Work Package 2
Peer To Peer (P2P) for Experience Sharing

P2P on Decentralized Water Management

- P2P No. 7: “Groundwater (GW) protection and GW body delineation”
- Water Information Systems
- P2P-8 B) Flood risk management at the local level, flood protection

SWIM–Horizon 2020 Support Mechanism
April 2019

Version	Document Title	Authors	Review and Clearance
V3	P2P on Decentralized Water Management	Over all report : Marwan Alraggad (SWIM-H2020 SM Non-key expert (NKE)) - P2P 7:Grath Johannes - P2P No. 8a: Eng. Arnulf Schönbauer - P2P No. 8b: Mr Demetris Zarris (NKE)	Suzan TAHA (SWIM-H2020 SM Key Water Expert)

THE SWIM AND H2020 SUPPORT MECHANISM PROJECT (2016-2019)

The SWIM-H2020 SM is a Regional Technical Support Program that is funded by the European Neighborhood Instrument (ENI) South/Environment. It ensures the continuation of EU's regional support to ENP South countries in the fields of water management, marine pollution prevention and adds value to other important EU-funded regional programs in related fields, in particular the SWITCH-Med program, and the Clima South program, as well as to projects under the EU bilateral programming, where environment and water are identified as priority sectors for the EU co-operation. It complements and provides operational partnerships and links with the projects labelled by the Union for the Mediterranean, project preparation facilities in particular MESHIP phase II and with the next phase of the ENPI-SEIS project on environmental information systems, whereas its work plan will be coherent with, and supportive of, the Barcelona Convention and its Mediterranean Action Plan.

The overall objective of the Program is to contribute to reduced marine pollution and a more sustainable use of scarce water resources. The Technical Assistance services are grouped in 6 work packages: WP1. Expert facility, WP2. Peer-to-peer experience sharing and dialogue, WP3. Training activities, WP4. Communication and visibility, WP5. Capitalizing the lessons learnt, good practices and success stories and WP6. Support activities.

Disclaimer:

This publication was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of the SWIM-H2020 SM Project and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. CONTEXT 7

2. METHODOLOGY AND PREVAILING ISSUES WITHIN THE FOCUS GROUP 8

2.1 P2P 7 - GROUNDWATER (GW) ZONE PROTECTION AND GROUNDWATER BODY DELINEATION: 8
2.2 P2P-8A - WATER INFORMATION SYSTEMS 9
2.3 P2P-8 B - FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AT THE LOCAL LEVEL, FLOOD PROTECTION 11

3. SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE 13

3.1 P2P 7 - GROUNDWATER ZONE PROTECTION AND GROUNDWATER BODY DELINEATION 13
3.2 P2P-8A - WATER INFORMATION SYSTEMS: 14
3.3 P2P-8 B - FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AT THE LOCAL LEVEL, FLOOD PROTECTION: 14

4. PEER TO PEER ASSESSMENT 15

5. APPENDICES 19

APPENDIX 1 - P2P NO. 7: “GROUNDWATER (GW) PROTECTION AND GW BODY DELINEATION”. GROUNDWATER REPORT 19
APPENDIX 2 - P2P NO. 8A: “FOCUS GROUP ON WATER INFORMATION SYSTEMS”. 19
APPENDIX 3 - P2P NO. 8B: FOCUS GROUP ON FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AT THE LOCAL LEVEL, FLOOD PROTECTION”. FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT REPORT. 19

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Countries and peers involved in P2P activity on DcWM per focus group 7
Table 2: Proposed themes and grouping of the issues raised by the peers (P2P 7) .. 8
Table 3: Proposed themes and grouping of the issues raised by the peers (P2P 8a) 10
Table 4: Proposed themes and grouping of the issues raised by the peer (P2P 8b) 11
Table 5: Results of the evaluation of P2P No. 7 16
Table 6: Results of the evaluation of P2P No. 8a 16
Table 7: Results of the evaluation of P2P No. 8b 17

ABBREVIATIONS

DcWM	Decentralised Water Management
GD	Guidance Document
GW	Groundwater
GWD	Groundwater Directive
P2P	Peer to Peer
SWIM-H2020 SM	Sustainable Water Integrated Management & Horizon 2020 - Support Mechanism
WFD	Water Framework Directive
WP	Work Package

1. CONTEXT

As part of its overall work plan, and under its work package (WP2), the EU-funded "Sustainable Water Integrated Management & Horizon 2020 - Support Mechanism (SWIM-H2020 SM)" project has implemented a Peer to Peer (P2P) activity on one of its Priority Themes: Decentralised Water Management (DcWM).

