



**ERAC-CT-2005-0260025**

**IWRM-NET**

**Towards a European-wide exchange Network for integrating research efforts on Integrated Water Resources Management**

**DELIVERABLE D-S4**

***INITIATING AND IMPLEMENTING JOINT RESEARCH FUNDING ACTIVITIES  
– EXPERIENCES, LESSONS LEARNED***

This supplementary deliverable replaces on and further develops the original Deliverables D41 (Compilation of preliminary trans-national project evaluation outcomes) and D42 (Provision on a trans-national project evaluation procedure including report on first practical experiences made).

<b>DOCUMENT INFORMATION</b>			
<b>The IWRM-Net Project is funded by the European Commission with the 6th Framework Programme</b>			
<b><i>Due date</i></b>	December 2007, Month 24 postponed to July 2010	<b>Actual submission date</b>	July 2010 (Month 52)
<b><i>Dissemination level</i></b>	Public		PU
<b><i>Draft Version</i></b>	Version V4		January 5, 2011
<b><i>Final version</i></b>			
<b><i>Authors</i></b>	Daniela Past (UBA-A) & Irene Huber (PTKA on behalf of BMBF) Markus Leitner (UBA-A) & Melanie Bauer (PTKA on behalf of BMBF)		
<b><i>Comments / support</i></b>			

## **TABEL OF CONTENTS**

PURPOSE .....	3
FACTS AND EXPERIENCES FOR THE 1 <sup>ST</sup> AND 2 <sup>ND</sup> IWRM-NET JOINT CALL .....	4
RESULTS AND EXPERIENCES FROM IWRM-NET JOINT CALLS .....	7
REFINED APPROACH FOR 2 <sup>ND</sup> JOINT CALL.....	10
LESSONS LEARNED FROM IWRM-NET JOINT CALLS .....	15
CONCEPT HOW TO PROMOTE JOINT TRANSNATIONAL FUNDING ACTIVITIES.....	16
APPENDICES.....	19
I.    Principles and Common regulations.....	19
II.   Application form .....	19
APPLICANT/ COORDINATOR – PARTNER 1.....	19
APPLICANT – PARTNER 2.....	20
APPLICANT – PARTNER 3.....	20
APPLICANT – PARTNER 4.....	21
APPLICANT – PARTNER 5.....	21
SUMMARY.....	22
(PLEASE DESCRIBE BRIEFLY OBJECTIVES, WORK PLANNING AND EXPECTED EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS OF THE SUGGESTED COLLABORATIVE PROJECT; MAX. 2000 CHARACTERS) .....	22
WORK PACKAGES (WP) .....	22
ESTIMATED PERSON MONTHS PER WORK PACKAGE .....	22
COSTS PER PARTNER AND REQUESTED FUNDING BUDGET (IN EURO) .....	23
III.   Evaluation form.....	25
IV.   1 <sup>st</sup> Call results .....	30
V.    Selected projects 2 <sup>nd</sup> Call.....	32
1. ESAWADI - Utilizing the Ecosystem Services Approach for Water Framework Directive Implementation (France, Germany, Portugal).....	32
2. WATER2ADAPT - resilience enhancement and water demand management for climate change adaptation (Italy, Germany, Spain, Portugal).....	32
3. Water Cap & Trade - Water Market scenarios for Southern Europe: new solutions for dealing with water scarcity and drought risk (France, Italy, Spain) .....	32
4. Climate Change - Impacts of climate change on water resources management – regional strategies and European view (Germany, France, Italy).....	33
5. IMPACT -Developing an integrated model to predict abiotic habitat conditions and biota of rivers for application in climate change research and water management (Germany, Portugal, France) .....	33
6. ICARUS - IWRM for climate change adaptation in rural social ecosystems Southern Europe (Italy, Portugal, Spain) .....	33
VI.   Reporting form (for final evaluation of 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Call projects).....	33
VII.  Policy letter form (for interim information of 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Call projects) .....	34
<b>SUMMARY FOR DECISION-MAKERS.....</b>	<b>34</b>

## **PURPOSE**

This document depicts and analyses the process of implementing joint transnational Calls in the field of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM), with a special focus on WFD implementation.

Since there are already extensive descriptions and analyses of joint funding activities from other ERA-Nets available, we will only summarize the most important facts necessary to provide a complete picture as well as a foundation for evaluation, “lessons learned” and conceptual thoughts.

## FACTS AND EXPERIENCES FOR THE 1<sup>ST</sup> AND 2<sup>ND</sup> IWRM-NET JOINT CALL

necessary steps	1 <sup>st</sup> Call	comments	2 <sup>nd</sup> Call	comments
decision on Joint Call	10/ 2006	– early it became obvious that the scope, range and regulations of national funding activities is diverse for the IWRM-Net partners which prevented the participation of all partners in joint Calls	01/2009	– based on the experiences of the 1 <sup>st</sup> IWRM-Net Call and the diversity of research needs continuously assessed by WP2, IWRM-Net partners wanted to improve transnational funding activities and tackle at least two more highly relevant topic
assessment of research needs and defining the Call topics	10/ 2006 ↓ 10/ 2007	– IWRM-Net internal discussions were accompanied by two stakeholder workshops to assess the research needs  – as for the different scopes of funders, a decision on broadly agreed topics became a complex and demanding issue which ends up in two topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hydrological and Morphological Pressures and Impacts on Ecological Status</li> <li>▪ Water governance</li> </ul>	11/ 2007 ↓ 02/ 2009	– IWRM-Net internal discussions were accompanied by a series of regional and common workshops to assess the research needs from the diverse stakeholder groups  – as for the different priorities of funders, three topics were agreed on in order to meet most interests or needs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ adaptation to climate change</li> <li>▪ water scarcity and droughts</li> <li>▪ economics for the implementation of the WFD</li> </ul>
analysis of the national prerequisites for Call activities	11/ 2006 ↓ 03/ 2007	– a detailed questionnaire yielded a rather limited feedback by the partners  → experiences from Pilot Calls of other environmental ERA-Nets like CRUE, SNOWMAN and SKEP were compiled, analysed, and adapted to partner's needs	10/ 2008 ↓ 12/ 2008	- experiences from the 1st Call and possible changes in framing conditions influencing IWRM-Net funders were collected and analysed and discussed within IWRM-Net
setting up a Call Package:	12/ 2006 ↓ 10/ 2007	– Call text defining the research needs – Principles of IWRM-Net Joint Calls (including roadmap and evaluation procedures) – Common Rules – Application Form + Guide for Applicants – Evaluation Form + Guide for Evaluators – Online Call Coordination	12/ 2008 ↓ 6/ 2009	– Call text defining the research needs – Principles of IWRM-Net Joint Calls (including roadmap and evaluation procedures) – Common Rules – Application Form + Guide for Applicants – Evaluation Form + Guide for Evaluators – Online Call Coordination

