Niedersächsisches Ministerium
für Umwelt, Energie und Klimaschutz

Review on methodical performances in Lower Saxony

recommandations from CIS documents: CBA, MCA, CEA etc.

Method	**Subject matter/objective**	**Duration**	**Costs**
CEA (cost-effectiveness-analysis)	Measures for passability and hydromorphological measure in two local communities/ cost-effectiveness	Approx. 8 months	25.000€ (not including internal costs)
MCA (multi-criteria-analysis)	Alternative measures for a length of 13km/ disproportionate costs	4 months	None, but equivalent to approx. 20.000€
MCA (multi-criteria-analysis)	Ranking of groups of measures/ decision support	4 months	50.000€
Ecosystemservices approach	Accompany of identification of measures and cost-benefit-analysis (international border)/ decision support and identification of possible benefit-transfers	Ongoing for over 2 years now	So far over 100.000€

Note: there were existing feasibility studies for the considered areas, so most data was already available at the start of the project

General results and experiences

- Only little and normally well known and discussed problems occur when applying the suggested methods like MCA, CBA, CEA or others

→ No problem with instruments!

- Application of methods basically only come in geographically, objectively and temporally restricted forms

→ Water management under WFD requires an ongoing, comprehensive and state-wide perspective on the problems

- So far the fulfillment of economic requirements was handled rather „end-of-pipe“: Practical experience shows that **if** major decisions in the water management planning process are avoided first, economics is expected to provide the answers

→ This is not the intention of the requirements in the Directive nor can economics help very much this way, with the suggested methods the economic discipline stays behind ist possibilities

- Only a few economists work in the water management authorities so authorities have to rely on scientients

→ Scientists again can only gain little insight of the challenges of practical water management

Conclusions and the need for new approaches

Why do we need new approaches:

- experience show the strength of the proposed methods, but also the limitations when it comes to practical water management challenges.
- time-consuming and cost-intensive for bottom up processes with very limited additional information

→ so far economics did not fullfil its task to support the achievement of the Directive's objectives in a efficient way!

What are the needs:

- focus on practical needs: what are the problems, where can economics help and how?
- consideration of water management procedures and structures →therefore maybe new approaches and methods? Example I-Five

First ideas:

- further integration of economics into the planning process?
- not only customizable but also standardizable economic based systems for decision support?
- look into other economic disciplins, e.g. organisational efficiency, adapted controlling of public authorities (water management administration)