The objectives of the Peer to Peer activity, which involves direct exchange of experience between peers from relevant institutions in the beneficiary countries, are:

- Sharing expertise and guidance among Peers on a specific issue/topic;
- Boosting south-to-south (and also north-to-south) cooperation;
- Building the cornerstones for long-lasting relations and exchanges, as opposed to one-time ad-hoc exchange.

The exchange within the P2P activity is typically focused around pressing/emerging issues in the beneficiary countries, which drove the identification of the focus groups following a match-making process between those countries requesting the expertise and those offering it. In this regard, the following focus groups have been identified as part of the DcWM theme, together with the coaches and the countries offering and receiving (Table 1).

Table 1: Countries and peers involved in P2P activity on DcWM per focus group

Focus Group	Country Receiving	Country offering	Coach and contact information
	Expertise and contact persons		
P2P 7: Groundwater zone protection and groundwater body delineation	Egypt and Palestine **Egypt**: Ahmed Abdelwahab **Palestine**: Azhar Sharif	**Austria**: Johannes Grath	Johannes Grath Umweltbundesamt GmbH T: +43 1 313 04 3510 Email: johannes.grath@umweltbundesamt.at
P2P-8A): Water Information Systems	**Lebanon**: 1. Eng. Samar Hejazi Eng. Samer Housaini	**Austria**: Eng. Arnulf Schönbauer	Eng. Arnulf Schönbauer Umweltbundesamt GmbH T: +43-(0)1-31304/3573 Email: arnulf.schoenbauer@umweltbundesamt.at
P2P-8 B) Flood risk management at the local level, flood protection	**Israel:** Dr. Amir Givati	**Malta:** Manuel Sapiano **Greece:** Mr Demetris Zarris	Mr Demetris Zarris LDK Email: dez@ldk.gr

2. METHODOLOGY AND PREVAILING ISSUES WITHIN THE FOCUS GROUP

2.1 P2P 7 - GROUNDWATER (GW) ZONE PROTECTION AND GROUNDWATER BODY DELINEATION:

Since there are no peers from countries offering expertise, the information was provided by the coach only, i.e. the coach acted as both a coach and peer at the same time.

The peers requesting expertise were asked to identify the imminent issues/questions pertaining to each focus group. The questions were submitted by email and further discussed within the focus group at the Regional Training (REG 5) Workshop on decentralised water management held in Vienna (April 2018). The outcomes of the discussions on how to group and deal with the proposed specific topics are summarised in table 2 below.

Accordingly the report (See Appendix 1) addressed the **proposed topics no. 1 , 2 , 3, 5, 6, 7 by Egypt and topics no. 1 and 2 by Palestine**), and was shared before its finalisation with the peers from Egypt and Palestine for further comment and review.

Table 2: Proposed themes and grouping of the issues raised by the peers (P2P 7)

Country	Proposed specific topic	Proposed theme and grouping of specific topic
Egypt	1. What are the most polluting groundwater activities?	1. Delineation and Characterisation of GW-bodies and identification of pressures (reference to Art. 5 and Annex II Water Framework Directive (WFD) as well as to specific guidance documents)
	2. How can well drilling method cause groundwater pollution?	
	3. How can groundwater pollution be measured quantitatively and qualitatively?	2. Principles for developing a monitoring strategy and for monitoring network design (requirements outlined in Art. 8 WFD), e.g. distribution of sites, identification of relevant pollutants, monitoring frequency, etc.
	4. What are the procedures used to contain and treat different contaminants of groundwater?	Remark: Within the Peer to Peer breakout session at the REG 5 Workshop in Vienna (April 2018) it was concluded that this issue should not be dealt with in the peer to peer activity, since it is a technical issue specifically depending on the type of pollutant
	5. What are the procedures for protecting the single well, well fields, and groundwater aquifers?	3. Principles outlined in the WFD concerning GW protection – from general approaches down to the GW body level and sampling sites; Prevent or limit requirements according to Art. 6 Groundwater Directive (GWD) will be described; examples will be provided
	6. Is it possible to protect the groundwater reservoir from pollution from any contaminant in the source of recharge (river, lake, or any water body)?	

