlašidi, Associazione Valle del Cormor, Gruppo Passaggio a Nord Ovest Carlino Marano Muzzana, Associazione Casoneri, Italia Nostra, Pro Loco Muzzana, RipuliAmoci, Menti Libere di Lignano Sabbiadoro, Legambiente FVG, CIIP, Sentina Association, Legambiente Circolo Lu Cucale of San Benedetto del Tronto, L.I.D.A., Marche a rifiuti Zero Association);</p> <p>6 Individuals (Margherita Bodi, Olja Fazlović, Ingrid Hrga, Ernesto Tiani, Louie Thomas Taylor);</p> <p>3 Schools (Istituto Comprensivo "Cuore dello Stella" di Rivignano Teor, Istituto Comprensivo Palazzolo dello Stella, Istituto Comprensivo "Università Castrenze" di San Giorgio di Nogaro);</p> <p>7 companies and privates (NET SpA, Bilancia di Bepi, GLAMPING, Selva Giurata Farm business, RETE BIKE FVG - SOCIETA' COOPERATIVA, AZIENDA MOTONAVE GEREMIA, IN BICI IN FRIULI)</p>
--	--	---

	<p>III. Specific objectives</p>	<p>The aims of all the wetland Contracts, the main objective of the CREW project, can be traced back to improvement in the 7 pilot areas: biodiversity, water quality, ecosystem service, protection level (normative framework).</p> <p>The specific objectives of CREW project are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. set up a cross border Observatory to monitor best practices and data on Italian and Croatian coastal wetlands. 2. to protect the biodiversity in Italian and Croatian coastal wetlands by the implementation of a coordinated methodology for wetlands management (Wetland Contract) in coherence with the ICZM principles. Enhancing the implementation of an integrated tool, the project will assure higher coordination among stakeholders and decision makers, limiting and absorbing raising conflicts between preservation issues and economic activities (farming, aquaculture, tourism) and will enhance the achievement of sustainable long-term results. 3. to share a cross border strategy and strengthen synergies among Italian and Croatian coastal wetlands; 4. to improve the public awareness about the value of the wetlands ecosystems among policy makers, managers, professionals, and the general public and strengthen their active engagement in territorial governance. <p>The cross-cutting objectives are:</p> <p>aimed at building a cross-border strategy are focused on landscape and environmental rehabilitation and socio-economic regeneration of the territorial system. In particular, the Contracts aim to combine the management of water, hydro-morphological risks and local development in an integrated, collaborative and sustainable manner. The Contracts are intended as a voluntary act of commitment shared by various public and private stakeholders aimed at finding ways to pursue objectives of landscape and environmental rehabilitation and socio-economic regeneration of the territorial system.</p>
--	---------------------------------	--

