Deliberative governance on river basin management planning: analysing the Water Framework Directive consequences in Catalonia

Marc Parés
Geography Department
Autonomous University of Barcelona

10 June 2013
marc.pares@uab.cat
Objectives

• Analyse the consequences of the deliberation (focusing our attention on the policy improvements)

• Explore the causes that explain the lights and the shadows of the deliberative process
Before the WFD was adopted

Structure of water administration:

According to two main criteria:

• Regional administration.

• River basin management.
Participation before WFD:

- Non-state actors were already involved in water management, but only those actors that were considered traditional users of water.

- This model of participation was based on River Basin Agencies created at the beginning of the past century. The model was established in 1985, when participation in water management was institutionalized through planning and management bodies into RBA.

- The composition of these bodies was established according to the amount of water used by each user.

- As in Catalonia irrigators are the main users of water, they controlled most of these participatory bodies.

- Contestation against the National Hydrological Plan (2001-2004)
Implementation timeline:

**December 2003:** the interregional river basin district was delimited.

**December 2004:** IMPRESS.

**2006-2007:** 2 pilot participatory processes were carried out.

**2007-2009:** 14 participatory processes

**December 2009:** the draft of the River Basin Management Plan of the district was approved.

**November 2010:** the River Basin Management Plan was approved by the government.
The Catalan case as a best practice:

- The government of Catalonia has played a significant role promoting a vast deliberative process

- 3M € invested on the deliberative process

- 290 meetings

- 1,766 people involved coming from 1,311 organizations

- 1,000 hours of debate

- 1,529 proposals produced

- 964 proposals introduced in the final River Basin Management Plan approved by the government in 2010
Participatory processes:
Who participated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders’ profile</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Interview sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional and local administration</td>
<td>517 (29%)</td>
<td>16 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and environmental organizations</td>
<td>476 (30%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and business stakeholders</td>
<td>290 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and forest stakeholders</td>
<td>229 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-organized citizens</td>
<td>122 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.769</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors’ own

- New actors have been involved on the policy-making process
- Basically directed to stakeholders as representatives
- Back doors to influence policy-making process
Results of the process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepted but already planned</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted and innovative</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred to other Departments</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,529</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Catalan Water Agency, 2010

- From particular interests to a public position
- Policy-influence was unequal. Resources, capacities, skills and time availability were extremely different between actors
- Lack of joined-up governance
- Lack of political engagement by all the Departments of government
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Evaluating the process

Deliberative quality:

- Exchange of opinions and arguments
- The process was accessible and understandable enough
- A practical decision allowed seeing the results
- Steered by the economy of moral disagreement
- Mutual respect

- Participants satisfied with the process but unsatisfied with its results
- Top-down participation
- The framework was already given

How could we improve it?

- Leadership and communication
- Real comprehensive planning
- Cultural change
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Final remarks

Incidence

Strategies of civil society participation

Resistance

Dissidence
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