Country	Proposed specific topic	Proposed theme and grouping of specific topic
	7. What are the procedures for protecting groundwater from deterioration of quality and increase of dissolved salts as a result of pumping?	according to the structure of the programme of measures in Annex VII WFD **Remark on 7**: since this is not an issue in Austria, hardly any information can be provided
	8. Is it possible to protect groundwater from increased recharge due to dams and arches?	**Remark**: Within the breakout session at the REG 5 Workshop in Vienna (April 2018) it was concluded that this issue should not be dealt with in the peer to peer activity
	9. Are there any previous feasibility studies that can be used to evaluate the effect of groundwater protection on sustainable development?	**Remark**: Within the breakout session at the REG 5 Workshop in Vienna (April 2018) it was concluded that this issue should not be dealt with in the peer to peer activity
	10. How to develop formal mechanisms to ensure public participation in the management of well fields and protection of aquifers?	**Remark**: This issue will not be dealt with under the peer to peer activity; It will be covered under the "public participation" section of SWIM.
Palestine	1. What is the best and simplest mean to delineate protection zone 2?	4. Requirements concerning water used for the abstraction of drinking water (Art. 7 WFD); More specific issues will be addressed by the Expert Facility EFS-PS-1 in progress under SWIM-H2020 SM in Palestine.
	2. How to detect pollutant track?	5. This issue will be partly covered in a rather generic way as far as possible under: 'Principles for developing a monitoring strategy and for monitoring network design' (requirements outlined in Art. 8 WFD) e.g. distribution of sites, identification of relevant pollutants, monitoring frequency, etc.

2.2 P2P-8A - WATER INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Since there are no peers from countries offering expertise, the information was provided by the coach only, i.e. the coach acted as both a coach and peer at the same time.

The methodology comprised e-mail exchange, face-to-face session and Skype meetings.

At the beginning of April 2018, the peers from Lebanon requesting expertise provided information notes on the water sector (Annex 3 of Appendix 2) and were asked to identify the imminent issues/questions pertaining to the focus group.

Questions were submitted and discussed during a dedicated Peer-to-Peer session that was held during the Regional On-site Training (REG-5) on decentralised water management held in Vienna at the end of April 2018. During the discussion, a first feedback was given by the Austrian peer.

The questions comprised a wide range of topics related to the establishment, funding and operation of a national Water Information System (Table 3). To cover the entire questions in depth would be out of scope of the P2P process as the resources are limited. It was agreed that the replies would cover all questions (but in short) via E-mail. The replies are given in Annex 3 of Appendix 2. In August 2018, a Skype meeting was held for clarification and detailed discussion.

The report (See Appendix 2) was thereafter drafted and shared for review and comments by the peers before its finalisation.

Table 3: Proposed themes and grouping of the issues raised by the peers (P2P 8a)

No.	Questions/Issues Raised by Lebanon	Proposed Themes	Proposed Output
1	How can a Water Information System (WIS) help in the issue of data sharing?	Data Sharing	1. Institutional responsibility for Data management: Generation, Processing and Provision
2	To which administrative level (competent authority) the responsibility for operating a WIS may be given? (one authority or each organization is responsible of its part)?	WIS governance	
3	What are possible difficulties during the developing phase of the WIS?	WIS creation	
4	What are some prerequisites for establishing a WIS?	WIS creation	
5	Is all data shared free? Is it possible to have an online payment system?	Data sharing	
6	What should be the geographical unit for this management, knowing that in some cases the same basin follows two different districts, and we have many inter basins transfer?	Management in shared basins	
7	Is the establishment of a WIS in a multi-level governance structure more demanding than in a centralized governance structure	Management	
8	What legislative amendment should be made to make a WIS achievable?	Legislative amendments	
9	How to insure the quality of data shared on the system?	Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC)	2. Technical solutions: QAQC / Data quality and validation and publishing
10	How to manage multiplicity of data produced by different organizations especially that they come in different formats and quality	QAQC and data protocols	
11	How to display all data that are originally in different forms and formats in a proper and understandable manner?	Information products	
12	How to manage sharing this data to public not just between organizations?	Data sharing	

2.3 P2P-8 B - FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AT THE LOCAL LEVEL, FLOOD PROTECTION

The peer from Israel requesting expertise had been asked to identify the imminent issues/questions pertaining to the focus group. The questions were discussed with the Coach of the P2P.

The initialization of the P2P-8B Session was done through the official invitation of the Coach (Mr. Demetris Zarris) to both the beneficiary and the receiving peer on 26/02/2018.