		<p>In the following notes we will list the specific objectives with partners values and definitions:</p> <p>Cross border Observatory</p> <p>Updated and digitally accessible database for the cluster projects, both material and immaterial. Fighting and mitigating climate change. Improve habitability, walkability and connection. Enhancement of slow and conscious mobility. Tourism is eco-sustainable and based on an experiential qualitative model.</p> <p>Protect biodiversity</p> <p>Care for the environment and culture; biodiversity of habitats and species, environmental healthiness; morphological and ecosystem system heritage value, defence of dunes and avifauna, embankments, sandbanks, coastal banks, phanerogams dynamics; Salinity of the lagoon, depth of the main and secondary channels. New skills are developed in the university field, specific courses for new environmental challenges, implementation of new aspects of territorial planning involving undergraduates and graduates; reduction of anthropic disturbance to the nesting of the species to be protected, to the use of a path and cycle network compatible with the protected areas, to a rationalization of landings; Inhabitants behaviour regarding the nature protection regulations and fire prevention.</p> <p>Share a cross border strategy</p> <p>Recovery and reuse of the water resource; fighting coastal erosion; activate and guarantee a process of public participation and sharing on issues related to the landscape in order to share choices and strategies; recognized potential for sustainable tourism and agriculture; information boards regarding protected areas devastated; agriculture: pesticides, reclamation, cattle breeding.</p> <p>Improve the public awareness about the value of the wetlands ecosystems among policy makers.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Sense of belonging to a unique natural/anthropic system, sense of care and affection, education and training, regulatory and administrative clarity, synergy between local organizations and initiatives, local knowledge, and resources. Shared decisions and manage conflicts. Enhancement of identity elements and traditions also from a tourist point of view; Raised financing of common activities.</p> <p>During the participatory process, the strategic areas and general objectives indicated were deepened and translated into specific objectives achievable through a mosaic of coordinated actions identified in the Action Plan of the Wet Area Agreement.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>IV. Actions in relation to environmental components and indicators</p>	<p>This section includes the number of actions in relation to each environmental component for the 7 target areas, here indicated as:</p> <p>LV - Northern Lagoon of Venice (Iuav University of Venice);</p> <p>ML - Marano Lagoon (Comunità Riviera Friulana);</p> <p>OR - Ofanto River (Patto Territoriale Nord Barese Ofantino);</p> <p>SR - Sentina Natural Regional Reserve (Municipality of San Benedetto del Tronto);</p> <p>RP - Special ornithological Reserve Palud (Natura Histrica);</p> <p>VM - Veliko i Malo blato (Natura Jadera).</p> <p>7-DN -Protected natural areas of Dubrovnik-Neretva (The Public institution for the management of protected natural areas of Dubrovnik-Neretva County);</p> <p>The sum indicates the total number of actions related to a specific component or indicator. It should be noted that one action can relate to more than one environmental component.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="539 1232 1426 1756"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Environmental components</th> <th colspan="7">number of actions</th> <th>TOT</th> </tr> <tr> <th>LV</th> <th>ML</th> <th>OR</th> <th>SR</th> <th>RP</th> <th>DN</th> <th>VM</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Biodiversity</td> <td>9</td> <td>6</td> <td>3</td> <td>13</td> <td>8</td> <td>13</td> <td></td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Quality</td> <td>8</td> <td>11</td> <td>1</td> <td>11</td> <td>6</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ecosystem services</td> <td>8</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>7</td> <td>6</td> <td>6</td> <td></td> <td>29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Protection Level</td> <td>7</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td>7</td> <td>14</td> <td>13</td> <td>2</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>15</td> <td>18</td> <td>1</td> <td>7</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>43</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The following is a horizontal comparison of actions related to each environmental component or indicator for the target areas. Following</p>	Environmental components	number of actions							TOT	LV	ML	OR	SR	RP	DN	VM		Biodiversity	9	6	3	13	8	13		40	Water Quality	8	11	1	11	6	5		37	Ecosystem services	8	4	4	7	6	6		29	Protection Level	7	4	1	7	14	13	2	35	Other	15	18	1	7	0	0	2	43
Environmental components	number of actions							TOT																																																								
	LV	ML	OR	SR	RP	DN	VM																																																									
Biodiversity	9	6	3	13	8	13		40																																																								
Water Quality	8	11	1	11	6	5		37																																																								
Ecosystem services	8	4	4	7	6	6		29																																																								
Protection Level	7	4	1	7	14	13	2	35																																																								
Other	15	18	1	7	0	0	2	43																																																								

	<p>each summary description are listed all the actions proposed by the partners and grouped by environmental indicator.</p> <p>1 Biodiversity</p> <p>The most common actions shared by the partners include: wetlands monitoring and restoration of wetlands, the implementation of available data in order to monitor local biodiversity and the regulation of water flow in and out of the wetland.</p> <p>It is worth noting the need, highlighted by several partners, to carry out coordinated actions to extend and integrate the influence of the contract with adjacent areas capable of strengthening its effectiveness. This occurs both at the local scale (tributaries and tributaries) and at the supra-regional and supranational scales (wetland contracts on the north Adriatic coast). In addition to this, it is necessary to create networking and coordination actions among stakeholders (creation of a control room and coordination, coordination among research groups).</p> <p>The partners also share the need to carry out actions to inform local inhabitants as well as visitors and students of the naturalistic values of the area.</p> <p>2 Water Quality</p> <p>As far as water quality is concerned, some recurring actions can be noted which concern in particular the hydromorphological rebalancing of the wetland, the monitoring and care of the drainage network, the analysis of the hydrological status, sedimentological and geochemical characterization and analysis in order to define homogeneous areas of intervention, the cleaning of waters in order to guarantee a hospitable context for local flora and fauna, as well as a high degree of environmental healthiness. In this case we are talking not only about waste (beach and marine litter) and discharges inside the wetlands (mostly produced by industrial plants and by the edges of eaves characterised in some cases by intense urbanisation), but also about water quality control of the purification, and adaptation of the sewage network within the area.</p>
--	--

