

Nr. înregistrare: 937/07.11.2025

ANUNȚ ÎNȚIERE PROCEDURĂ DE ACHIZIȚIE

pentru achiziționarea de *Servicii de consultanță privind realizarea unor analize privind politicile publice*

Societatea Ornitologică Română (SOR), în calitate de asociat în cadrul proiectului DRP0200419, RESTORIVER, Restoration of urban/periurban riversides, anunță demararea unei proceduri de pentru achiziționarea de Servicii de consultanță privind realizarea unor analize privind politicile publice.

Procedura se desfășoară conform procedurilor interne ale SOR, cu respectarea legislației naționale în vigoare și aplicarea principiilor și normelor de competitivitate, transparență, necondiționare și nediscriminare.

1. Obiectul achiziției: realizarea unor analize privind de politicile publice, după cum urmează:

A.3.1. Stimularea unei gestionări îmbunătățite și mai integrate a apei, a adaptării la schimbările climatice și a planificării urbane/teritoriale în țările și regiunile RESTORIVER

D.3.1.2. Analiză comparativă a mediilor de politici publice: Analiză comparativă a circumstanțelor instituționale, juridice și financiare regionale/naționale, a lacunelor, barierelor, contradicțiilor și a politicilor relevante (de exemplu: Planuri de Management ale Bazinelor Hidrografice – RBMP, Planuri de Management al Riscului la Inundații – FRMP, programe de dezvoltare urbană/regională, strategii/planuri/legi naționale privind adaptarea la schimbările climatice), raportat la concluziile analizelor și proiectelor pilot. Pe baza acestor analize, vor fi formulate recomandări (3.1.3.) – un document internațional care va include atât nivelul bazinului Dunării, cât și nivelul UE.

- Analiză detaliată (a lacunelor) a celor mai recente documente DRBMP, DFRMP, EUSDR (metodologia este aceeași ca pentru nivelurile național/subnațional, cu excepția secțiunii „Alte întrebări”; se acceptă o anumită flexibilitate, subiect de discuție).
- Analiză rapidă (scanning) a lacunelor și extragerea principalelor constatări și recomandări din analiza de politici Horizon MERLIN a politicilor UE (DCA – Directiva Cadru Apă, PAC – Politica Agricolă Comună, NRL – Directiva privind Nitrații, Directiva privind Apa Potabilă); consultare cu WWF sau alți parteneri MERLIN, dacă este necesar.

- Analiză comparativă a documentelor/politicilor macroregionale (DRBMP, DFRMP, EUSDR) și realizată de WWF Adria (Convenția Carpatică).
- Analiză comparativă a politicilor la nivelul UE (DCA, PAC, NRL, Directiva privind Apa Potabilă**).

A.3.2. Influențarea politicilor de planificare și management naționale și internaționale pentru a introduce abordări mai integrate și eficiente în gestionarea zonelor riverane din Regiunea Dunării

D.3.2.2. Recomandări de politică la nivelul UE/macroregional: Elaborarea de recomandări de politică privind politicile macroregionale, sprijinind Măsurile Naturale de Retenție a Apei (NWRM) în restaurarea zonelor riverane sau stimulând medii politice favorabile la niveluri inferioare de guvernare (ex.: EUSDR, ICPDR, Directiva Cadru Apă, Strategia UE de Adaptare, noua Lege a UE privind Restaurarea Naturii).

Sarcini principale legate de livrabilele anterioare:

- Pe baza analizei documentelor macroregionale și a consultărilor cu instituțiile și organizațiile relevante, formulați recomandări macroregionale.
- Pe baza analizei documentelor UE și a consultărilor cu instituțiile și organizațiile relevante, formulați recomandări la nivelul UE.
- Integrați contribuțiile partenerilor de proiect în recomandările macroregionale/UE, ținând cont de concluziile analizelor și recomandărilor naționale/subnaționale.
- Oferiți contribuții la recomandările naționale pentru a asigura coerența între nivelurile național, macroregional și al UE.

D.3.2.3. „Strategia RESTORIVER de Valorificare (Take-up Strategy)” Strategia de valorificare reprezintă produsul final al proiectului, având scopul de a facilita preluarea rezultatelor proiectului și de a prezenta o colecție de recomandări de politică formulate pentru toate nivelurile de guvernare.

Pe baza activităților din SO3 și a contribuțiilor suplimentare din SO1 și SO2:

1. Colectarea tuturor informațiilor și opiniilor necesare ca input și sintetizarea lor.
2. Pregătirea versiunii preliminare a Strategiei de valorificare (Take-up Strategy).
3. Transmiterea proiectului de document partenerilor din consorțiu și altor experți externi cheie identificați, coordonând procesul de discuție. Se va realiza un proces iterativ între diferiții actori, inclusiv organizarea și coordonarea angajamentului concret al partenerilor proiectului RESTORIVER pentru includerea în strategie.
4. Finalizarea Strategiei de valorificare.