On 28/03/2018 the Israeli Peer, Mr. Amir Givati, has stated the questions from his side to be included in the P2P-8B session to the Maltese Peer Mr. Manuel Sapiano. These questions are:

1. On average, what is the percentage of surface water (stream flow) in Malta out of the annual precipitation amount?
2. How much surface water you are able to capture on annual bases (in percentage from the total surface water amount and in MCM)?
3. Does the motivation for capturing flood water is mostly water resources management or for flood (flush floods) protection?
4. Do you suffer from flush floods in Malta? Urban flooding?
5. Do you have early warning system for floods? If so, do you operate your reservoirs according to that (release water before coming floods)?
6. Does the flood protection system is run by local agencies or at the national scale?
7. Do you have online monitoring network of weather, stream flow and reservoirs data (water level)?
8. Do you have Hydrological, Hydro-Meteorological modeling systems for that (simulations)?
9. Do you use 1% return period for flood protection planning for urban area?
10. Do you consider changing the return periods values due to climate change and land use changes?

The outcomes of the discussions on how to group and deal with the specific topics are summarised in the table below:

Table 4: Proposed themes and grouping of the issues raised by the peer (P2P 8b)

Proposed Theme	Proposed Specific Topic
1. Flood Modelling	a. Rain gauge data network and data management (design, transfer, storage, process, archive). Focus is on data management
	b. Types of early warning systems (radar networks, satellite imagery, real time flood forecasting, metamodels).
	c. Flood modelling methodologies (rainfall – runoff simulation, flood routing with 1D or/and 2D models in urban areas).

Proposed Theme	Proposed Specific Topic
	d. Flood Hazard Mapping: The importance of digital terrain models.
	e. Origin of Floods and Generation Mechanism according to catchment geomorphology (flash floods, river floods, urban floods, tidal floods, etc.). This topic depends on the type of floods flows prevailing in Malta.
2. Institutional Issues of Flood Risk Management	a. Assessing flood vulnerability and flood risk.
	b. Flood Risk Management Plans: Prevention, Protection & Mitigation - Who is doing what, especially when flooding occurs (emergency issues).
3. Flood Risk Management in the European Union according to the Directive 2007/60/EC on the Assessment and Management of Flood Risks: The pace so far and the way forward.	
4. Engineering design under flood threat.	a. The concept of return period in different storm drainage projects.
	b. "Event-based Flood Design" according to the Intensity – Duration – Frequency Curves vs "Continuous time flood modelling"
	c. Engineering design under climate change

The reply from the peer in Malta (presented in the main report (See Appendix 3) showed that Malta does not present a similar case to Israel with totally different flooding characteristics. It was therefore decided that the P2P-8B Coach (Mr. Demetris Zarris) will also act as Peer. The peering would be based on the expert knowledge and experience that the Peer has gained from his involvement during the preparation of the 1st Flood Risk Management Plan (according to the Directive 2007/60/EC) for the Republic of Cyprus. It was assumed that the Republic of Cyprus and Israel may exhibit the same characteristics relative to flood hazards and vulnerability. The catchments between Cyprus and Israel exhibit the same geomorphological characteristics with the severity of intense flood producing rainfalls and the same nature of flooding mechanisms (flash floods).

The Peer/coach had applied a 2D flood routing model for Klemos River that transects the suburbs of Nicosia City based on which discussions could be made on the advantages and limitation of various 1D and 2D models and the influence of topography and tall vegetation on flood routing and propagation.

A shortened list was thereafter identified (based on table 4 above) presenting the potential themes to be addressed on flood risk management and prevention at the local level (subject to available resources). The actual themes which were eventually discussed are presented in Chapter 3 of this report (SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES).

- **Flood Modelling to** explore most aspects of flood modelling including methodologies for flood routing (1D and 2D models), flooding generation mechanisms, early warning systems, etc. (corresponding to Topic 1.c and 1.e in table 4 above);
- **Institutional Issues of Flood Risk Management to** explore flood vulnerability and flood risk principles as well as the flood risk management plans especially who is doing what having in mind current practices in Greece and Cyprus (corresponding to Topics 2.a and b of table 4 above);**.**

- **Flood Risk Assessment & Management according to the European Directive (2007/60/EC)** on the Assessment and Management of Flood Risks: The pace so far and the way forward (corresponding to Topic 3 of table 4 above);
- **Engineering Design under Flood Threat to** explore design techniques of flood prevention structures (e.g. storm drainage networks) such as the concept of return period, the event-based and the continuous time simulation techniques for the sizing of storm drainage structures (corresponding to Topics 4.a and b of table 4 above).