	<p>Also, in this case it can be noted that many actions refer to activities to raise awareness of the environmental component and, in several cases, it is specified that the activity should concern the body of water (e.g. the importance of completing sewerage and wastewater treatment infrastructures and connecting household drains, the effects of discharges in tributaries and effects on the environment).</p> <p>3 Ecosystem services</p> <p>Also, in the case of ecosystem services, there is a need for coordination between the bodies and actors involved in the protection of wetlands and who have taken charge of the actions in the Contract. The action is important because it allows the passage of knowledge and the taking care of the territory through increased competences and local sensibility. These, it should be noted, also include the rethinking of tourist access to and use of the area, as well as the ways of crossing the landscape which, if rethought, can allow certain parts to be safeguarded.</p> <p>In this case, the focus is on the ways in which individual places and episodes can contribute to the proper functioning of ecosystem services (e.g. protection and naturalistic enhancement of the locality of Campalto and its salt marshes; promoting community agriculture, implementation of fit-for-purpose wastewater reuse systems, reintroduction of <i>Emys orbicularis</i>). In all these cases, the focus on community action and increased local sensitivity is central, allowing tailor-made solutions to be rethought and easily adopted.</p> <p>4 Protection Level</p> <p>The issue of protection certainly occupies a central place in the actions of each target area. Environmental peculiarities are certainly central to protection actions and cut across all the environmental indicators indicated in this section.</p> <p>Actions include initiatives for the protection enhancement of local assets in the physical as well as cultural, natural and economic sense. This theme, in particular, includes restoration and maintenance actions, as well as the analysis of possibilities of sustainable management. Also included are initiatives for the hydromorphological rebalancing of the</p>
--	---

		<p>area, monitoring and surveillance actions in collaboration between organisations and associations, and actions that deal with protection from a more purely faunal point of view, such as the control of poaching activities.</p> <p>5 Other</p> <p>This group of actions is the most diverse because it includes actions that do not strictly refer to the environmental components identified, but deal with them by addressing certain issues that may relate to different indicators. In many cases, they can be considered as transversal to the above actions.</p> <p>Among these we find: governance actions, research projects with no immediate impact on the target area, actions dealing with mobility, actions dealing with education and awareness-raising, actions involving the local heritage beyond the most widespread considerations on safeguarding, actions and projects defined as sustainable development, actions dealing with the reformulation of the tourism component in the perspective of a slow and respectful crossing of wetlands.</p> <p>Among them, it is worth mentioning governance actions, which are also the most numerous groups. These are composed of negotiation tables, agreements, possibilities to thicken the network of partners and initiatives supporting the actions promoted by the Contract. This component is particularly significant because it highlights the need for legislative and regulatory support for the actions promoted. The involvement of local stakeholders and their assumption of responsibility only makes sense if properly supported by institutions. This can also take place through awareness-raising campaigns that reveal how the issues of safeguarding and sustainable promotion are of interest at all scales and to all subjects, from the public to the private sector, from the individual to the collective.</p>
--	--	---

V. Actions: Typology	For all the partners the principal actions typologies are: Concrete Actions, Communication and Education, Monitoring and Surveys, Governance, Studies and Projects.								
	ACTIONS	number of actions							TOT
		LV	ML	OR	SR	RP	DN	VM	
	Concrete Actions	14	11	4	5	5	27		66
	Communication and Education Actions	37	9	2	1	4	41	3	97
	Monitoring Activities and Surveys	25	1	3	2	4	5	1	41
	Governance (and other) Activities	24	3	4	4	2	2	1	40
Studies and Projects	39	2	3	2	2	1		49	
<p>Concrete Actions</p> <p>Actions to implement positive impact on the territory for biodiversity, water, air, landscape and in some cases make them accessible with soft infrastructures. Concrete actions are mostly obtained to the environment and the development pillars, related to the requalification of the ditches and of the hydrographic basins; the safeguard of the landscape and of water; the implementation of green and protecting measures.</p> <p>Concrete activities span from the enforcement of local plans of sustainable mobility, to the follow up of European projects aiming at restoring the sandbars, to very specific measures pursued by single municipalities to contrast climate change and restore the hydraulic functions of the landscape.</p>									
<p>Communication and Education Actions</p>									