publishing the Call	11/2007 ↓ 02/2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not all participating countries could launch the Call simultaneously due to administrative reasons</li> <li>- Call-related information was posted at the IWRM-Net website and in national media.</li> <li>- the joint Call secretariat was supplemented by National Contact Points supporting the application period regarding the national rules &amp; preferences</li> <li>- 17 joint project applications from 14 European countries (9 IWRM-Net partners + Sweden, Italy, Luxembourg, Belgium, Switzerland) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Water Governance (8 proposals)</li> <li>▪ Hydrological and Morphological Pressures (9 proposals)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	7/ 2009 ↓ 10/ 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not all participating countries could launch the Call simultaneously due to administrative reasons</li> <li>- Call-related information was posted at the IWRM-Net website and in national media.</li> <li>- the joint Call secretariat was supplemented by National Contact Points supporting the application period regarding the national rules &amp; preferences</li> <li>- 15 joint project applications from 8 European countries and one Scientific Coordination Project</li> </ul>
evaluation of applications	03/2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- formal check by Call Secretariat</li> <li>- national eligibility test</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- formal check by Call Secretariat</li> <li>- national eligibility test</li> </ul>
ranking	04/2008 ↓ 05/2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- international expert panel consisting of 31 experts</li> <li>- triple evaluation for each project (except for 2 projects, because of short term-refusal by experts)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- international expert panel consisting of 15 experts</li> <li>- triple evaluation for each project</li> </ul>
funding decision / result	05/2008	- 4 <sup>1</sup> projects were funded	04/2010	- 6 <sup>2</sup> projects were funded

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.iwrn-net.eu/spip.php?article254>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.iwrn-net.eu/spip.php?article107>

negotiation phase	06/2008 ↓ 11/2008	-		-
start of projects	09/2008 ↓ 01/2009	-		-
interim evaluation		-		-
final evaluation		-		-
dissemination / transfer of results		-		-

## RESULTS AND EXPERIENCES FROM IWRM-NET JOINT CALLS

### (1) Benefits of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Joint Call

#### I open up for exchange and joint collaboration

European collaboration in research programming and management only recently has changed from personal, mostly bilateral cooperation to multilateral exchange. The most important achievement of the IWRM-NET Joint Calls therefore, definitely was that all IWRM-Net partners thought and discussed about joining efforts and open up for collaboration in IWRM-focused research, assessed potential, common interests and framework conditions necessary. Although at the end only half of the partners took part in the joint Calls, networks are larger and understanding improved on national interests and restraints.

#### II transnational research results supporting the implementation of the WFD

10 transnational research projects (four projects funded within the first call and six projects funded within the second call) have been initiated in the frame of IWRM-Net joint Calls. In order to promote dissemination of the project results, outcomes were not only presented in scientific journals, but have and will preferably be translated into “policy briefs” and other suitable formats to serve policy makers, implementers, and additional stakeholders.

Starting with the 2<sup>nd</sup> funding initiative, moreover, a Scientific Coordination Project promote exchange between the projects, will set the research results of the funding initiative into a wider context as well as support transferring them to the different stakeholder groups.

### (2) Potential to improve joint Call activities

issue	problems encountered	possible measures
Negotiation and adjustment of the Call documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- very time consuming</li> <li>⇒ numerous versions of documents need time to produce and read the outcome</li> <li>⇒ very detailed procedures requires lengthy documents</li> <li>⇒ extensive email exchange</li> <li>- not all Call participants read the documents in detail → surprises and discussions even after agreements settled</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- accept common rules for all EU-wide joint funding activities and pinpointing/negotiating only specific issues related to call topic or other special requirements</li> <li>- stick to call principles and supplementary agreements to avoid disputes to flared up again</li> </ul>
Call roadmap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- publication of the Calls as well as starting/ reporting dates of the successful projects could not be synchronized based on national rules</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- settle roadmap well in advance but leave windows of approx. 2 weeks for flexibility</li> <li>- sign this roadmap as part of supplementary agreements</li> </ul>

scientific evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not all national experts that were appointed by their national contact points were willing or able to perform the evaluation in time</li> <li>- wide ranging evaluation results in some cases</li> <li>- decision that no expert should evaluate a proposal from his/her own country to avoid conflict of interests counteracts the need of national background knowledge and makes distribution of proposals dependent on different scientific background complicated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ask for written consent of experts (amount of work and deadline)</li> <li>- evaluation of proposals in triplicate at least (scientists, &amp; national implementers)</li> <li>- discuss and corroborate ranking results during a joint evaluation board meeting</li> <li>- focusing on one specific Call topic diminishes the number of experts to be involved and allows for a better comparison of evaluation results/ ranking</li> <li>- payment of experts guarantees motivation and delivery of evaluation in time</li> </ul>
national prioritization	-	-
funding decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- scientific excellence was turned down for political reasons and financial restraints</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- clear agreements on decision making process</li> <li>- thorough advisory service during the application phase by national contact points to rule out proposals that meet not the national priorities</li> <li>- ensure proportionality of the national funding and a minimum funding budget for at least 3 projects</li> </ul>
reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- despite principle agreements, common interim reporting was rather heterogeneous in content, form and timing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- quality standard for all reporting duties should be set at the outset of the project</li> </ul>

Funders Meeting:

- No restrictions for certain projects or national prioritization should pop up during the funders meeting, since there was a national check of the proposals beforehand.
- The possible values of the projects should be clarified by the funders in advance
- The holidays have to be taken into account for the time frame of the Joint Call.
- Only people should be invited who have the permission to decide.

