

# SWOOT

PROCESS ANALYSIS | PILOT CASE STUDY **INN RIVER**

NOVEMBER 2018



# SHORT INTRODUCTION

The Engadine is an **inner alpine valley**, situated in the eastern part of canton Grison.

The Inn River has an approximate length of 517 km. 25,000 inhabitants live in the **15 communities** of the Engadine. The most important economic sector in Engadine is tourism.

Due to the climatic conditions, the Engadine has, in comparison with other alpine regions, less precipitation.

The annual distribution of the precipitation is highly influenced by climate change and causes seasonal scarcity problems.

In the past, water resources were primarily used for:

- health reasons/tourism, (mineral water sources)
- irrigation of meadows (distributed by water channel system, especially in Lower Engadine).
- hydropower production (since 1930, giving subsidies to local communities).

**Conflicts** in water availability and usage have **arisen**, within the most important sectors tourism, energy, water supply and agriculture. The 15 communities of Engadine are nowadays forced to share this water source.

Due to the melting glaciers and the forecasted changes of stream flow, **awareness** needs to be raised about protection and **use of water**. The main goal, within the SPARE project, was to establish an **Integrated River Basin Management Plan**, the first one in the canton of Grison; using

participatory processes to balance use and protection of water sources - considering ecosystem services as well as human use and ranking the main river conflicts in the basin.

The integrated innovative management plan will contain a variety of projects whose implementation will enhance **biodiversity and human welfare** in the Engadine valley.

# WHAT

In the frame of SPARE the following main activities took place:

- Several **meetings** to define the scope of the IRBM with federal and **cantonal offices** and with **municipal authorities**.
- Several **meetings** with the **pilot group**:
  - to present Integrated watershed management Engadine (IEM) project and SPARE project.

- to define the roles for pilot group members and the time frame of the ongoing process.
- to define objectives and ongoing tasks and presenting SPARE project activities.
- to present participatory methods.

- **public meetings**, to inform public and authorities
- **Water Week**, for public information in March 2017

- **River Walk Inn** for awareness rising of young people in July 2017.

- Workshop for Representative Group and international meeting (**River Dialogue Inn**), with some members of the PG, to present the Integrated River Basin Management (IRBM) Engadine.

- the **“Youth River Camp”**, in July 2018 (one week),

- informational and **face to face meetings**, to inform people in the region about the project and give them the possibility to exchange views;

- a final workshop is planned in February 2019, by that time the first steps of IRBM will likely be concluded.

# WHO

The project was managed by one **process manager from PTE** (Pro Terra Engiadina Foundation), a **cross-sector foundation** which aims to maintain and promote the natural and cultural landscape and biodiversity in the Engadine valley.

There wasn't a main facilitator: the function of **facilitator changed** depending on the kind of meeting. For some stakeholder events, even external facilitators have been involved.

The foundation Pro Terra Engiadina was the responsible institution for the IRBM. The strategic project was led by the new **Pilot group**, composed of **five members**, three from Lower Engadine, one from the canton of Grison and one representative of BAFU (Swiss Federal Office for the Environment) who held an advisory role.

**The PTE foundation board** decided to start an IRBM plan. This board consist of **municipalities representatives** (Lower Engadine), members of different NGOs, one member of **Swiss National Park** and **Plantahof** (school for agriculture), **tourism associations** representatives and of different **cantonal offices**.

In general, the participatory process was not inclusive in terms of age and gender, as representatives from sectors that are directly involved in water use and/or protection were mainly male.

**WHERE**





# WHY

*The main drivers in the evolution of SPARE activities were:*

- the composition of the Pilot Group,*
- the refusal of Upper Engadine to participate in the project and therefore the necessity to restart, by defining a new PG,*
- the initial Pilot Groups attitude towards participatory processes.*
- the expectation of federal and cantonal offices (to have after the project a set of measures to be implemented)*

*The idea to start IEM arose shortly before the opportunity to join SPARE came up. Due to the SPARE project, the funding of FOEN was easier to get without the higher involvement of the cantonal office.*

*Besides, SPARE was a good opportunity to get support by other project partners and therefore to ease the implementation process.*

# HOW

The participatory process started with a Pilot group meeting to present the Integrated River Basin Management (IRBM) Engadine project and the SPARE project: **Pilot group members were decided together.**

A presentation about IEM and SPARE was held for the president conference of Upper Engadine, to invite also this region to participate.

Upper Engadine region decided not to participate in the IRBM project due to several reasons. After this decision a new Pilot group was selected and it was defined how to proceed with the project (with a formal protocol for the Pilot group).

A crucial decision was to involve as much as possible young people living in the Inn catchment, organizing the International Youth River Camp.

MAIN TOOLS USED WERE:

- **report: influence of climate change** to the discharge of the Inn River.
- **actor analysis.**
- public information (Power Point presentation).
- PG meetings (Power Point presentation, minutes).
- **focus groups and world cafés** for the RG meetings.
- **face to face** meetings with citizens.
- graphic and videos (done by a graphic and video-maker specialist in the SPARE project).