Crt	DENUMIRE	LIVRABIL	TERMEN DE PREDARE
1	D.3.1.2. Analiză comparativă a mediilor de politici publice:	1 document internațional care să includă atât analiza lacunelor, cât și analiza comparativă la nivelul bazinului Dunării și al UE.	15 decembrie 2025
2	D.3.2.2. Recomandări de politică la nivelul UE/macroregional:	1 document transnațional cu recomandări la nivel macroregional și UE.	31 martie 2026.
3	D.3.2.3. „Strategia RESTORIVER de Valorificare (Take-up Strategy)” =	1 document „Take-up Strategy”	10 mai 2026.

Valoarea maximă estimată: 5.000 euro, inclusiv TVA

Oferta tehnică trebuie respecta și să fie în concordanță cu metodologia atașată prezentului anunț. În cazul în care achizitorul identifică neconformități între metodologie și livrabilul predat, atunci ofertantul este obligat să remedieze toate neconformitățile în termen de 5 zile de la notificarea achizitorului.

Procesul verbal de prestare a serviciilor se va semna după remedierea tuturor neconformităților.

Livrabilele vor fi redactate în limba engleză.

Oferta financiară se va prezenta detaliat, pentru fiecare livrabil în parte.

Nu se acceptă oferte parțiale

Plata serviciilor se va face pe baza facturilor fiscale, eșalonat, după predarea fiecărui livrabil, în termen de maximum 10 zile de la data semnării procesului verbal de prestare a serviciilor de către ambele părți.

Ofertele se vor transmite pe adresa de e-mail *lucica.bod@sor.ro* în termen de 5 zile de la data postării anunțului pe site-ul SOR.

Informații suplimentare pot fi obținute la:

Persoana de contact: Lucica Bod

Tel: 0724 570207

E-mail: lucica.bod@sor.ro

**Întocmit,
Responsabil Achiziții
Lucica Bod**



Co-designing and testing feasible, high-potential NWRM by municipalities and relevant authorities

D.3.1.1. JOINT METHODOLOGY FOR POLICY ANALYSIS AND DIALOGUE

Project title	RESTORIVER Climate resilient, natural water retention focused restoration of riversides and riparian areas adversely affected by human interventions along the Danube and its tributaries within the Danube Region
Programme	Interreg Danube Region Programme
Project ID	DRP0200419
Special Objective 2	Co-designing and testing feasible, high-potential NWRM by municipalities and relevant authorities
Deliverable	D.3.1.1. Joint methodology for policy analysis and dialogue
Author	Restoriver Project Partnership
Version	2.0
Date	June, 2025

Contents

•	3	
	A.	3
	B.	3
	C.	4
	D.	4
	E.	5
	F.	5
•	6	
	.1.	6
	.1.1.	6
	.1.2.	6
	.1.3.	7
	.1.4.	7
	.1.5.	8
	.1.6.	8
	.1.7.	8
	.1.8.	9
	.2.	9
	.2.1.	9
	.2.2.	9
	.2.3.	9
	.2.4.	10
	.2.5.	11
	.3.	11
	.1.1.	11
	.1.2.	11
	.1.3.	11
	.1.4.	12
	.1.5.	12
	.2.	12
	.2.1.	13
	.2.2.	13
	.2.3.	13
	.2.4.	13
	.2.5.	14
•	14	
	.1.1.	14
	.1.2.	14
	.1.3.	20
	.1.4.	20
	.1.5.	21
	.1.6.	21
	.1.7.	22
	.1.8.	23
	.1.9.	24

- **CONTEXT OF THE JOINT METHODOLOGY FOR POLICY ANALYSIS AND DIALOGUE
(JOINT METHODOLOGY IN FURTHER TEXT)**

- a. Purpose of the Joint methodology (objectives)**

- In a context of the Project

The RESTORIVER project increases climate change adaptation capacities of riversides and riparian areas - potentially reducing the risk of droughts, floods and heatwaves. The project joins water management, climate and nature conservation policy and knowledge institutions along the Danube and its tributaries.

Specific objective 3 (SO3 Improving planning and coordination frameworks to harmonise various level water and climate policies) is in line with project goal of „promoting feasible, climate proof NWRM in restoring riversides and riparian areas adversely affected by human land-use, control and exploitation, to increase climate adaptation capacities”.

Natural functioning of the catchments can improve climate change resilience by retaining water and preventing uncontrolled floods in urban areas during rainy and high water periods or by balancing water regime and normalizing water cycle during the high temperature extremes that result in droughts.