		<p>All the partners proposed environmental education and awareness-raising activities, addressed to students, citizens and decision makers, through articles, posters, brochures, campaigns. Collaboration between public organisations and associations and local active citizens helped and made the dissemination stronger. Communication and education activities pursue the sensibilization of a wider range of users, from local citizens to tourists, local guides, yatchmen and students. They include the activation of thematic tables on the topic, consultancy activities as much as the identification of local heritages to protect (built as much as cultural), the organization of periodic events (festivals) and a carefully planned dissemination activity.</p> <p>Monitoring Activities and Surveys</p> <p>Monitoring activities and surveys include the activation of an institutional coordination table on sustainable mobility, which is one of the biggest issues raised by all stakeholders. Also, an effort in rendering local activities (fishing, haunting, farming) sustainable is pursued and the intention of coordination among the municipalities of the north Adriatic coast sustaining this or other Wetland Contracts. Implementation and updating of knowledge and environmental data is an activity for all the target areas.</p> <p>Governance Activities</p> <p>Governance activities mainly focus on the activation of laboratories and permanent tables to discuss prominent topics for the safeguarding of the lagoon, together with the promotion of local economies. Also, specific actions consider the implementation of measures to adapt to climate change and the activation of institutional groups of discussion. Also, some governance actions are aimed to develop an updated and digitally accessible database, both material and immaterial. A set of advocacy and institutional actions have been foreseen, in order to grant continuity and meaning to previously approved plans, as well as advocate some specific legislative provisions.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Studies and Projects (and other)</p> <p>Studies and Projects include future and ongoing projects for the protection and promotion of the territory. The census of potentialities and dormant opportunities, the mapping of coastal paths, in-depth studies of the factors of productivity and competitiveness of traditional activities are some examples. These punctual interventions and studies aim to implement local master plans and increase the sensibility towards the environment. Other activities are linked to the problems related to environmental pollution and specifically to the installation of a "plastic catcher" and integrate the geomorphological study with sedimentological and geochemical characterization and analysis.</p>									
	<p>VI. Actions: Stakeholders involved in the implementation</p>	<p>The total number of stakeholders involved in the implementation of the project, in the 7 target areas, is 1.133, 363 private, 770 public.</p> <p>In all the different actions the presence of public (Ministry, Regions, Provinces, Municipalities, other Territorial Institution, University, Schools) stakeholders is the double of private one, or identify like private (Associations and organizations, individuals, companies and privates).</p> <p>Are the engaged actors' key stakeholders for the focused process? Yes, even if the private actors, in particular local associations and organisations, are less in number, they have been strategic actors, and bearers of new important key contacts for the process.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="539 1373 1420 1874"> <thead> <tr> <th>Action</th> <th>Private</th> <th>Public</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Concrete Actions</td> <td>63 <i>LV18, OR05, SR01, LM 36, DV03</i></td> <td>180 <i>LV28, OR09, SR07, LM 114, RP 10, DV12</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Communication Actions</td> <td>109 <i>LV95, SR06, LM6, DN02</i></td> <td>225 <i>LV70, SR01, OR07, VM03, LM116, RP 13, VM 03, DN12</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Action	Private	Public	Concrete Actions	63 <i>LV18, OR05, SR01, LM 36, DV03</i>	180 <i>LV28, OR09, SR07, LM 114, RP 10, DV12</i>	Communication Actions	109 <i>LV95, SR06, LM6, DN02</i>	225 <i>LV70, SR01, OR07, VM03, LM116, RP 13, VM 03, DN12</i>
Action	Private	Public									
Concrete Actions	63 <i>LV18, OR05, SR01, LM 36, DV03</i>	180 <i>LV28, OR09, SR07, LM 114, RP 10, DV12</i>									
Communication Actions	109 <i>LV95, SR06, LM6, DN02</i>	225 <i>LV70, SR01, OR07, VM03, LM116, RP 13, VM 03, DN12</i>									

