INTERNATIONAL SAVA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Ref. No.: 3-18-11/3-2

Zagreb, August 27, 2018

35th Meeting of the Permanent Expert Group for Flood Protection

REPORT FROM THE MEETING

Zagreb, 23-24 July 2018

Venue: Premises of the International Sava River Basin Commission, Kneza Branimira 29/II, Zagreb

Table of Contents

I. ATTENDANCE

The PEG members from Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia, as well as an expert from Serbia attended the meeting. The Consultant representatives engaged for the development of Sava FRMP, also participated at the meeting.

The list of participants is annexed to this report.

II. CHAIRMANSHIP

Ms. Dragana Milovanović chaired the meeting.

III. ADOPTED AGENDA

1. **Opening of the meeting**
    - Welcome address
    - Adoption of the Agenda
    - Presentation on the ISRBC activities

2. **Development of the Flood Risk Management Plan for the Sava River basin**
    - Project progress status
    - Presentation/discussion on the first set of the background documents
        - *Conclusions relevant for the basin, drawn from the PFRA*
        - *Conclusions relevant for the basin, drawn from the FHR maps*
        - *Objectives of flood risk management of common interest in the Sava River Basin*
        - *Summary of Measures and Catalogue of Measures*
    - Presentation/discussion on the draft Sava FRMP
    - Presentation/discussion on the second set of the background documents
        - *Common basin-wide Cost Benefit Analysis for the Summary of Measures*
        - *Environmental Impact Analyses/Report for the Summary of Measures including the proposal of analyses and maps of potential synergies and differences between PoM of RBMP and SoM of FRMP*
        - *Proposal of Modes of cooperation of the Sava countries in the flood defence emergency situations including the proposal of Mechanisms of coordination on the basin-wide level*
    - Preparation for the Stakeholders' Forum and public consultations process
    - Strategy for follow-up
    - Work plan
3. **Any other issues**

IV. DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

AD.1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

Welcome and opening remarks by the PEG FP Chairman

Ms. Dragana Milovanović opened the meeting, welcomed the PEG FP members, national experts, as well as the Sava FRMP project experts and informed the participants on some logistical issues.

Adoption of the Agenda

PEG FP adopted the proposed agenda of the 35th meeting (*Doc.Ref.No: 3-18-11/2-2*), with agenda items presented in Part III of this report. (Meeting document: *Ad.1. PEG FP_35th meeting_AdoptedAgenda).*

Presentation on the ISRBC activities

Ms. Dragana Milovanović informed the PEG FP on the most important activities and events since the last 34th PEG FP meeting held in June 2018, including conclusions related to the flood protection issues adopted at the 49th Session of the Sava Commission held in Karlovac on July 3-4, 2018.

Ms. Milovanovic informed the PEG FP on the upcoming meetings and events.

AD.2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE SAVA RIVER BASIN

Ms. Milovanović briefly informed the PEG on the current status of the WBIF project component 1 and development of the Sava FRMP.

Project progress status

Ms. Višnja Omerbegović informed the PEG FP members about the status of development of the background documents (BDs) and draft Sava FRMP. She continued with presentation of the content of each document.

Presentation/discussion on the first set of the background documents

Conclusions relevant for the basin, drawn from the PFRA

Ms. Višnja Omerbegović presented the latest version of the PFRA background document and the related chapter(s) of draft Sava FRMP. During the discussion it was once again explained that the Sava Commission is not positioned above national state authorities. Measures included in the Sava FRMP should be taken into account when doing national planning, but all the measures have to be implemented according to the national legislation in force. It was emphasised that the Sava FRMP does not introduce any new obligations to the countries, although the countries do have an obligation to include the adopted plans into their national procedures, and report on this every two years;

The following was agreed:

- AMIs, the mutual areas of interest for flood protection in the Sava River basin are defined as foreseen in the Article 6 of the Protocol on flood protection, taking into account that the PEG members from Croatia will deliver opinion on the proposal of the PEG members from Slovenia related to two AMIs (Kupa/Kolpa and Sotla/Sutla)
- The Consultant will give explanations on AMIs, previously requested by the PEG
- A dedicated disclaimer will be added to the draft Sava FRMP regarding the measures which will be proposed by the Secretariat;
- Note in chapter 3.3 should be considered within measures;
- AMI table in the annex of B2 PFRA document should be described in the text;
- Maps in A3 format should be removed from Annex 2, and a reference to document with maps should be added/updated accordingly.