Natural Water Retention Measures (NWRM) are multi-functional measures that aim to protect water resources and address water-related challenges by restoring or maintaining ecosystems as well as natural features and characteristics of water bodies using natural means and processes (EU, 2014). NWRM covers a wide range of actions and land use types. Many different measures can act as NWRM, by encouraging the retention of water within a catchment and, through that, enhancing the natural functioning of the catchment.

- SO3 Specific objective

The main SO3 goal is to harmonise local interventions with higher level water management, flood, drought and climate adaptation policies via introducing more integrated planning, coordination and funding frameworks and institutional cooperation routines. The following approach is taken to achieve this:

- analysing of existing policies and potentials for their improvement;
 - developing policy recommendations for various levels of government, by setting up a welcoming stakeholder and policymaker attitude and participation;
 - introducing advocacy or take-up strategies for further actions.

Take-up strategies will define joint and individual commitments of partners to support the transfer of project experience and results; to stipulate the implementation of policy recommendations on all levels of governance and to prepare and implement follow up interventions in and around pilot locations.

- b. Scope of the Joint methodology**

The Joint methodology consists of 4 separate methodologies explaining SO3 deliverables as well as inputs, methods, roles, responsibilities and specific outputs for each SO3 deliverable. These methodologies are:

- METHODOLOGY FOR COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF POLICY ENVIRONMENTS (also D.3.1.2)
 - METHODOLOGY FOR RECOMMENDATIONS
 - METHODOLOGY FOR RESTORIVER TAKE-UP STRATEGY
 - METHODOLOGY FOR forming/creating/establishing (?) NETWORK OF SUPPORTIVE POLICY MAKERS

All methodologies are structured in a same way, with following subchapters:

- Roles and responsibilities
 - Inputs
 - Methods
 - List of outputs

o Deliverables

c. SO3 Timetable

2025												2026						
Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	July	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May		
D 3.1.1 Joint methodology for policy analysis and dialog																		
Methodology for comparative analysis of policy environments						Method. for Recommendations, Network of supportive policy makers, Transnationally relevant policy scenarios and Take up Strategy												
Review, comments and suggestions									R, C, S									
						D. 3.1.2 Comparative analysis of policy environments (External expert)												
					D 3.1.3 (Sub) national policy recommendations (LP, PP2, PP4, PP5, PP7, PP11, PP14, PP15)													
				D 3.1.4 Transnationally relevant policy scenarios (PP4, ROS, APELE, VUVH, External expert)														
						D 3.2.1 Network of supportive policy makers (PP4, PP5, PP7, PP9, PP10, PP11, PP12, PP15, External expert)												
												D 3.2.2 International/Macroeconomic Policy Recommendations (External expert)						
												D 3.2.3 RESTORIVER Take-up strategy (All, external expert)						

d. Relation to other SO

The SO2 relates to SO3 – During the preparation & implementation works of SO2, the partners came across different policies and legal procedures and rules that apply to their respective pilots on local and/or national levels and must be taken into account during the SO3 phase, within D.3.1.3. (Sub) national policy recommendations, and D.3.1.4. Transnationally relevant policy scenarios, all of which aim to stimulate improved and more integrated water management, climate change adaptation and urban /land use planning.

Identification and involvement of stakeholders and policymakers during SO1 and SO2 will result in creating a D.3.2.1. Network of supportive policymakers to connect them with other relevant stakeholders and engage them in national-level representation of project objectives. In the final phase of the project, all gathered SO3 findings and inputs should translate into D.3.2.2. International/macoregional policy recommendations and D.3.2.3. Take up strategy.

e. Existing policies and strategies included in a project scope, including key points to be addressed

1. Policy matrix

Policies are divided into 4 levels: local, national, Danube basin and EU.

Danube basin and EU level policies are common for all project partners.

Each partner country individually has decided which legislation, strategic documents, development plans and management plans are relevant for the comparative analysis, having in focus the following: water management, climate change adaptation and biodiversity loss/nature protection.

Policies on national and subnational (local) level will be analysed as part of 3.1.2. Comparative analysis of policy environments.