The draft report (See Appendix 3) was thereafter prepared and shared with the peer for review and comments before finalisation

3. SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE

Based on the issues that have been identified (see above), three **documents were prepared (Appendices 1, 2 and 3) that responded to specific issues raised by the participating countries with due consideration** to the available resources and time

3.1 P2P 7 - GROUNDWATER ZONE PROTECTION AND GROUNDWATER BODY DELINEATION

The questions which were submitted by the peers from Palestine and Egypt were subsumed in a concise report under the following topic:

„Principles for groundwater protection against pollution in line with the European Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EU (WFD) and the Groundwater Directive 2006/118/EU (GWD)“

The report comprised the following issues – based on existing guidance documents and experiences made so far:

- Delineation and characterisation of GW bodies and identification of pressures (reference to Art. 5 and Annex II WFD as well as to specific guidance documents developed under the WFD CIS):
  - Delineation and characterisation of GW bodies and identification of pressures are the basis for developing a monitoring strategy and for monitoring network design (requirements outlined in Art. 8 WFD), e.g. distribution of sites, identification of relevant pollutants, monitoring frequency, etc.;
- Measures for GW protection– from general approaches down to the GW body level and sampling sites:

- examples were provided according to the structure of the programme of measures in Annex VII WFD;
- Measures to prevent or limit input of pollutants into groundwater according to Art. 6 GWD;
- further aspects as considered relevant;

- Requirements concerning water used for the abstraction of drinking water (Art. 7 WFD).

The report was based on guidance documents which were developed at the European level to support the implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive and the EU Groundwater Directive (under the WFD **Common Implementation Strategy** (CIS)), and on selected assessment reports.

Moreover, the Austrian experience concerning groundwater management – in particular by implementing the EU Water Framework Directive and the Groundwater Directive, with an emphasis on GW body delineation and characterisation, risk assessment, monitoring and status assessment, and on groundwater protection measures was brought in. Since groundwater is the predominant source for drinking water abstraction in Austria (at around 99% of all drinking water being abstracted from groundwater), information concerning drinking water protected areas was shared, as well.

The report **(Appendix 1)** addressed as indicated in table 2 above the **proposed topics no. 1 , 2 , 3, 5, 6, 7 by Egypt and topics no. 1 and 2 by Palestine**)

3.2 P2P-8A - WATER INFORMATION SYSTEMS:

The report **(Appendix 2)** directly addressed all the questions raised by the peers from Lebanon as per table 3.

3.3 P2P-8 B - FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AT THE LOCAL LEVEL, FLOOD PROTECTION:

Considering the available resources and time, **the chapters of this report (Appendix 3) were prepared that responded to the following specific issues raised by the country:**

- Flood modelling methodologies (rainfall – runoff simulation, flood routing with 1D or/and 2D models in urban areas) (**corresponding to the proposed topics no. 1c by Israel**).
- Description and Analysis of the modelling strategy for the Klemos Catchment (Cyprus) 2D Flooding Routing Model using MIKEFLOOD software. (**corresponding to the proposed topics no. 1d by Israel**).

4. PEER TO PEER ASSESSMENT

A set of indicators was used to evaluate the peer to peer exchange i) evaluation indicators, reflecting the quality of the organizational, administrative and planning aspects of the activity (See section A below of tables 5, 6 and 7), (ii) indicators to assess the technical quality of the activity (See section B below of tables 5, 6 and 7), and (iii) indicators for an overall assessment of the activity as indicated in section C of tables 5, 6 and 7 below.

A set of criteria in each category was developed & assessed by the participants, using quantitative scores ranging between 1 to 4, with an opportunity to provide suggestions for improvement.

Only four questionnaires were distributed among the peers: one from each of Egypt, and Palestine (P2P 7), one from Lebanon (P2P 8a) and one from Israel (P2P 8b). The results of the three P2P activities are given in tables 5, 6 and 7 .

