

URBEM Start-up meeting 4th and 5th of December

Attendees:

Roger Bettess	HR Wallingford
Thierry Prost	European Commission
Paul Samuels	HR Wallingford
Jochen Schanze	Institut für Ökologische Raumentwicklung e. V., Dresden
Sarah Higginson	New Economics Foundation
Peter McIntyre	Newcastle City Council
Joao Rocha	Portuguese National Civil Engineering Laboratory
Elsa Alves	Portuguese National Civil Engineering Laboratory
Graca Saraiva	Instituto Superior Tecnico - Centro De Sistemas Urbanos e Regionais
Jorge Silva	Instituto Superior Tecnico - Centro De Sistemas Urbanos e Regionais
Michelle Malcolm	HR Wallingford
Drago Dolence	Javno podjetje Vodovod-Kanalizacija
Mitja Brilly	University of Ljubljana – Faculty of Civil and Geodetic Engineering
Cedo Maksomovic	Centre for Urban Waters UK
Michael Lafont	CEMAGREF
Phillipe Namour	CEMAGREF
Pascal Briel	CEMAGREF
Herbert Holzman	Department for Water Management, Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering, University of Agricultural Sciences Vienna
Joachim Tourbier	Technical University of Dresden
Lesley Batty	Newcastle University

Partners – What they bring to URBEM and what they perceive as the potential challenges

Roger Bettess

Experience

- River hydraulics and river restoration

Challenge:

- Co-ordination

Thierry Prost

Experience

- EC co-ordinator

Paul Samuels

Experience:

- Involved in the set up of URBEM
- Experience in EC projects

Challenge:

- Production of the final report

Jochen Schanze

Experience

- River basin management

Sarah Higginson

Experience:

- Democracy and decision making
- Social capital/consultation/indicators

Peter McIntyre

Experience

- Regeneration in urban river catchment
- Bring forward a community led initiative towards water course

Challenge

- Apathetic community

Joao Rocha

Experience:

- Hydraulics engineer
- Experience in EC projects

Challenge:

- Guarantee innovation

Elsa Alves

Experience:

- Hydraulics and hydrology

Challenge:

- First EC project

Graca Saraiva

Experience:

- Landscape architect
- River rehabilitation/Aesthetic/ Cultural values
- Public perception

Jorge Silva

Experience:

- Engineer – urban planning/evaluation procedures

Michelle Malcolm

Experience

- River flooding and environmental regeneration

Challenge:

- Urban context, and co-ordination across Europe

Drago Dolence

Experience

- Public water utility
- Groundwater, network and sewerage data

Mitja Brilly

Experience

- River restoration

Challenge:

- Implementation

Cedo Maksomovic

Experience:

- Easy to use and attractive tools

Challenge:

- Everyone to think about the education output of their project from the inception

Michael Lafont

Experience

- Hydraulic/hydrology

Phillipe Namour

Experience

- Water chemistry
- Measure pollutants transitory system

Pascal Briel

Experience

- Hydrology and Hydraulics
- Hydro – ecology

Challenge:

- Improve water management

Herbert Holzman

Experience:

- River restoration – construction and monitoring

Challenge

- Urban context

Joachim Tourbier

Experience

- Experience in river hydraulics, restoration

Lesley Batty

Experience

- River pollution/remediation experience of monitoring

Challenge:

- Collation of the data

European Commission (Thierry Prost)

The URBEM programme falls under the city of tomorrow and cultural heritage key action

The overall aim of the key action is:

- Sustainable economic development
- Urban management and integrated planning
- Quality of life and cultural identity

Approach of key action

- Socio-economic, environmental technological
- A participatory approach to decision-making.

Clusters in key action

- Urban planning
- Ecology,
- Green areas,
- Regeneration

6th Framework Programme

- FP6 will change from a call for proposals to a call for tender. Several groups will compete for larger projects
- No chance of re-submission

Thematic areas (not urban)

- Genomics
- Information society technology
- Nano technology
- Aeronautics
- Food quality
- Sustainable development, global change and ecosystems
- Citizens and governance

Urban issues in FP6

- Urban environment
- Indicators of urban sustainability
- Protection of cultural heritage

General recommendations for URBEM

- Direct information to the co-ordinator
- Give information to the EC on conferences, publication and meetings
- Sign a consortium agreement
- Read the contract.

Reporting

Guidelines for reports

www.cordis.lu/eesd/mange.html

6 monthly report

- 10 pages
- Written by the co-ordinator
- Focused on practicalities

Annual reports (scientific report)

- Not too long
- Organised in scientific work packages
- Executive summaries
- Includes updated T.I.P.