2. Key points to be addressed/evaluated in policies

Key point to be addressed and analysed in policies on local, national, regional and EU level will result in policy recommendations which will be in line with:

- The Programme priority “to promote climate change adaptation capacities in the Danube Region and disaster management on transnational level in relation to environmental risks taking into account ecosystem-based approaches.
- Project main objective to “Explore and demonstrate feasible, climate proof NWRM in restoring riversides and riparian areas adversely affected by human land-use, control and exploitation, to increase climate adaptation capacities by reducing the risk of droughts, floods and heatwaves. Supported by harmonising, adapting and connecting higher level water management, climate adaptation and flood protection policies with local interventions, serving transnational water and climate adaptation systems and stakeholder networks”

Practical experiences, analysis of multilevel sectoral plans and processes will lead to **economically/socially viable policy recommendations to be channelled into decision making in water, climate and land management on regional, national and DRB-wide levels.**

In order to produce these recommendations, we need to analyse gaps, barriers, contradictions but also opportunities in existing policies on all levels, in terms of natural water retention, Nature based solutions, climate change adaptation and all the relevant criteria/key points that we identify as important for each level of policies. This criteria/key points that need to be analysed are listed in an Annex [Template for 3.1.2 Comparative analysis of policy environments-Gap analysis](#)

f. Definitions and terminology

Definitions:

- **Nature-based solution (NbS).** As defined at the 5th United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA 5.2), nature-based solutions (NbS) are “actions aimed at protecting, conserving, restoring, and sustainably managing natural or modified terrestrial, freshwater, coastal, and marine ecosystems, which address social, economic and environmental challenges effectively and adaptively, while simultaneously providing human well-being, ecosystem services, resilience and biodiversity benefits.
- **Natural water retention measure (NWRM).** Natural Water Retention Measures (NWRM) are measures that aim to safeguard and enhance the water storage potential of landscape, soils and aquifers, by restoring ecosystems, natural features and characteristics of water courses, and by using natural processes. They are green infrastructure solutions and they support adaptation, reducing vulnerability of water resources. (Source: nwrms.eu).

- **Ecosystem-based approach.** Ecosystem-based approaches focus on ecosystem restoration and enhancement of ecosystem services to protect society against negative impacts of climate change. As climate change makes itself increasingly felt through, e.g., droughts, extreme weather events and flooding, the urgency of adaptation measures increases.

Terminology-synonyms:

- Nature based solution, Green infrastructure, Green measures, Ecosystem-based approach

● METHODOLOGY

●.1. Methodology for Comparative analysis of policy environments (D.3.1.2)-

●.1.1. Roles and responsibilities for executing Comparative analysis

- Each country shall engage external service to prepare a report on Comparative analysis of policy environments (D.3.1.2):
 - LP1 BSPB (Bulgaria)
 - PP2 NARW (Romania)
 - PP4 Adria (Croatia)
 - PP5 WWF SK (Slovakia)
 - PP7 WWW HU (Hungary)
 - PP11 ROS (Romania)
 - PP13 OVF (Hungary)
 - PP14 WWF RS (Serbia)
 - PP15 WWF UA (Ukraine)
- Transnational (EU level, Danube River basin level) analysis (WWF CEE)

●.1.2. Inputs for comparative analysis

- [Policy matrix](#)
 - List of policy documents that need to be analysed, per country. The policy matrix is Annex 1 to the Joint methodology document. Only policy documents on **local and national levels** are analysed in a scope of comparative analysis.
- D.3.2.1 Network of supportive policy makers and existing D.1.1.3. Stakeholder analysis
 - stakeholder's inputs in regards to existing policies
- nwrn.eu-not mandatory, source of more information about NWRM
- IUCN global standard for NbS (Standard in further text) – mandatory

As NbS enters into policy and is adopted by projects on the ground there is a pressing need for greater clarity and precision of what the concept entails and what is required for it to be deployed successfully. Without this, the application of NbS could result in inconsistent and ungrounded applications. The Standard, therefore, also provides a systematic learning framework so that lessons can improve and evolve the applications, leading to greater confidence in NbS among decision makers. Similarly, in the absence of such a Standard, NbS may remain a general concept, only marginally contributing to the pressing sustainability needs and not realising its full potential. Consequently, the Standard provides an opportunity to create a global user community that helps guide implementation on the ground, accelerate policy development, and create conservation science on NbS. Through the Standard, NbS will be based on a common understanding of its interpretation and a shared

vision for a just and sustainable world. (source:

<https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/2020-020-En.pdf>

●.1.3. Methods

- Desktop quantitative and qualitative analysis
 - Use policy documents stated in [Policy matrix](#)
 - Use [Template for 3.1.2 Comparative analysis of policy environments-Gap analysis](#)
 - **Write down basic and summarized information (in English) for each policy document separately**
 - General questions about specific policy document
 - Add a short personal reflection to the following questions, based on information you have analysed
 - Summarize all the relevant findings, based on information you've analysed and questions/sub questions you have answered
 - **Answer the questions and sub questions – Identify key points** in policy documents, gaps or controversies (local language)
 - **Answer other questions** (local language and/or in English)
 - Record gap analysis answers in a [template table](#) (tabs Gap analysis local and Gap analysis national). Pay attention to pre-defined values. (in English)
 - Compare and cross check all policy documents one with another for specific relevant key points, to check whether they are harmonized about specific key points. Record in a [template table, tab harmonization \(1-6\) \(in English\)](#). Pay attention to pre-defined values. If the answer is “partially” or “No”, please elaborate in a Template [for 3.1.2 Comparative analysis of policy environment-Harmonization](#) (local language).
 - When answering questions or elaborating:
 - Write down sufficient reference detail-reference so that we can go straight to the specific part of the policy document. Use the Author-Date referencing method e.g. (European Commission 2019) + page or section number to show where you found text to answer the question. Please include URL where it is available to help us find the information again quickly.
 - Using reference software will auto-generate a list of references used in the document or add them by hand (see heading ‘data sources’)-not obligatory.
 - Summarise so we have synthesis. Ensure the text is an evaluation of how the documents relate to the question/criteria and not just a list of page numbers or bullet points
 - Please respect the formatting in the template and do not change the heading style (this makes later analysis using NVIVO and excel easier).
 - Use plain (normal) text to provide your answers

●.1.4. Gap analysis

The purpose of gap analysis is to identify gaps in regards to NbS/NWRM, but also opportunities and drivers for further development and implementation of NbS/NWRM interventions, especially with regards to climate change adaptation.

Use [Policy matrix](#) for the list of local and national policies which will be analysed and [Template for 3.1.2 Comparative analysis of policy environments-Gap analysis](#)

Repeat/use template as many times as you have policy documents (for each policy document repeat the procedure).

●.1.5. Other questions to be answered

Use [Template for other questions to be answered.](#)

●.1.6. Harmonization analysis

Policies that are to be analysed are stated in [Policy matrix](#)-local and national level. Policies are listed in a [template table](#), tabs Harmonization (1-6) where the answers will be entered. There are 6 Key points-topics that are identified as relevant for cross checking through policies with the aim to determine whether the policies are harmonized, both in vertical (hierarchical) or horizontal direction:

- KEY POINT 1 Is NbS/NWRM recognized in a policy document as a principle/measure in water management?
- KEY POINT 2 Is NbS/NWRM recognized in a policy document as a tool/measure for climate change adaptation?
- KEY POINT 3 Is NbS/NWRM recognized in a policy document as a tool/measure for prevention of biodiversity loss and enhancement of biodiversity?
- KEY POINT 4 Does the policy document recognize the IUCN standard for NbS as a principle for NbS/NWRM implementation?
- KEY POINT 5 Does the policy document refer to financial resources needed for implementation, maintenance and monitoring of NbS/NWRM?
- KEY POINT 6 Does the policy document refer to educational and raising awareness activities, in regards to water management, climate change adaptation and biodiversity loss?

Elaborate **only** for those policies which are **PARTIALLY** or **NO** harmonized.

Repeat/use template for every case of “partially” or “no” harmonized policy documents (repeat the procedure for each case).

Use [Template for 3.1.2 Comparative analysis of policy environment-Harmonization](#)

●.1.7. List of outputs

1. Annex 3.1.1 policy matrix-updated. Insert information about policy document in "PLEASE FILL IN" section in Annex 3.1.5.
2. Annex 3.1.2 template for 3.1.2. Comparative analysis of policy environments-Gap analysis -filled in for each policy document separately
3. Annex 3.1.3 template for other questions to be answered-filled in

4. Annex 3.1.4 template for comparative analysis of policy environment-harmonization analysis- filled in for all cases when policies are "partially" or "no" harmonized
5. Annex 3.1.5 template for quantitative analysis- filled in xls templates (Gap analysis local; Gap analysis national; Harmonization 1-6)

●.1.8. Deliverables

- D.3.1.2. Comparative analysis of policy environments deliverable consists of 7 reports – one for each country plus one report covering EU and Danube River basin level policy analyses

●.2. Methodology for Recommendations

●.2.1. Roles and responsibilities for executing recommendations

- (Sub) national policy recommendations (D.3.1.3.) - per country. Planned:
 - LP BSPB (Bulgaria)
 - PP2 NARW (Romania)
 - PP4 Adria (Croatia)
 - PP5 WWF SK (Slovakia)
 - PP11 ROS (Romania)
 - PP14 WWF RS (Serbia)
 - PP15 WWF UA (Ukraine)
 - PP7 WWF HU (Hungary) lead
- D.3.1.4. Transnationally relevant policy scenarios: PP7 WWF HU/CEE lead, with help of external expert; PP4 – ADRIA ; PP5 - WWF-SK, PP6 – VUVH: discuss, give feedback and inputs and finalize the recommendations for Danube River Basin level.
- D.3.2.2. International/macoregional policy recommendations: PP7WWF HU/CEE lead, with help of external expert