After the first Joint Call the following activities have been decided on:

- Prior knowledge exchange between the funders on status quo
- Call organisation
  - o choice of Call topic & policy steer



- agreement on principles of the Call
- provision of forms for all stages
- partners commitment
- Funding arrangements
- Call process
  - evaluation procedure
  - partners commitment e.g. selection of suitable experts
  - funding commitment
  - performance of Call secretariat
  - information flow to Call secretariat (e.g. usage of the online coordination tool)
- Project implementation and reporting
  - Project co-ordination information flow to Call secretariat & online coordination tool
  - Dissemination

## REFINED APPROACH FOR 2<sup>ND</sup> JOINT CALL

For the second Call the evaluation criteria and procedures have been adapted, also the weighting in comparison with the ERA-Nets BIODIVERSA and SKEP.

WP4 has analysed Call procedures from CRUE and BIODIVERSA in order to

- decide whether to include national prioritisation marks into the ranking, and
- to compare and validate the criteria for the scientific peer review.

### 1. National Prioritisation:

CRUE and BIODIVERSA gave their national funders the chance to assign prioritisation marks to the projects:

A (highest priority)

B (moderate priority)

C (least priority)

WP4 proposed to add these prioritisation marks to the ranking table in order to ease decision during the final funders meeting. The following table may help to illustrate the idea:

Consortium acronym/ Sorter	countries involved	requested financial support	Evaluation Score									national prioritisation marks	score of scientific review	final ranking	
			added value	relevance call	scientific quality	transdisciplinarity	case studies	dissemination	trans-national linkage	consortium	planning				cumulated scores (1-9) out of 88
project A	ES	x	10	10	13	4	5	12	4	15	10	83	A	78	1
	UK		9	10	12	4	4	12	3	14	8	76	B		
	RO		10	10	15	4	5	10	4	15	3	76	A		
project B	ES	y	10	9	15	4	5	14	3	15	9	84	B	77	2
	UK		8	8	11	4	3	12	4	12	8	70	C		
	RO		6	10	13	4	5	12	4	15	7	76	C		

Since a 'Fit-to-Call' must be ensured through direct contact of the applicants with their national help desks before submitting a proposal, prioritisation will aid ranking of proposals with similar scientific quality.

## 2. Evaluation Criteria

The comparison of the evaluation criteria was quite satisfying; all relevant points seemed to be covered. Hence it was decided to keep the proposed criteria:

- (1) Added value for the WFD implementation / IWRM policy and potential for solving problems; **10 CP**
- (2) Relevance / extent to which the proposed project addresses the objectives of the Call; **10 CP**
- (3) Scientific quality of the project hypothesis, approach and innovation (clear progress beyond the current state-of-the-art); **15 CP (minimum 10 CP)**
- (4) Inter- and transdisciplinarity (good diversity of scientific disciplines, complementarity between participants); **4 CP**
- (5) Demonstration / case studies, are there good practical demonstration examples (case studies) provided; **5 CP**
- (6) **NEW:** Involvement of relevant practitioners/ implementers **15 CP**
- (7) Dissemination / expected exploitability of results; **15 CP**
- (8) Trans-national linkage and benefit of cooperation (clear added value); **8 CP**
- (9) Quality of consortium management and expertise of the coordinator and the Project Partners; **10 CP**
- (10) Prospects for success with regard to the work and financial plan including time schedule; **10 CP**

The following table summarizes the evaluation criteria of all three ERA-Nets:

BIODIVERSA	CRUE	IWRM.Net	Consensus
<b>Pre-proposal stage</b>			
1. Scientific Aspects (as below)	One stage		
2. Policy Relevance (as below)			
3. European added value			

BIODIVERSA	CRUE	IWRM.Net	Consensus
<b>Full proposal stage</b>			
<b>1. Scientific Aspects</b>			
a) Scientific quality of the proposed research	Innovation: The extent to which the objectives represent clear progress beyond the current state-of-the-art.	Scientific quality of the project approach and innovation (clear progress beyond the current state-of-the-art); 15 CP (minimum 10 CP)	Scientific quality of the project <b>hypothesis</b> , approach and innovation
b) Novelty / Originality and innovation			
c) Clarity of the hypothesis			
d) Quality and suitability of the consortium	Qualification and expertise of the coordinator and the project partners	Quality of consortium management and expertise of the coordinator and the	Quality of consortium management and expertise of the coordina-

	Quality of the management	Project Partners; 15 CP	tor
e) Level of inter/multi/trans-disciplinarity	Inter- and Transdisciplinarity	Inter- and transdisciplinarity: good diversity of scientific disciplines, complementarity betw. Participants;4CP	Inter- and transdisciplinarity
f) Fit to thematic priorities	Relevance: the extent to which the proposed project addresses the objectives of the Call.	Relevance / extent to which the proposed project addresses the objectives of the Call; 10 CP	Fit to thematic priorities
<b>2. Policy relevance</b>			
a) Relevance for the identified policy application, importance of the research for solving pressing concerns/issues related to biodiversity	Potential: the extent to which the proposed project is likely to have an impact on solving problems in flood risk management.	Dissemination / expected exploitability of results; 15 CP	Dissemination / expected exploitability of results
b) Arrangements for knowledge transfer	Exploitability: The extent to which exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results.		
c) Approach to stakeholder engagement		Involvement of relevant practioners/ implementers 15 CP	Involvement of relevant practioners/ implementers
d) Identification of end users			
<b>3. Project management and added value</b>			
a) European added value	Added value for the European flood management policy	Added value for the WFD implementation / IWRM policy and potential for solving problems; 10 CP	Added value: state benefit for the end users or policy makers (lesson learnt by CRUE)
	Transnational linkage and benefit of cooperation	Trans-national linkage and benefit of cooperation (clear added value); 8 CP	benefit of cooperation
b) Feasibility and risk	Prospects for success with regard to the work and financial plan including time schedule	Prospects for success with regard to the work and financial plan including time schedule; 10 CP	Feasibility and risk
	Cost effectiveness of the proposal set against its relevance, significance, and scientific excellence.		
		Demonstration / case studies, demonstration examples; 5 CP	Practicability

Some partners outside IWRM-NET have been integrated in this process per email invitation and some via direct contacts → ISPRA the only successful example, due to already established contact, integration of unknown partners failed.