Conclusions relevant for the basin, drawn from the FHR maps

Ms. Višnja Omerbegović, Mr. Predrag Srna, and Mr. Davorin Singer gave an overview of the changes made in the latest version of the FHRM document (including the draft Methodology for preparation of Flood Maps), the related changes in the draft Sava FRMP, as well as the maps included in the document. The following conclusions were made:

- Terminology in the document (e.g. tables with designation of hazard categories in member countries) should be aligned with the national documents;
- Chapter 2.7 is missing from the B3 FHRM document, since it goes directly from 2.6 to 2.8;
- Chapter 4.3 of B3 FHRM document (*Flood Hazard Maps):*
    - In 1st Table in Chapter 4.3 (national hazard classifications) it should be further emphasized (under the table) that different countries use different calculation of the hazard parameter (i.e. not depth-based only);
    - 2nd Table in Chapter 4.3 (Methodology hazards classification) should be modified so that it doesn't refer to being used by non-competent persons. The same chapter in the Sava FRMP draft (4.3.5) doesn't include this reference, so the text from the Sava FRMP can be used in the BD;
    - Regarding hazard categories and the associated table (both for background document Ch. 4.3 2nd Table and draft Sava FRMP):
        - Description column should be removed since hazards should not be designated in the range of *very low* to *high hazard*. Instead, the four classes should be designated Categories 1-4, in the opposite sequence;
        - Column with the border values (value ranges) should remain in the table.
- Chapter 4.5.2 of B3 FHRM document:
    - Legends in the testing example hazard maps should be updated, so they show new hazard designations and value range (e.g. Category 2 – 1.50-2.50). Hazards can be presented as a measure of depth (in meters);
    - Legend and map in Figure 9 should be changed to that the red colour is not used. Also, it was suggested that a smaller map showing the wider area can be included.

Objectives of flood risk management of common interest in the Sava River Basin

The following remark was made about the Objectives background document:

- Summary conclusions should be added regarding national objectives.

Presentation/discussion on the draft Sava FRMP

Ms. Višnja Omerbegović and other members of the Project Team presented the latest version of the draft Sava FRMP, as well as the related background documents. Discussion was related to the quality of document, and necessity of definitive structure development given that neither in this moment all chapters are not included and elaborated. The PEG also emphasized that all chapters of the document should be improved to present the expected content of Sava FRMP foreseen by the Program.

Below is the list of comments on the draft Sava FRMP, with a note that some of the comments from the other sections of this report (that refer to BDs) also relate to changes in the draft Sava FRMP.

- In Sava FRMP, figure 8 in Chapter 2.6 legend and description should be changed;
- Table 4 in draft Sava FRMP and the associated chapter (Chapter 2.8) should be updated. Information is from 2009, and where new information is available (APFRs) it should be included;
- All information about the surface/lengths of the Sava River basin should in principle be taken from the Sava RBMP and/or the Sava RBM Analysis. In case significant discrepancies are noted compared to other/national documents (e.g. national strategies), these should be listed and presented to the PEG FP, in order to decide which information should be included in the draft Sava FRMP;