	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Monitoring Actions</td> <td>45 <i>LV43, SR01, DN1</i></td> <td>100 <i>LV59, SR08, VM02, LM 14, RP13, VM02, DN02</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Governance Actions</td> <td>78 <i>LV50, SR07, OR3, LM 18</i></td> <td>142 <i>LV64, SR11, OR09 VM01, L M 51 RP03, VM01, DN02</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Studies and Projects</td> <td>68 <i>LV 65, SR 01, LM 01, DN01</i></td> <td>123 <i>LV 79, S R05, LM 29, RPO9, DN01</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Notes to the engagement:</u> the stakeholder's involvement is indicative only. Many actions have among their aim the involvement of a wider spectrum of stakeholders. For other actions the Lagoon Assembly will need to identify the lead stakeholder during the first meeting.</p>	Monitoring Actions	45 <i>LV43, SR01, DN1</i>	100 <i>LV59, SR08, VM02, LM 14, RP13, VM02, DN02</i>	Governance Actions	78 <i>LV50, SR07, OR3, LM 18</i>	142 <i>LV64, SR11, OR09 VM01, L M 51 RP03, VM01, DN02</i>	Studies and Projects	68 <i>LV 65, SR 01, LM 01, DN01</i>	123 <i>LV 79, S R05, LM 29, RPO9, DN01</i>
Monitoring Actions	45 <i>LV43, SR01, DN1</i>	100 <i>LV59, SR08, VM02, LM 14, RP13, VM02, DN02</i>								
Governance Actions	78 <i>LV50, SR07, OR3, LM 18</i>	142 <i>LV64, SR11, OR09 VM01, L M 51 RP03, VM01, DN02</i>								
Studies and Projects	68 <i>LV 65, SR 01, LM 01, DN01</i>	123 <i>LV 79, S R05, LM 29, RPO9, DN01</i>								
VII. Actions: Financial resources	<p>This section presents the financial resources deployed through the sum of the budgets prepared by the six contracts.</p> <p>Although the information is partial, it can be seen that the largest sum is earmarked for "concrete activities", i.e. projects to be implemented in the short to medium term (a total of €5,668,667). This figure confirms the operational nature of the contract, one of the main purposes of which is to propose the implementation of small concrete projects.</p> <p>The other section with a significant budget is "other activities" (for a total of €1,122,567). These activities include, for example, studies and research that do not necessarily have an operational impact but aim to increase the material available for understanding and monitoring the area.</p>									

		Action	Budget (euro)	Financial resources
		Concrete Actions	LV: 208.000 ML: undisclosed OR: 1.775.000 SR: 3.549.000 RP: 136.667 VM: n/a DN: 1.566.766 TOTAL 7.235.433	Miscellaneous (European, national, regional, local and other, from the institution, foundations)
		Communication Actions	LV: 618.000 ML: undisclosed OR: 100.000 SR: 44.000 RP: 33.333 VM: 30.000 per yr (120.000) DN: 15.666 TOTAL 930.999	Miscellaneous (European, national, regional, local and other, from the institution, foundations)
		Monitoring Actions	LV: 580.000 ML: undisclosed OR: 190.000 SR: 125.000	Miscellaneous (European, national, regional, local and other, from the institution)

			RP: 45.333 VM: n/a DN: n/a TOTAL 940.333	
		Governance Actions	LV: 185.000 ML: undisclosed OR: 45.000 SR: 58.000 RP: 14.000 VM: 10.000 per yr (30.000) DN: n/a TOTAL 332.000	Miscellaneous (European, national, regional, local and other, from the institution, foundations)
		Others	LV: 740.000 ML: undisclosed OR: n/a SR: 362.567 RP: 20.000 VM: n/a DN: n/a TOTAL 1.122.567	Miscellaneous (European, national, regional, local and other, from the institution)
		<u>Notes to the budget</u>		