Finally on April 30<sup>th</sup> 2009 during the Vienna meeting the principles and the timing for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Joint Call had been approved. It was decided that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Joint IWRM-NET Call on specific topics, which had to be decided in the following, should be published, and a Scientific Coordination project should be funded, in order to guarantee an ongoing support for the funded projects even after the end of IWRM-NET in December 2010. The procedures for both Calls was communicated and adapted to the needs of the participating funding organisations in several rounds.

On June 6<sup>th</sup>, 2009 the Scientific Specification for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Joint IWRM-NET Call was finalized and the following topics were agreed:

- Economics and Social Values for Integrated Water Management
- Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation for IWRM
- Water Scarcity and Drought

Right after that agreement the national promotion of the Call did start. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Joint Call was opened on July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009 and closed on October 15<sup>th</sup> 2009. 15 thematic proposals and 1 Scientific Coordination Project (SCP) had been submitted to the Call Secretariat. All the electronically proposal submissions had been in time. The printed version arrived up to 10 days later. In the following table the division of the thematically focus of the projects is shown:

<b>Thematic Scope</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Proposal</b>
<b>Economics and Social Values for Integrated Water Management</b>	FR, GE, PT FR, IT, ES SE, FR, RO	<b>ESAWADI</b> <b>Water Cap &amp; Trade</b> <b>Economics and Social Values</b>
<b>Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation for IWRM</b>	PT, ES, GE GE, FR, ES, SE ES, NL, GE, FR GE, FR, IT GE, FR, PT FR, IT, ES	<b>CATCH</b> <b>Kyoto meets WFD</b> <b>ICARIM</b> (also social economics) <b>Climaware</b> <b>IMPACT</b> <b>IMAGHYNE</b> (also social economics)
<b>Water Scarcity and Drought</b>	IT, GE, PT, ES, FR ES, GE, PT IT, ES, FR, PT ES, PT, IT	<b>DROVAVAS</b> <b>WATCHA</b> <b>INARES</b> <b>DROUNET</b>

	IT, GE, ES, PT IT, PT, ES	<b>WATER2ADAPT</b> (also economics) <b>ICARUS</b> (also social economics)
--	------------------------------	--

The eligibility check by the Call Secretariat took place from October 15<sup>th</sup> till - 20<sup>th</sup> 2009. The fit-to-Call evaluation on national level did last from October 20<sup>th</sup> to November 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009.

Problems appeared with IMAGHYNE, ICARIM & SCP proposals. A pragmatic approach for ICARIM (NL) and IMAGHYNE (ES) have been found.

But for the SCP-Call procedure no solution could be worked out. Although the procedure was discussed and agreed on in beforehand, the involved funding partners did no longer agree on evaluation of the SCP-proposal by the funding organizations themselves. An external evaluation was required. Due to this it was necessary to launch the SCP Call again. The relaunch of the SCP Call was from December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009 till Jan. 8<sup>th</sup>, 2010. An external evaluation in triplicate (3 evaluators) was implemented.

The external peer review board of both Calls, Thematic and SCP Call, had time till October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2010 to evaluate the proposals. The ranking list was distributed to the evaluators and funders on January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010. The final ranking meeting took place in Vienna from January 14<sup>th</sup> till 15<sup>th</sup> 2010. All Evaluators but three of them could come to the meeting and discuss the evaluation results to define a scientific ranking list. The evaluators of the SCP proposals were not asked to participate at this meeting.

On the final meeting of funding organisations in Berlin January 28/29, 2010 a funding decision was resolved. The scientific ranking could be followed except for the project WATCHA, due to budget reasons. The funded projects are:

- ESAWADI,
- WATER2ADAPT,
- Water Cap & Trade,
- Climaware,
- IMPACT and
- ICARUS.

For the country distribution, please have a look at the following table:

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Country</b>
ESAWADI	GE, FR, PT
WATER2ADAPT	GE, ES, NL, PT
Water Cap & Trade	FR, ES, NL
Climaware	GE, FR, PT
IMPACT	GE, FR, PT
ICARUS	ES, NL, PT

Lessons learned from the second Call:

Sending out documents like the Principles per mail for a cross check of by the involved partners seemed to be not efficient enough.

- The SCP Call had to be relaunched.
- It was again not possible to follow the scientific ranking list 100% due to financial aspects.
- Again it was hard to collect the evaluations from the evaluators in time, although they had been informed of all the deadlines in time.
- It was not easy to follow the role that no evaluator should evaluate a proposal of his own country and each proposal should be evaluated by 3 evaluators, without missing the focus of the evaluators and the proposals they have to evaluate.
- Not all evaluators could participate at the peer review board meeting in Vienna cause of several reasons: some had not time, some were not allowed to take a flight, if it would also be possible to do a meeting via a web conference.
- The payment for the evaluators is a very complicated process for the coordinator of IWRM-NET. The payment is still not finalized three months after the Vienna meeting.

## **LESSONS LEARNED FROM IWRM-NET JOINT CALLS**

Although there was a general willingness to support joint transnational research Calls at the start of IWRM-NET, the problems we encountered when initiating joint Calls reflected:

- I. the differences of ERA-Net partners with respect to their scope and funding habits:

- different scope of research (e.g. applied vs. fundamental research, specificity and scale of topics) different ways to fund research (contract award, funding, fiscal advantages)
- different traditions, time and legal frames for implementation or funding initiatives between various agencies in ERA-Net.

II. financial limitations due to changing national priorities

III. although given the necessity to an European collaboration, the funding instrument "ERANet" could not be established so far:

- the need to define suitable boundary conditions for an European-wide collaboration still exists

These findings are neither unexpected nor do they differ significantly from the outcomes of the various surveys of ERA-Net activities<sup>345</sup>. Although many research managers gained experiences in bilateral co-operations in the field of research and education, they only start to implement multilateral collaboration.