- Chapter 2.8.2 of the draft Sava FRMP – information for Montenegro is missing and should be added;
- Table 5 in Chapter 2.8.3 of the draft Sava FRMP – source of information should be added;
- Sava FRMP chapter 6.5 on financing sources, to be used for Follow-up strategy as well:
  - Add WBIF as a funding mechanism;
  - On page 58, the sentence related to the EC proposal that existing integration instruments be incorporated should be checked and to which countries this applies.
- Regarding the presentation of maps, it was agreed that full size maps will be in a separate document, but that maps of appropriate size should also be included in annexes of background documents if and where applicable;
- On the maps, distinction should be made between areas of no risk and areas for which no information was available. Each of these should have its own colour, description and symbology;
- Disclaimer in the maps should be checked by the PEG members and if necessary adjusted/corrected;
- The maps layout was also discussed and agreed.

Summary of Measures and Catalogue of Measures

Ms. Višnja Omerbegović presented structural and non-structural measures that are currently included in the draft Sava FRMP, as well as the general approach that was used for determining priority groups of non-structural measures. The Consultant were instructed once again that the Summary of measures is the most important part of the document and should be much more elaborated so the PEG will have the possibility to give their comments on the proposed measures. Therefore, all analysis (foreseen by the ToR and Program), related to the proposed measures, should be made and if data for some specific measure are not available it should be described.

Main remarks are listed below:

- Chapter order in the background document should be changed. Chapters regarding national situation should be first, followed by international;
- Chapter 3 should be moved to the Background document Summary of Measures;
- Column with the implementation period for measures should be removed (non-structural);
- Column with the responsible party for measures should be removed (non-structural);
- Prioritisation principle in Chapter 3 for non-structural measures (currently in the Catalogue, to be moved to Summary) should be further explained/justified (e.g. why listed types of measures considered to be of High or Very High importance);
- Also, if the prioritisation of non-structural measures is to be retained in the document, priority levels should be assigned by the Consultant to all non-structural measures presented in the Catalogue in Chapter 4;
- Consider to remove Table 4 in Chapter 3 from the BD since it overlaps with the table in Chapter 4, which shows all non-structural measures, and to include this table (after its finalization) in the Follow-up Strategy instead;
- According to comments from Croatia – title of the chapter(s) about structural measures should include the term “indicative”; in addition, a new Disclaimer will be added regarding the fact that the implementation of these measures is subject to national legislative procedures and competencies. This Disclaimer will be proposed by the Secretariat.

Presentation/discussion on the second set of the background documents

Common basin-wide Cost Benefit Analysis for the Summary of Measures

The document was presented by Mr. Đorđe Mitrović, who explained the changes done to simplify the CBA methodology compared to the previous version. The methodology was modified having in mind the available data, and all types of parameters are now aligned with the Methodology for preparation

of hazard and risk maps, which is part of FHRM BD. The CBA Methodology text is accompanied by an Excel model, which includes a series of input data and calculation formulas allowing for potential flood damages to be calculated using the surface that would be affected by floods (e.g. for human health, environment and economic infrastructure and activities). Parameters used for calculating the damages were taken from a number of studies used in the EU countries, as well as statistical data sources, but can be changed in the CBA model as required. Compared to the previous version, certain unit values (such as the value of human life) were re-calculated to be the same for all countries.

The PEG discussed the document and concluded that the proposed CBA methodology should be tested for the proposed measures within the project. The following remarks were made during the meeting:

- Given that the chapter on CBA Methodology is missing from the Sava FRMP it should be added as a part of the Chapter on structural measures. However, for the purpose of commenting, it should be delivered to the Secretariat as a separate document/text by Friday 27/7/2018;
- The Consultant presented that a CBA analysis cannot be performed for each listed structural measure in the course of this project / draft Sava FRMP preparation period and recommended that the CBA shouldn't be used as a sole (or even the most important) prioritisation method for the listed infrastructure projects, since the projects are widely different in their type, scope and level of maturity. If there is to be prioritisation of the infrastructure projects in the future (not in the scope of this Sava FRMP), it is recommended to develop a multicriteria analysis, where the CBA parameters will only be one criterion that can be used. This can also be recommended in the Follow-up strategy;
- The Consultant will test the Methodology using flood damage data for Obrenovac (Serbia) when such data is received;
- The PEG took note on the presentation and pointed out that in determining of the proposed measures for achieving the objectives, was expected that the Sava FRMP shall have regard to the costs and benefits of different methods of managing the flood risk. As well as that was expected that the Sava FRMP would define priority measures having in mind costs and benefits for population, economic activities including infrastructure, cultural heritage and environment. Therefore, and if these expected activities will not be performed, the PEG requested that should be noted in the Final report.