Table 5: Results of the evaluation of P2P No. 7

A. ORGANISATIONAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND PLANNING ISSUES BEFORE AND DURING THE EVENT		*Peer Country*		
		Palestine	**Egypt**	Average Score (max = 4)
A1	Planning of the P2P session : efficient and effective communication of objectives	2	4	3
A2	Clarity, coverage and sufficiency of concepts, objectives, anticipated outputs and outcomes	3	4	3.5
A3	Efficient and Effective Facilitation of the P2P process	3	4	3.5
B.FEEDBAACK ON TECHNICAL ASPECTS/CONTENTS				Average Score (max = 4)
B1	Efficient and effective performance and interaction with the other	1	1	1
B2	Clarity, coverage and sufficiency of concepts, objectives, anticipated outputs and outcomes	3	1	2
B3	Length of the process :In your view the duration of the peer to peer process (from conception to the delivery of the output)	Sufficient	Sufficient	-
B4	What did you like most about this P2P process and what was the benefit for you to participate?	Exchanges Experiences	Exchanges Experiences	-
B5	What needs to be improved or could be done differently?	More communication	More communicati on	-
C.OVERALL ASSESSMENT				Average Score (max = 4)
C1	Do you see the peer-to-peer processes a suitable tool for knowledge transfer?	Very Suitable	Very Suitable	4
C2	Overall rating of the P2P process	3	3	3

Table 6: Results of the evaluation of P2P No. 8a

A. ORGANISATIONAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND PLANNING ISSUES BEFORE AND DURING THE EVENT		*Peer Country*	
		Lebanon	Average Score (max = 4)
A1	Planning of the P2P session : efficient and effective communication of objectives	1	1
A2	Clarity, coverage and sufficiency of concepts, objectives, anticipated outputs and outcomes	3	3

A. ORGANISATIONAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND PLANNING ISSUES BEFORE AND DURING THE EVENT		*Peer Country*	
		Lebanon	Average Score (max = 4)
A3	Efficient and Effective Facilitation of the P2P process	3	3
B.FEEDBAACK ON TECHNICAL ASPECTS/CONTENTS			Average Score (max = 4)
B1	Efficient and effective performance and interaction with the other	4	4
B2	Clarity, coverage and sufficiency of concepts, objectives, anticipated outputs and outcomes	3	3
B3	Length of the process :In your view the duration of the peer to peer process (from conception to the delivery of the output)	Longer	-
B4	What did you like most about this P2P process and what was the benefit for you to participate?	side discussions	-
B5	What needs to be improved or could be done differently?	More P2P sessions	-
C.OVERALL ASSESSMENT			Average Score (max = 4)
C1	Do you see the peer-to-peer processes a suitable tool for knowledge transfer?	-	-
C2	Overall rating of the P2P process	2	2

Table 7: Results of the evaluation of P2P No. 8b

A. ORGANISATIONAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND PLANNING ISSUES BEFORE AND DURING THE EVENT		*Peer Country*	
		Israel	Average Score (max = 4)
A1	Planning of the P2P session : efficient and effective communication of objectives	2	2
A2	Clarity, coverage and sufficiency of concepts, objectives, anticipated outputs and outcomes	2	2

B.FEEDBAACK ON TECHNICAL ASPECTS/CONTENTS			Average Score (max = 4)
B1	Efficient and effective performance and interaction with the other	3	3
B2	Clarity, coverage and sufficiency of concepts, objectives, anticipated outputs and outcomes	4	3
B3	Length of the process :In your view the duration of the peer to peer process (from conception to the delivery of the output)	Sufficient	-
B4	What did you like most about this P2P process and what was the benefit for you to participate?	Hydrological modeling	-
B5	What needs to be improved or could be done differently?	Understand more about P2P process	-
C.OVERALL ASSESSMENT			Average Score (max = 4)
C1	Do you see the peer-to-peer processes a suitable tool for knowledge transfer?	-	-
C2	Overall rating of the P2P process	2	2

It is worth to highlight that although the P2P activity was highly acknowledged and appreciated by the peers, the overall assessment of the activity was low (between 2 to 3 out of 4). Most of the participants requested more exchange and communication with the peers/coaches. This is however was limited due to the limited resourtces dedicated to the coaches.. A Significant recommendation was given to continue cooperation & exchange knowledge and experience between peers' countries. This is after all one of the main objectives of the P2P activity: To boost cooperation and continue exchange beyond the completion of the activity.

5. APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 - P2P NO. 7: “GROUNDWATER (GW) PROTECTION AND GW BODY DELINEATION”. GROUNDWATER REPORT

APPENDIX 2 - P2P NO. 8A: “FOCUS GROUP ON WATER INFORMATION SYSTEMS”.

APPENDIX 3 - P2P NO. 8B: FOCUS GROUP ON FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AT THE LOCAL LEVEL, FLOOD PROTECTION”. FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT REPORT

‘