●.2.2. Inputs for recommendations

- Results of Comparative analysis of policy environments (3.1.2)
- Network of supportive policy makers (D.3.2.1)
- SO2 (D 2.2 (pilot projects), D.2.3.1.Fundraising action plan for spinoff interventions, D.2.3.2.Pilot reports, D.2.3.3.Professional workshops presenting highlights) - draft versions since final deliverables will not be ready
- Transnationally relevant policy scenarios (D.3.1.4)

Collection of transnationally relevant good policy practices providing comprehensive guidance and recommendations on multi-level harmonisation of climate-adaptation riparian interventions, cooperation protocols for municipalities and authorities, shared via open access online knowledge hubs

●.2.3. Methods

(sub) National recommendations:

- Desktop search and analysis, discussions/if necessary, interviews with selected stakeholders, authorities
- Synthesis of comparative analysis findings into practical recommendations.
- Harmonization with International/Macroregional policy recommendations
- Draft Recommendations will be presented to policy makers and other stakeholders and then, accordingly, revised. They should be involved in defining gaps/barriers/controversial issues, as well as into formulation of recommendations.

International/Macroregional policy recommendations:

- Desktop review based on EU Horizon MERLIN policy analysis results
- Complemented with targeted interviews/discussions with colleagues, experts, authorities or key stakeholders if needed.
- Inputs from (sub) National policy recommendations
- Compilation of all the collected inputs and analysis results (good practices from partner countries, EU initiatives, and relevant international projects)
- Cross-check alignment with EUSDR objectives, EU Water Framework Directive, Floods Directive, CAP, and EU Climate Adaptation Strategy.
- Exchange and validation during EUSDR Embedding Weeks and other fora.

Recommendations on all levels should be harmonized

●.2.4. List of outputs

1. (Sub) national policy recommendations (D.3.1.3)

- Structured as a list of specific recommendations for local level and national level: policy harmonization, implementation acts, capacities (people, money, technological, knowledge/capacity building support, anything with protocols or processes)
- 1 document per country.

2. International/macroregional policy recommendations (D.3.2.2)

- refers to Danube basin and EU level
- has to comply with (Sub) national policy recommendations (D.3.1.3)
- Structured as a list of specific recommendations for Danube basin and EU level
- 1 document

3. Transnationally relevant policy scenarios (D.3.1.4)

- Collection of transnationally relevant policy good practices providing comprehensive guidance and recommendations on multi-level harmonisation of climate-adaptation riparian interventions, cooperation protocols for municipalities and authorities, shared via open access online knowledge hubs. The EUSDR Embedding Weeks (started in 2022) will provide fora for exchange and dialogs as well.

These tasks will be done by external expert:

- Collection of transnationally relevant policy good practices (from RESTORIVER partners, from existing network, available databases, from international platforms like Rhine Commission or INBO; external experts/institutions, web, etc) and formulation of a brief report.
- Explore exchange opportunities connected to EUSDR and use them (Embedding weeks, other fora)
- Structured as 1 document including the report on transnationally relevant policy good practices a summary of the results of the EUSDR exchanges.

●.2.5. Deliverables

- Recommendations for local/national policies (D.3.1.3) -1 document per country. Repeat [template table](#) for each policy document.
- Recommendations on International/Macroregional Policy (D.3.2.2 - [1 document](#))
- Transnationally relevant policy scenarios (D.3.1.4)-1 document prepared by external expert.

●.3. Methodology for RESTORIVER Take-up Strategy

The RESTORIVER Take-up Strategy aims to support a coordinated approach outlining both collective and individual partner commitments to facilitate the transfer of project experience and results, promote the uptake of policy recommendations across the Danube basin, and design and pave the way for follow-up actions in and around pilot areas beyond the RESTORIVER project period.

It provides a structured framework for:

- Stimulating the uptake of policy recommendations at all levels of governance (local, national, basin-wide, EU).
- Pave the way for follow-up interventions in and around pilot locations after RESTORIVER project.

●.1.1. Roles and responsibilities for executing Take-up Strategy

- o D. 3.2.3.: PP11 ROS, PP7 - WWF-HU/CEE with help of external expert.