The EU-Commission promotes this process with various instruments, e.g. FP programme committees, ERA-Nets and Joint Programming Initiatives (JPI). Until now however, these instruments mainly focus on the cooperative identification of R&D needs and implementation of common research programmes, but do not cover the multitude of accompanying measures of transnational collaboration. Moreover, transnational funding activities of IWRM-Net turned out to lead to a less-than-hoped for participation of funding organisations in joined activities. The two ERA-Net calls (4.5M€ budget allocated) are pilots and the experiences funders gained in transnational exchange and cooperation in the field of research management is undeniable and yielded partnerships that provide a solid base for different forms of collaboration and follow-up activities..

But how could such activities look like in order to meet our expectations on efficacy at the one hand and being attractive for all European research managers (regardless on the size of research programme and budget) on the other hand?

## **CONCEPT HOW TO PROMOTE JOINT TRANSNATIONAL FUNDING ACTIVITIES**

Since there is no "universal funder" for water research but rather distinct institutions with different foci, levels and financial support of funding, transnational collaboration will require true advantages for the funding institutions involved, both in cost-benefit ratio as well as with regard to contents. Against this background, the following concept has been developed:

---

<sup>3</sup> Management Challenges for Environmental ERA-Nets for Transnational Research – Report of the SKEP-Helsinki Workshop 2009

<sup>4</sup> CRUE 1<sup>st</sup> Research Funding Initiative - Synthesis report

<sup>5</sup> Optimising research programmes and priorities - Report of the ERA Expert Group; 2008



1. The first prerequisite for this is a transparent & interactive information exchange. Therefore, information on national research needs, foresight activities, and R&D activities/ programmes planned should be provided regularly (e.g. annually) to feed a European information base (e.g. WISE-RTD) in a well-structured manner. For this, the engagement of funding organizations is essential since information about planned but not yet started research is crucial to reduce fragmentation.
2. National funding institutions can check, if their needs match with those of others and indicate overlap of interest/ themes, if they want to join efforts. This allows for a continuous “match-making of funding organisations” which should at least initially be moderated.
3. Once match-making has been revealed, partners with overlapping interests should discuss the type and thematic focus of joint activities as well as framing conditions to allow for efficiently set up bi- or multilateral collaboration in a certain research area/ for a specific research question.

The following options might be considered:

- a) If any of the programmes are in the stage “programme definition”, in which types of collaboration would you be interested:
  - Exchange of information
  - Defining options of joint accompanying measures (e.g. scientific coordination, thematic workshops, status conferences, PhD programme, public relations)
  - open specific topics (parts) of your national research programmes with a cross-cutting dimension for non-national applicants
  - coordinate the window for open calls with other countries, so that applicants are able to find partners from other countries and might benefit of that during evaluation?
  - Others (please specify)
- b) If any of the programmes are in the stage of “project proposal evaluation” in which types of collaboration would you be interested:
  - Exchange of information
  - Jointly evaluate proposals in case programmes focus on the same topic (e.g. joint review board)
  - Jointly develop accompanying measures for the follow-up of the programme (e.g. scientific coordination, thematic workshops, status conferences, PhD programme, public relations)
  - Others (please specify)

- c) If any of the programmes are in the stage of “project implementation” in which types of collaboration would you be interested:
- Exchange of information
  - Jointly evaluate projects in case programmes focus on the same topic (e.g. joint review board)
  - Jointly implement accompanying measures (e.g. thematic workshops, status conferences, PhD programme, public relations)
  - jointly explore follow-up potential of the projects
  - Others (please specify)
- d) If any of the programmes are in the stage of “programme evaluation” in which types of collaboration would you be interested:
- Exchange of information
  - Jointly evaluate programme results
  - Jointly assess follow-up potential (e.g. next phase, transfer of results, PR) of the projects/ programme
  - coordinate upcoming research programme phases to complement each other
  - jointly develop follow-up R&D-programmes?
  - Others (please specify)
4. Cost-Benefit ratios of joint activities could be optimized when applying common rules for collaboration and/or funding that need to be adjusted only minimally to fit the funders involved. The International Common Application Process (ICAP)- initiative developed by the ESRC, DFG (Germany), NWO (Netherlands) and FWF (Austria) might be a step into this direction<sup>6</sup>.

### **New concepts**

- I. Joint programming: commitment stronger when the money has already dedicated?
- II. FP7 approach: Work programme is supplemented by national money of interested countries – could combine the instruments FP and ERA-Net plus
- III. watERAnet idea – flexible Calls  
was not supported

---

<sup>6</sup>[http://www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/Images/International%20Common%20Application%20Process%20Guidelines%20for%20Applicants\\_tcm6-25909.pdf](http://www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/Images/International%20Common%20Application%20Process%20Guidelines%20for%20Applicants_tcm6-25909.pdf)

## APPENDICES

### I. Principles and Common regulations

Can be viewed at <http://www.iwrm-net.eu/spip.php?article332>

### II. Application form

## Common Application Form

#### 1. Project title:

#### 2. Duration of the project: *DD/MM/YYYY - DD/MM/YYYY*

#### 3. Submission Date: *DD/MM/YYYY*

#### 4. Administrative details:

**We herewith confirm that each of the partners has made contact with its national help desk and received confirmation that the proposed project is of high relevance for the funding institution in charge.**

APPLICANT/ COORDINATOR – PARTNER 1					
Research institute/ Company					
Status: Private or public?					
Street name and number					
PO Box		Postal code		Cedex	
Town			Country		
Person in charge					
Family name			First name(s)		

<b>Title</b>		<b>Gender</b>	<b>Female</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Male</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Date of birth</b>	<b>(DD/MM/YYYY)</b>	<b>Nationality</b>		
<b>Phone</b>		<b>Fax</b>		
<b>E-mail</b>				
<b>Web site</b>				
<b>APPLICANT – PARTNER 2</b>				
<b>Research institute/ Company</b>				
<b>Status: Private or public?</b>				
<b>Street name and number</b>				
<b>PO Box</b>		<b>Postal code</b>		<b>Cedex</b>
<b>Town</b>		<b>Country</b>		
<b>Person in charge</b>				
<b>Family name</b>		<b>First name(s)</b>		
<b>Title</b>		<b>Gender</b>	<b>Female</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Male</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Date of birth</b>	<b>(DD/MM/YYYY)</b>	<b>Nationality</b>		
<b>Phone</b>		<b>Fax</b>		
<b>E-mail</b>				
<b>Web site</b>				
<b>APPLICANT – PARTNER 3</b>				
<b>Research institute/ Company</b>				
<b>Status: Private or public?</b>				
<b>Street name and number</b>				
<b>PO Box</b>		<b>Postal code</b>		<b>Cedex</b>
<b>Town</b>		<b>Country</b>		
<b>Person in charge</b>				
<b>Family name</b>		<b>First name(s)</b>		