Environmental Impact Analyses/Report for the Summary of Measures including the proposal of analyses and maps of potential synergies and differences between PoM of RBMP and SoM of FRMP

Mr. Branislav Sekulović presented the background document, which includes environmental analysis sheet with data and conclusions for each of the listed infrastructure projects. A summary table of projects is also provided, with projects grouped in several categories, based on their assessed risk of effects on the environment. It was noted that this assessment is a general analysis based on the available information for the purpose of the Plan, but that each project has to comply with whatever national legislation is in place regarding the assessment of environmental impact, when these effects will be investigated in much more detail and appropriate counter-measures proposed, where needed. The following comments were made about the analysis:

- Terminology used for the level of risk and the associated colour should be changed. Projects being designated as risky (and marked red) can give a negative impression of their effects on the environment. Therefore, it is recommended that the terminology should be softened, so a term like "potential effect" should be used (to indicate a likely need for further analyses) instead of "risk";
- Color-coding should be removed.

The following conclusions were made about the background document related to the analyses and maps of potential synergies and differences between PoM of RBMP and SoM of FRMP:

- The Consultant noted that the Article 4.7 of the Water Framework Directive was taken into account in the text;
- Status of water bodies, defined by the Sava FRMP, should be linked to AMIs on the maps as well as to the measures from the PoM of RBMP;
- The word "*conflict*" should be replaced with something more suitable – focus on the synergy.

Proposal of Modes of cooperation of the Sava countries in the flood defence emergency situations including the proposal of Mechanisms of coordination on the basin-wide level

Mr. Nijaz Lukovac gave an overview of the changes made to background documents B7 and B8, following the agreement that these two should be combined. Elements of both documents were presented, and the following agreed:

- Revise and better integrate two background documents related to the tasks B7 and B8;
- Document related to the task B7, as a very important output which should defined the mechanisms of coordination on the basin-wide level for the future flood risk management planning cycles and procedures, should be improved and expanded to include coordination mechanisms (for the implementation of the Sava FRMP) and not only those related to the use of the Geoportal;
- In document related to the task B8, a reference related to establishment of a body which should manage coordination of assistance should be reformulated, so that a specific body is not mentioned, but instead that the "assistance coordination should be improved";
- Figure for Montenegro should be in the same format as for other countries;
- Comments received from Serbia should be taken into account. These are related to the fact that in the text before the figures, regular water-management/flood protection authorities are presented. However, the figures show structures for emergency situations, which include other (non-water) authorities as well. This change from regular to emergency situations should be better presented and explained.

Preparation for the Stakeholders' Forum and public consultations process

Mr. Zoran Bogunović and Mr. Boris Sčekić explained the proposed approach for the public consultations and the organisation of the Stakeholders Forum, based on the Concept Note delivered in February. The date for the Forum can be determined once the Sava FRMP is approved for public sharing by PEG FP. Current expectation is for the Forum to be in September, during the period of public consultations. Main remarks and conclusions are listed below:

- The Forum is to be a two-day event in Belgrade while an approximate time needed for organising the Forum is one month;
- Concept Note for the Forum, agenda and list of participants, as well as the promo materials should be prepared by the Consultant and discussed with the Secretariat prior to delivery to the PEG
- Given the current status of the project, the PEG agreed that the draft Sava FRMP (after the PEG approval) will be published online at the same time when the document is made available to Forum participants so that the public consultations process will begin before the Forum event. Comments received during the consultations period should be managed immediately, so that the new Sava FRMP version (with the report on the consultations) can be ready as soon as possible after the consultations period has ended;
- Given the current status of the project, the PEG also agreed that only draft Sava FRMP and maps be subject of the Forum and public consultations process.