		<p>1: the budgets are indicative only. The scheme foresees some discretionarily on various aspects. Budget for staff varies and depends on the kind of contracts in place. For this reason, staff budget is never explicit and will be discussed case by case. Also, for ongoing projects, reference to the project budget is indicated without details. In other cases, the budget is not indicated because it depends on the kind of interventions that will be discussed and approved during the lagoon Assembly.</p> <p>2: the sum of budgets is not inclusive of Comunità Riviera Friulana, as the budgets for Marano lagoon are “undisclosed” and “to be retrieved”.</p>
	<p>VIII. Actions: Timeline and Work plan</p>	<p>This section compares the project timelines for the actions across the 6 target areas. On the whole, the actions proposed for the target areas take place over a medium time horizon. Few of them take place within two years, while there is a tendency to push towards 5, even 6 years. This slight slippage in the time normally devoted to wetland contract actions is probably due to the limitations that became necessary as a result of the pandemic and which still affect the way in which activities normally conceived in presence must be conducted in an alternative manner. During the pathways leading up to the signing of the contracts this caused some slippage and also the need to realistically rethink the feasibility of some actions. The way in which they will be conducted and delivered will also depend on the development of the health condition and the degree of freedom that will be allowed for the implementation of coordinated and collaborative activities.</p> <p>LV: Out of 18 actions, 17 are planned to start in 2021, 1 in 2022. 2 of them are planned to be delivered in 2023, 16 i 2025. The majority of actions are planned to be delivered in 5 years.</p> <p>ML: All 26 actions are planned to start in 2021 and be delivered in 2026 within a timespan of 5 years.</p> <p>OR: Out of 11 actions, 7 are planned to start in 2021, 4 in 2022. 3 of them are planned to be delivered within 1 year time, 2 of them within 2 years and the remaining 8 actions are planned to end by 2023. The majority of actions are planned to be delivered in 3 years.</p>

		<p>SR: Out of 22 actions, 17 are foreseen to start in 2021, 2 start in 2022, 3 were already started. Only 2 of those are foreseen to end in 2022 and 2023, while 20 are foreseen to end in 2024. The majority of them are therefore planned to span over 4 years.</p> <p>RP: Out of 17 actions, 12 are planned to start in 2021, 4 in 2022 and 1 in 2023. 7 actions are planned to be delivered by 2023, 2 by 2024, 1 by 2025, 6 by 2026. The delivery is varying from 2 to 6 years.</p> <p>VM: 3 actions are planned to start in 2021, 1 in 2022. 3 actions are planned to be delivered by 2024, 1 by 2023. The majority of them are therefore planned to span over 4 years.</p> <p>DN: 46 actions. The Public institution for the management of protected natural areas of Dubrovnik-Neretva County (PIDNC) led a participatory process in 2016, 2017, 2020 and 2021 involving various stakeholders.</p>
--	--	--

C. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE IMPLEMENTED WETLAND CONTRACTS

Chapter number and name		Contents
C. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE IMPLEMENTED WETLAND CONTRACTS	I. Weaknesses and strengths of the process	<p>Weaknesses-obstacles to the process</p> <p><u>Restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 Pandemic:</u></p> <p>A first difficulty highlighted by all partners is linked to the rules of distancing imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic, which prevented the carrying out of activities normally conceived in presence. The need for closeness, a necessary condition for listening and exchange, forced the research group to build alternative moments of confrontation.</p> <p>The difficulty was overcome by switching to on-line communication, but for the process of this kind, taking into account that for many stakeholders this was the first time that they encountered this kind of participatory approach, it would have been better if we could have classical face-to-face meetings and territorial labs.</p> <p>Despite local stakeholders' cooperative and proactive approach to the participatory activities, the process that led to the creation of the Wetland Contract and its knowledge base has been seriously impacted by Covid-19 emergency, and consequent deep change of the configuration of the project and its realistic objectives.</p> <p><u>Opposing political interests resulting in the lack of Referent subject for the next phases and the withdrawal of some institutional partners from the project:</u></p> <p>This aspect concerned one partner in particular, that is Iuav University for the Wetland Contract for the Northern lagoon of Venice. The IUAV University of Venice initially proposed to nominate, among the bodies of the Contract, a Coordinator subject who would be the referent of the project on the territory. Normally, this role is covered by institutional subjects recognised by the partnership for their representative function, and therefore endowed with territorial authority. Unfortunately, some political oppositions conditioned the involvement of the Coordinating body identified in the Metropolitan City of Venice, which was not able to take on the role of contact person for the implementation phase</p>