<b>Title</b>		<b>Gender</b>	<b>Female</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Male</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Date of birth</b>	<b>(DD/MM/YYYY)</b>	<b>Nationality</b>		
<b>Phone</b>		<b>Fax</b>		
<b>E-mail</b>				
<b>Web site</b>				

**APPLICANT – PARTNER 4**

<b>Research institute/ Company</b>				
<b>Status: Private or public?</b>				
<b>Street name and number</b>				
<b>PO Box</b>		<b>Postal code</b>		<b>Cedex</b>
<b>Town</b>			<b>Country</b>	
<b>Person in charge</b>				
<b>Family name</b>			<b>First name(s)</b>	
<b>Title</b>		<b>Gender</b>	<b>Female</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Male</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Date of birth</b>	<b>(DD/MM/YYYY)</b>	<b>Nationality</b>		
<b>Phone</b>		<b>Fax</b>		
<b>E-mail</b>				
<b>Web site</b>				

**APPLICANT – PARTNER 5**

<b>Research institute/ Company</b>				
<b>Status: Private or public?</b>				
<b>Street name and number</b>				
<b>PO Box</b>		<b>Postal code</b>		<b>Cedex</b>
<b>Town</b>			<b>Country</b>	
<b>Person in charge</b>				
<b>Family name</b>			<b>First name(s)</b>	

<b>Title</b>		<b>Gender</b>	<b>Female</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Male</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Date of birth</b>	<b>(DD/MM/YYYY)</b>	<b>Nationality</b>		
<b>Phone</b>		<b>Fax</b>		
<b>E-mail</b>				
<b>Web site</b>				

**SUMMARY**

***(PLEASE DESCRIBE BRIEFLY OBJECTIVES, WORK PLANNING AND EXPECTED EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS OF THE SUGGESTED COLLABORATIVE PROJECT; MAX. 2000 CHARACTERS)***

**WORK PACKAGES (WP)**

<b>No. of WP</b>	<b>Title</b>
<b>1</b>	
<b>2</b>	
<b>3</b>	
<b>4</b>	
<b>5</b>	
<b>N</b>	

(Use as much lines as needed)

**ESTIMATED PERSON MONTHS PER WORK PACKAGE**

	<b>Partner 1</b>	<b>Partner 2</b>	<b>Partner 3</b>	<b>Partner 4</b>	<b>Partner 5</b>	<b>Partner N</b>
<b>WP 1</b>						
<b>WP 2</b>						
<b>WP 3</b>						
<b>WP 4</b>						
<b>WP 5</b>						
<b>WP 6</b>						
<b>WP N</b>						
<b>Total</b>						

(Use as much lines as needed)

<b>COSTS PER PARTNER AND REQUESTED FUNDING BUDGET (IN EURO)</b>			
<b>Partner</b>	<b>A - Total costs/expenses<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>B - Requested funding budget</b>	<b>Funding rate (B/A)</b>
<b>Partner 1</b>			<b>%</b>
<b>Partner 2</b>			<b>%</b>
<b>Partner 3</b>			<b>%</b>
<b>Partner 4</b>			<b>%</b>
<b>Partner 5</b>			<b>%</b>
<b>Partner N</b>			<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>			

1) Total costs/expenses comprise costs or expenses for personnel, travelling, consumables, overhead (if applicable) etc.; the cost calculation has to be based for each partner on its national/regional funding rules; for questions, please contact your national/regional funding organisation

(Use as much lines as needed)

## 5. Project description

Please provide a detailed project description, jointly filled by all applicants [max. 25 pages A4; minimum type size 11 (Arial) or 12 (Times Roman)], which addresses:

	<b>Recommended No. of pages</b>
<b>1. Title of proposal</b>	
<b>2. General information on the</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1. Coordinator</b>	
<b>2. Partners involved</b>	
<b>3. Evidence of special competence and references from the applicants and, where applicable, description of the partners' preliminary work and results relevant for the proposals (including current IWRM/WFD-related research projects)</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. Project description</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>1. Scientific objectives with detailed account of their relationship to the themes of the call and to current European IWRM/WFD-related research activities</b>	<b>(1-2)</b> <b>(10-12)</b>
<b>2. Work plan and division of work packages between the partners</b>	<b>(1-2)</b>
<b>3. Proposed exploitation of future project results</b>	<b>(1)</b>
<b>4. Dissemination of results to practitioners and policy</b>	

- 5. Detailed work and time schedule (Table) 1**
- 6. Sharing of work and cooperation with external organisations contributing to the project (if applicable) 1**
- 7. Survey of the collaborative project financing scheme indicating by partner the applicants own funds and financial requirements, structured according to permissible expenditure/cost types. 1**
- 8. Description of project management 2**
- 9. Signed declaration that the project does not contravene the European principle of ethics as applied for FP7 and evidence that a consortium agreement was made. 1**



### III. Evaluation form

#### EVALUATION FORM

**Name of reviewer\*:**

**Position/ Institution:**

**Name of the applicant:**

**Project title:**

\* The name of the reviewer will not be released to the applicants

Before undertaking this evaluation, we would like to ask you to accept the following **confidentiality agreement**:

**I herewith declare that I will keep all information with respect to the review procedure confidential.**

Next to assigning credit points, you are kindly asked to comment on your scores and (if necessary) add some advice. If you have questions or want to get more information on specific points, you can contact the **Call Secretariat (iwrn-net@ptka.fzk.de)** that will mediate any exchange with the applicants.