The overall cost for implementing the IRBM and the participatory activities was higher than €50.000.

# STRENGTHS

- **PTE** is a regional foundation with a **broad based foundation board**, who were able to establish one strategy: the implementation of an IRBM. Cooperation and agreement were our key strength. There aren't other institutions with the same aims, in this region.

- To **start with the IRBM** before the problems concerning water resource were too high was definitely a strength.

- The Federal Government gave cantonal offices **the possibility to trial IRBM** as a pilot case. We could try different methods in a case study, without the stress of needing to be successful.

- Years before similar approaches, without commitments of cantonal and federal offices didn't work out.

- Financial resources for the implementation of IRBM could also be used for SPARE activities.

- The **international project** gave us a certain **background** (support from experts in River management and participatory processes) and a higher **acceptance**.

# WEAKNESSES

- Within the PG the inputs of SPARE concerning the participatory processes were not initially entirely needed. However, in the latter phases, the processes were partly accepted.

- We need good communicators and facilitators with a knowledge or interest in water topics and with a socio-scientific background; **to improve:**

- Real **participation processes**

- **Communication skills**

- We need to **avoid** (even in further experimentation phases)?

- Producing too much paper

- To spend too much time **theorising rather than acting**

- Within SPARE we didn't have enough funds. We had to look for additional finances and got financial support from WWF CH.

- Some stakeholders have the impression that international EU based projects are not fitting for Switzerland.

- The high level of involvement required for participatory processes may cause **some stakeholders to feel overwhelmed** or fatigued by the required level of contribution.

# OPPORTUNITIES

- **Acceptance** from the regional planning institution and politicians of communities who support IRBM and consider it as an important issue for the future.
- We believe that **now water management questions are more important** for the municipalities responsible for all water issues.

- The project **increased communication and cooperation** between individual users. o We used the climate change study for the whole project and during SPARE we had a lot of **natural hazards** caused by climate change. All these evidences have **strengthened the recognition** between river protection, climate change and use of water.

- As institution PTE, tried to find a solution with the regional planning office to establish an official place for water and river issues. The PTE can hand over the ongoing process started by SPARE (the IRBM) to the regional planning office of Lower Engadine.

- Changes in federal office strategy caused a rather negative influence, but changes in regional political thinking influenced activities implementation in a favourable way.

# THREATS

- One of the main obstacles was the refusal to participate of political representatives of the municipalities in Upper Engadine.

- The other was the need, in the beginning of the project, to negotiate; the start of the questionnaire held up the start of the project. Furthermore, the implementation of all designed participatory processes began late.

- The natural hazards (landslides, inundations) that occurred during the SPARE project highlighted the risk which can be caused by rivers. But on the other side, this brought a higher understanding of possible measures.

- Proposed actions, such as revitalisation projects, were sometimes perceived as measures against the fishing industry. Fishermen and women are interested in fishing, however, are not as invested in other issues, such as the natural activity of a flood plain.

- We have different conflicts in water use and protection. So, opposition from the energy sector, tourism and agriculture are possible. The main aim for the future, is to have a guaranteed water supply and to have minimised the negative effects of the conflicts mentioned above.

- The Pilot Group is satisfied of activities done during experimentation and willing to ensure the process will be ongoing, after the SPARE project.

- The government regulations are going in the same direction as we are focusing with SPARE and IRBM. It is only the prioritisation of implementation of IRBM in Switzerland, that is taking too long.

- The most difficulties we had, were in involving citizens and young people.

- Deadlines within the deliverables of SPARE were often too short for us. That was the reason why we couldn't start the participatory process as foreseen. Only in three years to learn, convince and start and implement the process is not feasible.

## LESSONS LEARNT

- Planning of participatory processes are dependent on local cultural behaviour and should be planned based on this background.

- Communication skills are very important in such a process and specialists have to be involved.

- Involvement of stakeholders needs a lot of time, whereas a project with a duration of three years is a bit short to get constructive inputs from them.

- The availability of a set of methods for participation and realisation of an IRBM is very important from the beginning of the project. The complexity of such methods has to be translated to be understandable for involved stakeholders. A common language is a good basis for a project like this.

- Evaluation and monitoring are such a complex topic, that this has to be planned and prepared preliminary. Probably it would be helpful to have a specialist in the beginning who supports the project manager and his team.

- The support from SPARE partners was helpful and gave the project a common basis, which helped not to get lost in the topic.

**Interreg**  
Alpine Space



**SPARE**

EUROPEAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

## INFO & CONTACTS

Angelika ABDERHALDEN  
Pro Terra Engiadina  
a.abderhalden@arinas.ch

Susanne MUHAR  
University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences (BOKU)  
susanne.muhar@boku.ac.at

Copyright © PTE

# DOCUMENT CONTROL

## PROJECT

SPARE- Strategic Planning for Alpine Rivers Ecosystems

## ACTION

WPT3 - action 3.3

## DELIVERABLE

WPT3 - deliverables 3.3.1

## DISSEMINATION

Public

## ORIGIN

PTE

## AUTHORS

Angelika Abderhalden, a.abderhalden@arinas.ch