	<p>following signature. Since no other body felt it had the means and strengths to take on this task, the role was filled by the IUAV University of Venice.</p> <p>The same opposing political interests caused the municipalities' temporary uncertainty about joining the Contract. After several other bilateral meetings almost all of them decided to join except the municipality of Venice and the municipality of Quarto d'Altino.</p> <p>Also in other cases, towards the end of the process, several major stakeholders showed a bit of a concern regarding the financial part of the Contract. This was also mainly induced by the COVID-19 crisis, which forced numerous public stakeholders to reduce the amounts of money for their activities.</p> <p><u>General lack of trust to Public Institution</u></p> <p><u>Lack of quality communication between Public institution and stakeholders in the past</u></p> <p><u>First contract to be signed in the region:</u></p> <p>In some cases (e.g. Special Ornithological Reserve Palud) the difficulties came from the fact that the contract was the first one of the kind to be signed in the Region, and stakeholders (both institutional and non-institutional) were not accustomed to the process, nor the framework and the means or tools to be put promptly in place.</p> <p><u>Negative attitude of local residents (partly) to the whole process; some of them decided not to sign the contract.</u></p> <p><u>Difficulties in maintaining a balance between sustainable development and not affecting the reserve in any harmful way.</u></p> <p>Strengths to the process</p> <p>Strengths to the processes are identified in:</p>
--	---

	<p><u>Inventive and proactive solutions to maximise the sharing experience in times of restriction due to the pandemic:</u></p> <p>The need for proximity, a necessary condition for listening and exchange, forced the research team to build alternative moments of confrontation. This highlighted the need to think of supplementary and alternative tools for the collection of local knowledge, new mechanisms for the active involvement of local actors and a renewed ability to manage the process, coordinating activities and materials of a very different nature. Luav, for example, decided to structure the working tables in an original way, avoiding the traditional tripartition protection / hydro morphological risk / local development, normally associated with the regulatory principles of the River Contracts.</p> <p><u>Variety of stakeholders involved (institutional, NGOs, individuals/locals)</u></p> <p><u>Increased connection among partners and projects:</u></p> <p>The creation of various opportunities for discussion gave the actors living and working in the area the opportunity to get to know each other. This made it possible to increase mutual knowledge by identifying points of contact and similar projects already in operation. The contract has therefore allowed, on the one hand, the convergence of common interests and, on the other, the acceleration of ongoing processes.</p> <p>In some cases, this increased the cooperation with the regional bodies in creating a permanent table for River/Lake/Coast/Wetland contracts.</p> <p><u>Synergy with the Lagoon management plan:</u></p> <p>Processes laid the ground for future better management of the area.</p> <p>This is especially important in the cases where the management plan and internal regulation on protection of the wetland areas (e.g. Special Ornithological Reserve Palud) have not yet been realized. These are obligatory documents, so the biggest value of the Wetland Contract is that it establishes communication between stakeholders on different levels so we expect future actions to run more smoothly.</p>
--	---

		<p><u>Proactiveness:</u></p> <p>The stakeholders proved to be cooperative and proactive in the activities carried out and in the negotiation phase, investing both personnel and financial resources of their own for the activities planned in the coming years for a more innovative and sustainable management of wetland areas. Synergy and positive attitude created between the stakeholders, new ideas emerging during the process.</p>
	<p>II. Present and future impacts</p>	<p>Positive and negative impacts</p> <p>The present and future impacts of wetlands contracts are related to the strength of the built-up network that stakeholders bonded, as well as to the capability of actors to take advocacy on the use and management of the territory. However, some risks are related to external factors, such as global economy, environmental changes and sanitary situation.</p> <p>Positive impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased awareness of stakeholders on environmental issues actions that can put in place immediately in order to face the climate change impact strengthening of social and community networks increased success potential for ongoing and planned projects building a critical mass for new projects and funding improvement of living conditions care of the territory also by those who live there, and not only by those who govern it establishment of a platform capable of relaunching the territory and new forms and opportunities for economies recognition of human beings as part of an ecosystem <p>Negative impacts</p>