Furthermore, we should be grateful if you could take a few moments to reflect whether you have any **conflict of interest** regarding this application, such as:

- past or present collaborations or other interactions with the candidate or the proposed host institution which might bias your judgement in either direction
- expecting benefit in a professional, financial or personal manner from the success or failure of this application

If you feel that such a conflict of interest might be the case you are requested not to evaluate. Please, inform us on this issue.

**1. Added value for the WFD implementation / IWRM policy and potential for solving problems & adequate involvement of relevant practitioners/ implementers**

Does the proposal demonstrate a clear **added value** of the expected results at **European level and also for national public bodies**?

Are the **relevant stakeholders and users of the results involved** from the making of the proposal to the implementation of the expected results? ( **max. 15 CP**)

**Comment:**

**Score:**

0 to 15 (15 is best)

**2. Relevance**

Does the proposed project **address the favoured outcomes** of the call? ( **max. 10 CP**)

**Comment:**

**Score:**

0 to 10 (10 is best)

**3. Scientific quality of the project approach and Innovation (clear progress beyond the current state-of-the-art)**

Does the project represent **clear progress beyond the current state-of-the-art**? ( **max. 15 CP**)

**Comment:**

**Score:**

0 to 15 (15 is best)

#### 4. Inter- and Transdisciplinarity

Is there

- good **complementarity** between participants? (**max. 2 CP**)
- good **diversity of scientific disciplines**? (**max. 2 CP**)

**Comment:**

**Score:**

0 to 4 (4 is best)

#### 5. Demonstration/ Case studies

Is there good practical demonstration examples (case studies) provided? (**max. 5 CP**)

**Comment:**

**Score:**

0 to 5 (5 is best)

#### 6. Expected exploitability and dissemination of results

Is the extent of exploitation and dissemination adequate to ensure **optimal use of the project results**? (**max. 5 CP**)

Is there a **link to practitioners, potential users** of the results **and other stakeholders**? (**max. 10 CP**)

**Comment:**

**Score:**

1 to 15 (15 is best)

## 7. Trans-national linkage and benefit of cooperation

Does the proposal demonstrate a clear **added value** in carrying out the work on a transnational level? **(max. 2 CP)**

Can the countries involved expect a common benefit of cooperation? **(max. 2 CP)**

**Comment:**

**Score:**

1 to 4 (4 is best)

## 8. Quality of consortium management and expertise of the coordinator and the project partners

Do the participants collectively constitute a **consortium of high quality**? **(max. 5 CP)**

Are the participants **well-suited and committed to the tasks** assigned to them? **(max. 5 CP)**

How is the quality of the **project management**? **(max. 5 CP)**

**Comment:**

**Score:**

0 to 15 (15 is best)

## 9. Prospects for success with regard to the work and financial plan including time schedule

The extent to which:

- the overall **work plan is adequate** to achieve the objectives of the project **(max. 3 CP)**
- the **time schedule** for the project **is adequate** **(max. 3 CP)**
- the overall **financial plan** for the project **is adequate** **(max. 4 CP)**

**Comment:**

**Score:**

0 to 10 (10 is best)

10. Funding recommendation / Overall evaluation result		
<b>Comment:</b>		
<b>Total Score:</b>	Sum of all scores	/out of 93 (evaluation criterium 1-9)

Place and Date:

Signature

#### IV. 1<sup>st</sup> Call results

Table 1 summarizes the scientific evaluation and funding decision of the 1<sup>st</sup>Call application

Consortium acronym/ Sorter	average criteria 1-3	average cumulated points	ranking overall	political funding decision	priority
HYDROMORPHECO - Hydro-Morphological Pressures And Ecological Effects In Meso-Scale European Rivers: Identification, Assessment And Prioritisation Of Restoration Measures	33	78,3	1		high priority
i-FIVE - Innovative Instruments and Institutions in Implementing the Water Framework Directive	30	76,7	2	☑	
CAMAN - Capacity Building of Stakeholder Involvement and Governance Systems for Effective River Basin Management	32	76,5	3		
RIPFLOW - Riparian vegetation modelling for the assessment of environmental flow regimes and climate change impacts within the WFD	31	76,5	4	☑	
FORECASTER - Facilitating the application of and Case Studies on Ecological Responses to hydro-morphological Output from Research degradation and rehabilitation	31	74,7	5	☑	reserve list
QHYP - Quantifying hydromorphological pressures: Science and management	29	71,0	6		
KNAC - Knowledge in Action in the Rhine river basin hydromorphological restructuring	26	70,0	7	☑	
Habitat-Modelling - Development of a model-based method to assess the ecological status of riverine systems related to hydrologic and morphologic changes	27	69,3	8		
FLOW-ER - Effect of river flow regime in estuaries nursery functions	29	68,3	9		
PaDeS - Participation and Decision Support	26	68,0	10		
RHES - River Hydromorphology and Ecological Status	25	67,7	11		
EURODELTA - Sharing Experience for Better Governance and Management of Deltaic Regions in Europe	25	67,3	12		no funding considered
IMDEA - The right territory for water management in terms inter-connecting the different administrative scales in several countries of South-Western Europe	22	60,0	13		
IMCOP - Integrated immission based modeling and management of discharge and pollutants for catchments with complex landuse patterns	23	59,3	14		
ReFormRivers - ReFormRivers - River Morphodynamics as key parameter for achieving a good ecological status - selfforming river and floodplain processes	23	56,7	15		
DESTAB - Decision support tools for assessing biological community habitats and identifying pressures at reach, water body and catchment scales (DESTAB)	26	56,0	16		
SPIRBasin - SPIRBasin - Support and Planning Integration on River Basin Management	31	80,0	17		

During the funders meeting in Berlin May, 2008, the funding organizations agreed on the final ranking and selection of successful applications. Based on national priorities and funding constraints (see table 2), unfortunately scientific ranking could only partly be considered when selecting the successful projects i-Five, RIPFLOW, and FORECASTER.

Joint efforts of BMBF and the Dutch partner allowed additional funding of one additional project: KNAC even after the official funding meeting.