Publications

- Send the EC the latest version
- Acknowledge funding
- Agreed by all partners – acknowledge it is a collaborative work
- Ensure publishing does not inhibit others intellectual property rights

Financial principles

- EC contributes the maximum figure
- Cost – reimburse real expenses
- Charge actual costs
- Contracts for staff (outline projects and duration)
- Timesheets
- Eventual audit – could be 5 years after the completion (includes the EC projects costs but not the match funding)

Transfer of budget between partners

- Inform the commission
- <20% of eligible costs
- Doesn't affect the scope or the conditions of the projects

Payment

- All payments are made to the co-ordinator
- 40% advance
- EC keep 15% until completion
- Annual payments upon submission of expenses
- EC recovering the advance gradually

Cost statements

- Each partner to prepare an end of year costs statement of expenses (eg: Nov 1 2002 – October 31st 2003) and submit to the co-ordinator
- Costs statements due 2 months after the end
- Missing costs may be adjusted the next year

Administration – (Roger Bettess)

Consortium agreement

- Covers how we work together and intellectual property
- Joao Rocha will send his version to Michelle Malcolm
- Michelle Malcolm will circulate copies for partners to consider

Quarterly report

- 1 page template,
- Integrated to form the 6 monthly report

TIP

- Difficult to get the TIP right,
- Co-ordinator to identify a framework
- The TIP should be viewed from the perspective of the end users, and outlines how the partners will commit themselves to the exploitation of the results
- Set up a virtual TIP committee, co-ordinated through email.
- Co-ordinator should provide a draft skeleton for the committee to discuss and complete

Mid Term Review

- Identify milestones
- Review programmes and possibly re-shape the programme in view of the problems or experiences
- Thierry Prost will do the assessment

Eligible costs

- Consumables do not include literature or office supplies. These are considered overheads or a partner contribution
- Items such as lab chemicals and software license can be claimed for.

Match Funding

- Data that can be valued can be counted
- Volunteer time that can be valued can be counted
- Licensed software that can be valued can be counted

Steering Group

- Internal steering group
- Users views can be incorporated in the workshops

What is an urban watercourse?

- Is it only small rivers or can it be the big rivers that traverse rivers – e.g. the Thames or the Seine
- There is a strong correlation between urban watercourse and heavily modified water bodies, but not all HMWB will be in cities
- Does it include all rivers that are impacted by their urban catchments?
- URBEM stands for urban river basin – so it must be basin not just the watercourses. But what are the limits of the domain?
- Is a river corridor the flood plain or a wider amenity area?
- Only includes stagnant water if the stagnant water is very closely linked with the water course.
- URBEM should include SUDS that may be implemented to improve the watercourse
- On the Ouseburn people want a vibrant canal side community – how can a project like URBEM deliver this

Glossary of terms

- Michelle Malcolm to action.

Other European Commission Projects

Citynet (Paul Samuels)

- Cluster under the water key action
- URBEM partners will be invited to Feb 21st and 23rd meeting to see how we can work together and potentially become involved in FP6 bids
- Citynet planning a network of excellence for the 6th framework bid
- Register interest on the citynet website: <http://www2.unife.it/care-w/citynet1.html>

SMURF (Pam Bowker)

- Life funded project to demonstrate the principles of river basin planning – applied to heavily modified and degraded water bodies
- To develop two practical projects using the land use planning tool

European Research Network (Jochen Schanze)

- Integrate European flood research
- Action and policy oriented
- 6FP – integrated flood risk management methodologies
- Seeking new partners – workshop in the beginning of next year

Workpackage 10 – Indicators of success (Joachim Tourbier)

Presentation

- Amenity
- Social and economic well being, including recreation (NEF and NCC involved)
- Public health
- Stewardship
- Advice

Discussion

- Riparian forests – only as they relate to urban areas
- May be able to use advocacy through the press (e.g. turning the tide)
- Of the 100 or so river restoration projects in the UK less than 10 had been reviewed against criteria.

Workpackage 2 - Case studies (Joachim Tourbier)

Presentation

- Non European rivers considered
- Need for a range of countries, size, slope, region, type of urban area, type of engineering.
- Selecting sites will be based on finding interesting case studies, but also having contacts with individuals who will be happy to volunteer information
- The focus would be the river basin – so the larger river and its tributaries will be considered.
- The link between WP3 - is monitoring on completed and or ongoing projects
WP2 is just completed projects

Discussion

- If any one has case studies they think are good examples, they should give details to Joachim Tourbier and Jochen Schanze for them to prioritise.
- We need to establish criteria to ensure proper selection
- We are interested in success stories that demonstrate our work packages, but most case studies will have less successful elements that we can also learn from.