●.1.2. Inputs for Take- up Strategy

- Comparative analysis of policy environments (D.3.1.2)
- (Sub) national policy recommendations (D.3.1.3)
- International/macroregional policy recommendations (D.3.2.2)
- Network of supportive policy makers (D.3.2.1)
- SO2 (D 2.2 (pilot projects), D.2.3.1.Fundraising action plan for spinoff interventions, D.2.3.2.Pilot reports, D.2.3.3.Professional workshops presenting highlights)-draft versions since final deliverables won't be ready

●.1.3. Methods

- Joint strategy of shared and individual commitments of partners to support the transfer of project experience and results, to stimulate the implementation of policy recommendations on all levels of governance, and to prepare and implement follow-up interventions in and around pilot locations. Applies to all governance levels: local, national, Danube basin, EU.
- It should aim to define change including all the steps that need to happen for the advocacy objective to become reality. It builds on

- o the comparative policy analysis ('rules of the game') to address the barriers and enablers identified in the current policy context.
- o the network of identified policy makers to build alliances: engage with key stakeholders and rights-holders to strengthen the position of NbS/NWRM uptake and implementation also identifying barriers to change.
- o the different recommendations and policy scenarios and good practices defined in this project to identify the related interventions.
- The Take-up Strategy should be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound), and should answer the questions: who does what, in what timeline, with what specific goal and advocacy plan.

●.1.4. List of outputs

- Joint strategy (who, what, in what timeline, with what specific goal and advocacy plan)
- Partner individual commitments-(who, what, in what timeline, with what specific goal and advocacy plan)
- Separate chapters for each pilot location
 1. Lessons learned (in terms of necessary policy related changes, needs)
 2. Specific commitments for implementation, upscaling or replication after RESTORIVER.
 3. Proposed follow-up interventions.

●.1.5. Deliverables

- 3.2.3 RESTORIVER Take-up strategy-[1 document](#) including
 1. Partners joint action
 2. Partner individual commitments
 3. Separate chapters for each pilot location

●.2. Methodology for Network of supportive policy makers

The purpose of the Network of Supportive Policy Makers methodology is to create a structured, multi-level framework for engaging policymakers and stakeholders in climate change adaptation (CCA)-focused riparian Natural Water Retention Measures (NWRM). The network will:

- Facilitate national and macroregional advocacy for NWRM.
- Connect thematic networks (ICLEI, ICPDR, EUSDR, INBO, Carpathian Convention, GWP CEE, WWF ADRIA, WWF CEE/HU, Western Balkans Green Centre) with other relevant stakeholders.
- Ensure cross-sectoral involvement of authorities responsible for water, nature, urban development, and agriculture.

●.2.1. Roles and responsibilities for executing Network of supportive policy makers

- D.3.2.1 Network of supportive policy makers Per country
 - PP4 – ADRIA (Croatia)
 - PP5 - WWF-SK (Slovakia)
 - PP9 – RUSE (Bulgaria)
 - PP10 – TULCEA (Romania)
 - PP12 – SOMBOR (Serbia)
 - PP15 - WWF-UA (Ukraine): have external costs of professional workshops
 - PP7 - WWF-HU (Hungary)-provide thematic support
- D.3.2.1. Network of supportive policy makers-Danube basin level-external expert

●.2.2. Inputs for Network of supportive policy makers

- Identification and involvement of stakeholders and policymakers during SO1 & SO2 will result in creating a D.3.2.1. Network of supportive policymakers to connect them with other relevant stakeholders and engage them in national-level representation of project objectives.
- The target audience for the Strategy Take-up
- Comparative analysis of policy environments (D.3.1.2)-list of authorities
- R(Sub) national policy recommendations (D.3.1.3)
- International/Macroregional Policy Recommendations (D.3.2.2)
- SO2 (D 2.2 (pilot projects), D.2.3.1. Fundraising action plan for spinoff interventions, D.2.3.2.Pilot reports, D.2.3.3.Professional workshops presenting highlights)-draft versions since final deliverables won't be ready.

●.2.3. Methods

- Policy dialogue (involves discussions among stakeholders to raise issues, share perspectives, find common ground, and reach agreement or consensus, if possible, on policy solutions)
- Workshops, interactions, meetings.
 1. Each partner country may choose the most suitable approach—organizing a dedicated online workshop, participating in policymaker meetings, or integrating this activity into other project workshops.
 1. Gather information from them on what they have done so far and what they are planning to do for improving NWRM implementation. It would give an internal ownership, willingness, commitment to act to become a supportive stakeholder in practice as well as helping us to identify recommendations and take-up strategy content.
 2. Policy dialog on Danube basin/macroregional level
- The Stakeholder Analysis Excel Table will be updated with additional insights, by each country, such as the level of NWRM acceptance among policy-maker stakeholders. This updated table will also be part of the deliverable D 3.2.1 Network of supportive policy makers

●.2.4. List of outputs

- Meetings memo and workshop memo summarized in most important outputs.