Table 2: funding commitments of IWRM-Net partners for the 1<sup>st</sup> Joint Call

<b>budget</b>	<b>Partner name</b>	<b>Partner short name</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>number of proposals received</b>
500,000	Project Management Agency, Research Centre Karlsruhe on behalf of the Federal Ministry of Education and Research	BMBF/PTKA	DE	10
50,000	Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management	BMLFUW	AT	6
500,000	Ministère de l'Ecologie, du Développement et de l'Aménagement Durables	MEDAD	FR	9
80,000	Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management, Directorate General for Public Works and Water Management, Centre for Water Management	CWM	NL	7
70,000	ENVIRONNEMENT AGENCY	EA	UK	6
75,000	Latvian Council of Science	LCS	LV	1
200,000	Foundation for Science and Technology/Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia	FCT	PT	4
100,000	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development/ Ministerul Mediului si Dezvoltarii Durabile	MMDD	RO	3
project dependent	Swedish Environment protection Agency	SEPA	SE	3
150,000	Fundación para el Conocimiento madri+d	FPC	ES	2
300,000	Ministerio de educacion y ciencia	MEC	ES	7

## **V. Selected projects 2<sup>nd</sup> Call**

### **1. ESAWADI - Utilizing the Ecosystem Services Approach for Water Framework Directive Implementation (France, Germany, Portugal)**

The ESAWADI project proposal focuses on the theme 1 “Economics and social values for integrated water management” of IWRM-Net call. Secondary objectives are linked to theme 2 and 3. It aims to analyze and provide advice on the potential usefulness of the ecosystem services approach (ESA) to support the implementation of the European Water Framework Directive (WFD) economic requirements.

### **2. WATER2ADAPT - resilience enhancement and water demand management for climate change adaptation (Italy, Germany, Spain, Portugal)**

The alteration of rainfall pattern (form, intensity and timing of rainfall) will have significant effects on water availability and frequency of extreme events such as floods and droughts. The knock-on effects of these changes will affect almost all communities throughout Europe, and most economic sectors. This project will examine river basins Po (Italy), Weser (Germany), Guadalquivir (Spain) and Guadiana (Portugal). It will i) identify ‘social drivers’ of water scarcity; ii) assess the magnitude and mediating factors of water scarcity- and drought-induced impacts; and iii) revisit the performance and wider impacts of the water demand management policies.

### **3. Water Cap & Trade - Water Market scenarios for Southern Europe: new solutions for dealing with water scarcity and drought risk (France, Italy, Spain)**

Structural water deficits and drought risk are expected to become more frequent, putting at stake the current mechanisms of water management and allocation. The establishment of water markets or systems of tradable abstraction quotas could represent a possible alternative. The use of a “cap and trade” approach could simultaneously guarantee environmental protection as required by the Water Framework directive and enhance flexibility in allocation to maximize water use utility and possibly reducing conflicts. The present research proposal aims at investigating the potential for water market scenarios in Southern Europe, focusing in particular on their socio-economic implications by mobilizing complementary socio-economic methods and tools.

The research project will address the following questions and issues:

- Which type of water market scenarios could be proposed for Southern Europe?
- Which potential for water re-allocation through market mechanisms?
- Are water market scenarios socially acceptable?
- What is the order of magnitude of transaction costs that are likely to result from establishing and operating water markets?
- What can be learned from the Spanish experience with water markets?



#### **4. Climate Change - Impacts of climate change on water resources management – regional strategies and European view (Germany, France, Italy)**

The Primary objectives of the project are:

- Elaboration of quantitative projections of changes in river flows and consequences such as flood frequency, drought occurrence and sectoral water uses.
- Analysis of the effect of climate change on the hydromorphological reference conditions of rivers and therefore the definition of “good status”.
- Definition of management rules/strategies concerning dam management and irrigation practices on different time perspectives.
- Investigation of uncertainties in climate model – scenario combinations.

#### **5. IMPACT -Developing an integrated model to predict abiotic habitat conditions and biota of rivers for application in climate change research and water management (Germany, Portugal, France)**

The research project outlined herein aims at developing an integrated model which predicts the abiotic habitat conditions and biota of natural (reference), semi-natural or restored river reaches. The coupled models will be used to assess the effect of climate change on discharge and in turn on river morphology and stream biota compared to the impact of other anthropogenic pressures like water quality, hydromorphological alterations, and altered re-colonization potential. The project will focus on macroinvertebrates and fish and for the first time include dispersal models of aquatic taxa to predict temporal scales of restoration success and population recovery.

#### **6. ICARUS - IWRM for climate change adaptation in rural social ecosystems Southern Europe (Italy, Portugal, Spain)**

ICARUS aims at increasing, in selected areas of Italy, Portugal and Spain, efficient water use in agriculture by analysing biophysical, socio-economic and institutional dimensions of sustainable water management and identifying innovative adaptation strategies, practices and tools for saving water in irrigated productions systems, which could be disseminated in other Mediterranean countries.

#### **VI. Reporting form (for final evaluation of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Call projects)**

This form can be viewed at <http://www.iwrn-net.eu/spip.php?article332>

## VII. Policy letter form (for interim information of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Call projects)

### SUMMARY FOR DECISION-MAKERS

(2 - 4 pages max; non-technical language; graphics and diagrams where possible, too)

#### Notes to assist report editor in compiling a “Summary for Decision-Makers”:

The Executive Summary should be written in plain English. It should be a stand-alone summary of the research findings and their implications.

Please structure your “Summary for Decision-Makers” using these headings:

- [Headline Summary Message \(one paragraph\)](#)
- [What the report is about and why the work is important](#)
- [Aims/Objectives, including who may benefit from the research](#)
- [Results/Key findings in relation to report objectives](#)
- [Implications for stakeholders \(policy-makers, practitioners, others where relevant\)](#)
- [Recommendations for decision-makers.](#)

To boost interest and attract attention to specific information in the “Summary for Decision-Makers” you are requested to use ‘pullout’ quotes. You can do this by copying pertinent text into a text box and placing them in relevant places on the page.

This structured Executive Summary should be suitable for IWRM-NET to use as a standalone short-report (like Synthesis report, fact sheet or brochure). The opening paragraph should briefly summarise the report and its importance.

**Attention:** It is important that the section break be *next page* – please do not use *odd page* or *even page breaks* anywhere in the document as this can cause problems later on for the publishers. Thank you!