Strategy for follow-up

Ms. Višnja Omerbegović presented the intended approach and main elements for the document, which should be a separate document and to contain all foreseen information on the potential funding sources for the implementation of the Plan, as well as:

- Steps/mechanisms on identifying the related financing and investment needs to implement the measures including the facilitation of concrete financing and investment plans on the appropriate level (focus on maintenance of existing water infrastructure and watercourses and investment in new structural flood protection measures);
- Strengths and weaknesses of the Sava FRMP including a SWOT and detailed gap analysis - basis for the preparation of a subsequent work programme on international and national levels, with clear recommendations for the next planning period.

Work plan

Below are summarised the key next activities for the finalisation of the document(s):

- CBA text for the draft Sava FRMP and the updated Forum Concept Note to be delivered to the Secretariat by 27/7/2018;
- PEG FP members to provide comments to the Secretariat by 6/8/2018. Due to the vacation period, Croatian members will submit comments by 28/8/2018;
- Comments from PEG FP members should be primarily focused on the draft Sava FRMP, since the main objective is to finalise this document and approve it for presentation to the public and the Forum participants;
- An effort should be made to focus the comments on the finalisation of the document(s), according to the discussions made so far on CWG and PEG FP meetings;
- Another PEG FP meeting will be considered depending on the comments and requirements for approving the draft Sava FRMP;
- After approval of the draft Sava FRMP by PEG FP all necessary steps for the organization of the Stakeholder Forum should be done. This includes translation of the Sava FRMP to English.

AD.3. ANY OTHER ISSUES

Mr. Mirza Sarač briefly informed the PEG about the SHELTER project proposal, in addition to the presentation from the 34th meeting, and asked the PEG members to check and review the list of potential stakeholders to the project to whom the request for letter of support will be send.

The next 36th meeting of PEG FP will be held in August 2018.

ANNEX I. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Full Name	Country/Company/Organization	Tel/ E-Mail	Attendance
SECRETARIAT OF THE SAVA COMMISSION			
Dragana Milovanović	ISRBC Secretariat	+385 1 488 69 68 dmilovanovic@savacommission.org	x
Mirza Sarač	ISRBC Secretariat	+385 1 488 69 72 msarac@savacommission.org	x
PEG FP MEMBERS AND DEPUTY MEMBERS			
Almir Bajramlić	Bosnia and Herzegovina Sava River Watershed Agency	+387 33 726 407 bajramlic@voda.ba	x
David Latinović	Bosnia and Herzegovina Public Institution "Vode Srpske"	+387 51 215 485 dlatinovic@voders.org	
Amer Kavazović	Bosnia and Herzegovina Sava River Watershed Agency	+387 33 726 425 kavazovic@voda.ba	x
Sandra Sokolić	Republic of Croatia Ministry of Environment and Energy	+385 1 630 73 61 Sandra.Sokolic@mzoe.hr	
Miro Macan	Republic of Croatia Ministry of Environment and Energy	+385 1 630 73 68 Miro.Macan@mzoe.hr	
Sanda Buconjić Kolarić	Republic of Croatia Croatian Waters	+385 1 630 74 32 sanda.buconjickolaric@voda.hr	
Danko Biondić	Republic of Croatia Croatian Waters	+385 1 630 73 23 dbiondic@voda.hr	x
Darko Barbalić	Republic of Croatia Croatian Waters	+385 1 630 75 82 darkob@voda.hr	x
Merita Borota	Republic of Serbia Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management	+381 11 201 33 47 merita.borota@minpolj.gov.rs	x
Darko Janjić	Republic of Serbia Public Water Management Company "Srbijavode"	+381 11 201 33 22 Darko.janjic@srbijavode.rs	x
Božidar Beloš	Republic of Serbia Public Water Management Company "Vojvodina Vode"	+381 21 557 418 bbelos@vodevojvodine.rs	x
Marina Babić Mladenović	Republic of Serbia Jaroslav Černi Institute for the Development of Water Resources	+381 11 390 64 77 marina.babic-mladenovic@jcerni.co.rs	
Luka Štravs	Republic of Slovenia Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning	+386 1 478 74 04 luka.stravs@gov.si	
Bojan Jakopič	Republic of Slovenia Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning	+386 1 478 72 06 bojan.jakopic@gov.si	
Blažo Đurović	Republic of Slovenia Slovenian Water Agency	+386 1 478 31 42 blazo.djurovic@izvrs.si	
EXPERTS AND GUESTS			
Rade Marčetić	Republic of Serbia Public Water Management Company "Vojvodina Vode"	rmarcetic@vodevojvodine.rs	
Boris Ščekić*	EPTISA (Sava FRMP project manager)	+381 63 861 41 60 bscekic@eptisa.com	
Višnja Omerbegović	EPTISA (Sava FRMP project team leader)	+385 99 388 36 08 vkomerbegovic@eptisa.com	
Predrag Srna	EPTISA (Sava FRMP project key expert)	+381 64 212 95 76 predrag.srna@eptisa.com	