Workpackage 11 - Training and dissemination (Cedo Maksimovic)

Presentation

- Target groups
 - Key decision makers – politicians
 - professional – planners and engineers
 - Public: young, old etc.
- Focus on the river system not the sustainability of the complete water cycle.
- The training website will be part of the main website
- Papers in urban water journal
- When we consider rehabilitation we must do so within the development and planning context

Discussion

- Supply decision-support tool as well as technical ‘how to do it’ guidance.
- not just town planners – also environmental planners
- Complex tools or untailed material can result in a loss of trust between the community and the professional
- The model of experts giving information to the public doesn’t always work. The public should be involved as early as possible.

Work package 3 – Study site monitoring (Lesley Batty)

Presentation

- To collate existing monitoring data into a database.
- The database will provide standardisation of data.
- Seek data from:
 - Universities
 - LA's
 - EA
 - Partners
- Type of data:
 - channel geology
 - land use
 - economics
 - safety

Discussion

- River Habitat Survey database may be a source of data

Work package 4 – Aesthetic evaluation (Graca Saraiva and Jorge Silva)

Presentation

- Surveyed 800 people on preference of river features including:
 - Meander
 - Valleys
 - Rocks
 - Cultural
 - Land use
- Survey considers visual criteria and also cognitive criteria.
- Consider river rehabilitation in three dimensions
 - material world (river)
 - personal world (individual)
 - social world (city)
- Different relationship between a cities and a rivers, for example:
 - city on one side – Lisbon
 - big river city either side – London
 - small river – built up on either side
 - small river with large riparian zone

Discussion

- Survey is missing the urban perspective – restaurants, housing

Work package 5 – New tool to assess the potential for rehabilitation (Roger Bettess)

Presentation

- Assess the suitability of sites for rehabilitation.
- It will be a decision making tool for local authorities and environmental authorities
- Tool will be tested for urban watercourses at different sites
- Many factors to be considered:
 - WQ
 - Ecology
 - Aesthetics
 - Constraints
 - Communities
- River habitat survey database for the UK can help with physical quality objectives – it will not address the social factors that need to be included.

Discussion

- The potential for rehabilitation will be linked to how it will be funded the works – and this might be funding related to Water Framework Directive, or it might be funding associated with development.
- A methodology to weight the various factors will have to be developed

Work package 6 - Assessment of the new tool (Mitja Brilly)

Presentation

- Review of the new tools.
- Hierarchical structure of information
- Review of new tools is based on indicators and models
- We require understanding of different funding regimes in Europe and different legislation throughout Europe.

Discussion

- Produce URBEM indicators – can draw on existing sources – eg: European environmental agency we need to review and add what is missing.
- Need to link with LA's indicators
- Indicators often measure outputs but not the impact, need to ensure the indicators are meaningful.

Work package 7 – Social appraisal tool (Sarah Higginson)

Presentation

- People prioritise other things before environment
- Decide how much weight will be given to the views of people obtained through the consultation process
- If people are to be consulted then they must be able to affect change
- People might not always say what you want or expect
- We can help people to focus on positive aspects of rivers

Discussion

- Who pays and who benefit from work – riverside properties may directly benefit from work.
- URBEM needs to help provide a robust framework for restoration over a number of years.
- Different weighting to the opinions of professionals and the public
- We need to give our legislative and policy drivers weight.

Work package 8 – New Techniques for urban river rehabilitation (Joao Rocha)

Presentation

- New techniques for river restoration.
- Methods to re-naturalise urban water courses.
 - SUDS
 - New materials
- Challenge - to guarantee innovation

Discussion

- New doesn't need to mean recently invented, they could include methods that have been around for a while but not in common usage, for example: bio-engineering
- Different methods might be new in different parts of Europe.

Work package 9 - Decision support methodologies. (Roger Bettess)

Presentation

- Help local and environmental authorities to go through the priority process
- Best practice including citizen involvement

Other presentations

- LNEC – Lisbon case study
- CEMAGREF - Lyon case study and CEMAGREF research
- **Department for Water Management, Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering, University of Agricultural Sciences** - Vienna case study

First 6 Months

- Please supply ideas to WP3 on sites for monitoring.
- WP4 – will deliver 4.1 at the end of January instead of December (identification of parameters to be monitored for aesthetic assessment)

Next Meetings

- Meetings to be either at the end or the beginning of the week.
- Week 28th of April – either in Vienna or in Newcastle.

Any Other Business

- The conference that is programmed to disseminate the findings of URBEM, currently the budget isn't big enough to hold a professional conference, a 1% levy on all partners would provide enough to hold a professional conference.
- If there are no objections, the co-ordinator will discuss transferring this percentage for the conference, with the EC
- One topic that seems to have been missing from the discussion has been flood risk.
- If everyone could supply their presentations on disk, they will be displayed on the website.