		<p>voluntary participation in the implementation of the action programme</p> <p>internal contrasts among stakeholders, public/private bodies, organisations</p> <p>risk of the implementation phase</p> <p>insecurity about everyone taking responsibility and accountability for their commitments</p> <p>effective implementation of projects and initiatives</p> <p>fundraising</p> <p>enlargement of the stakeholders' map</p> <p>future changes in territorial governance and local politics</p> <p>vulnerability related to possible external/global events (climatic, economic, sanitary)</p>
	<p>III. The Observatory</p>	<p>The Observatory represents a space of confrontation among target areas and their wetland contracts and it will become increasingly important as the various contracts develop and action programmes take shape and are implemented.</p> <p>In particular, some aspects deserve to be highlighted that are emerging from the comparison between the contracts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > detect commonalities between different geographical contexts: environmental similarities, management obstacles and difficulties, impacts of inhabitants' communities, economic interests and values; > identify similar goals and values: environmental protection, education, sustainable use and development, strengthening networks, wetland's care by the inhabitant communities > recognize diversity in critical aspects among the different contract processes in order to learn from other experiences, to prevent critical situations that other contracts have already faced, to take inspiration

		<p>from the different action programmes for future contract implementations</p> <p>> to increase knowledge and to discover technical solutions related to other similar territories</p>
	<p>IV. Effectiveness of the tool</p>	<p>The parallel process of development and construction of the wetland Contracts has been particularly useful for every partner, as the unfolding of similar participatory processes help partners in achieving every step and make possible the constant exchange of experiences.</p> <p>The comparison between processes and results gives the opportunity to analyse different experiences and to highlight similarities, differences and peculiarities between the signed Contracts.</p> <p>It is possible to identify positive results of the Contracts processes, that point out the effectiveness of this tool and, moreover, the importance of having conducted these processes in parallel, in different territories.</p> <p>Firstly, the parallel development of Contracts favoured the building of a shared vision on wetland governance among partners. Taking into account the fact that partners are very different between them (local public bodies, environmental protection agencies, universities), it is remarkable that all partners came to a common vision, that is in part similar to previous experiences on wetland contracts; however, crew partners could produce a specific, original point of view on the topic, giving strong relevance to the participation of civil society, rather than involving just governance bodies.</p> <p>Secondly, the sanitary conditions related to pandemic forced partners in searching for an innovative, common methodology able to adapt to the limits imposed by Covid-19 control measures. The physical distance obliged partners to find ways to involve communities and to bring on participatory processes that are usually conducted in presence. To do so, a number of on-line and remote activities have been put in place and partners shared suggestions and solutions in order to not interrupt the participation or lose participants and stakeholders.</p>

	<p>Thirdly, and most important, those difficulties made the relations and linkages between partners even stronger and made possible the recognition of shared values and common principles. The impossibility of setting face-to-face meetings between partners was remedied by organising frequent, very operational online update meetings. This allowed the partners to really work in parallel, which led to the identification of very similar social, economic and environmental values in the development of contracts. At the same time, this anomalous condition meant that the principles of construction and implementation of the contracts followed similar paths, albeit with differences determined by the different territorial contexts.</p> <p>Of course, the conditions imposed by this last year and a half have not only produced unexpected positive results. Strict limits have conditioned processes and results, preventing all initial ambitions from being fulfilled. Above all, from a practical point of view, many activities could not take place, such as meetings with communities, surveys, workshops with stakeholders, and this strongly conditioned not only the participatory process, but also the expected results. Sharing these difficulties, however, allowed the partners to rely on a support network and helped them to adapt their expectations and ambitions to the new conditions that were occurring.</p> <p>Beyond the results obtained in terms of the construction of the various contracts, the whole development process has been fundamental in consolidating and broadening the knowledge of the different territories examined. This knowledge was developed in a collaborative way not only within the single target areas, with the stakeholders and the local communities, but also transversally among the various partners. by dealing with similar territories, in fact, it was possible to integrate technical-scientific and practical-local knowledge and to build a complete and useful knowledge for the purposes of environmental protection and innovative forms of territorial governance. This knowledge-building process has also enabled the partners to take a common position, including a political one, in terms of sustainable forms of economic development and land use.</p>
--	--

		<p>To conclude, it is important to point out the impact of cross-border exchange has on the parallel processes of wetland Contracts. The continuous exchange between the partners' experiences, in fact, has primarily strengthened cross-border relations, not only in terms of sharing methodologies and Contract development strategies, but also in terms of mutual support and help in the most delicate phases of Contract development. These strengthened and consolidated relationships will be crucial in the next phase of implementation of both the Contracts and the Action programmes. It will be important to maintain and cultivate these cross-border relationships to ensure continuity in the objectives of both the crew project and the individual participatory processes carried out.</p>
--	--	--