Full Name	Country/Company/Organization	Tel/ E-Mail	Attendance
Davorin Singer	EPTISA (Sava FRMP project key expert)	+385 91 366 72 02 davorin.singer@gmail.com	
Branislav Sekulović	EPTISA (Sava FRMP project non key expert)	bsekulovic@insitu.co.rs	
Đorđe Mitrović	EPTISA (Sava FRMP project non key expert)	djordjem@gmail.com	
Zoran Bogunović*	EPTISA (Sava FRMP project non key expert)	mail@zoranbogunovic.hr	

* by web link

ANNEX II. LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Agenda item	Document	ENG	HRV	SLO	BIH-BOS	BIH-HRV	BIH-SRP	SRP
1.	Ad.1. PEG FP_35th meeting_AdoptedAgenda.docx	⇩						
2.	Ad.2.2_B2_SavaFRMP_PFRA_Nacrt_v1.1_180718 final.docx		⇩					
	Ad.2.2_B3_SavaFRMP_FHRM_Nacrt_v1.0_180718 .docx		⇩					
	Ad.2.2_Maps	⇩						
	Ad.2.2_B4_SavaFRMP_Ciljevi_Nacrt_v1.1_180718. docx		⇩					
	Ad.2.2_B5_SavaFRMP_Katalog mjera_Nacrt_v1.0_180718.docx		⇩					
	Ad.2.2_B5_SavaFRMP_Pregled mjera_Nacrt_v1.1_180718.docx		⇩					
	Ad.2.3_B1_SavaFRMP_Nacrt_v1.0_180718.docx		⇩					
	Ad.2.4_B5_SavaFRMP_CBA_Nacrt_v1.1_180718.d ocx		⇩					
	Ad.2.4_B5_Simple CBA Flood Model_ver1.0_180718.xlsx		⇩					
	Ad.2.4_B5_SavaFRMP_Sinergija WFD i FD_Nacrt_v1.0_180718.docx		⇩					
	Ad.2.4_B6_SavaFRMP_EIA_Nacrt_v1.0_1807618.d ocx		⇩					
	Ad.2.4_B6_SavaFRMP_EIA_Struk_mjere_v1.0_180 718.xls		⇩					
	Ad.2.4_B7_B8_SavaFRMP_Flood Defence Emergency Situations _v.1.1_180718.doc		⇩					

Documents are available at the PEG's ftp site.