- The Stakeholder table will be updated with additional insights, such as the level of NWRM acceptance among policy-maker stakeholders. **The update will be subject to data availability.**
- List of stakeholders on macroregional level

●.2.5. Deliverables

- Network of supportive policy makers (D.3.2.1)-one document with compiled [templates/country](#)

● ANNEXES

●.1.1. Policy matrix

●.1.2. Template for 3.1.2 Comparative analysis of policy environments-Gap analysis

General questions about specific policy document: (In English)	
Country	
Title of the policy document: <i>(Enter full official title of the policy)</i>	
Level: local; national	
Type of policy document: strategic; management plan; other	
Area covered by the policy document: water, climate, environment, other, combinations	
When was the policy document first introduced?	
When was the last review of the policy document?	
What period does this policy document apply to?	
Is there any information about a review or revision of the policy document, and if so, when will this happen?	
Short summary of the main policy document objectives as stated in the policy	
Responsible authority - the main actors in the policy development, implementation and review. (These are the people we might want to share the draft findings - Network of supportive policy makers)	
Add a short personal reflection to the following questions, based on information you've analysed: (In English)	
In what way does the policy document enable mainstreaming NbS/NWRM, specifically with regards to climate change adaptation?	
In what way does the policy document prevent mainstreaming NbS/NWRM, specifically with regards to climate change adaptation?	
What do we need to maintain, create or disrupt in order to provide a supportive policy environment for NbS/NWRM with regards to climate change adaptation?	
Summarize all the relevant findings, based on information you have analysed and questions/sub questions you've answered: (In English)	

Describe key gaps and controversies in an analysed policy document, with regards to NbS/NWRM and its use in climate change adaptation.	
Describe key opportunities in an analysed policy document, with regards to NbS/NWRM and its use in climate change adaptation.	
Describe whether the policy document is or is not harmonized with any of the other (national or subnational/local) analysed policy document.	

Gap analysis: Please answer a list of questions and sub questions for each policy document and fill in the template document (descriptive answers in local language).

1. Is NbS/NWRM recognized in a policy document as a principle/measure in water management?

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

Is NbS/NWRM recognized as a tool/measure which helps adapting to climate change threats and is it specified to what specific climate change threats?

Are NbS/NWRM specified (look in catalogue of measures)?

Is NbS/NWRM preferable measure in comparison to traditional methods?

Is climate change adaptation set as a goal of a specific policy document and what kind of measures are suggested to be used?

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

2. Is NbS/NWRM recognized in a policy document as a tool/measure for prevention of biodiversity loss and enhancement of biodiversity?

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

Please elaborate

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

3. Is NbS/NWRM recognized in a policy document as a tool/measure for climate change adaptation?

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

Please elaborate

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

4. Does the policy document refer to NbS/NWRM and societal challenges? (Please refer to [IUCN Global Standard](#) for Nature-based Solutions)

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

Why is a policy needed by society, including how the policy is relevant to climate change adaptation and mitigation, disaster risk reduction, ecosystem degradation and biodiversity loss, human health, socio-economic development, food security and water security.

Are the challenges clearly documented, urgent, and desired outcomes identified?

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

5. Does the policy document refer to designing NbS/NWRM at scale? (Please refer to [IUCN Global Standard](#) for Nature-based Solutions)

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

Does the policy address/define the need to work at the landscape or multiple scales beyond a NbS/NWRM intervention site?

Does it recognise interactions between ecosystems, society and the economy and with other interventions and sectors?

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

6. Does the policy document refer to NbS/NWRM result in biodiversity net-gain and ecosystem integrity? (Please refer to [IUCN Global Standard](#) for Nature-based Solutions)

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

Is the NbS/NWRM intervention directly responding to evidence-based assessment of the current state of the ecosystem and prevailing drivers of degradation and loss?

Are clear and measurable biodiversity conservation outcomes, as a result of NbS/NWRM measure identified, benchmarked and periodically assessed?

Does policy ensure any adverse impacts on nature from NbS/NWRM are monitored and addressed?

Are opportunities to enhance ecosystem integrity and connectivity identified and incorporated into the NbS strategy?

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

7. Does the policy document refer to economic feasibility? (Please refer to [IUCN Global Standard](#) for Nature-based Solutions)

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

What kind of feasibility (technical feasibility, financial feasibility, operational feasibility, and legal feasibility e.g)?

Does the policy refer to the costs and benefits associated with NbS/NWRM?

Is there reference to cost-effectiveness? Are NbS/NWRM compared to alternative solutions?

Are externalities considered? Are financing options (including market-based, public sector and voluntary commitments) considered?

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

8. Does the document recognize the possibility of including all the relevant stakeholders in the identification and implementation of NbS? (Please refer to inclusive governance [IUCN Global Standard](#) for Nature-based Solutions)

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

Does the policy refer to all sectors of society involved in NbS/NWRM design, implementation and maintenance?

Does the policy make use of indigenous and local community knowledge in a phase of design, implementation and monitoring of NbS/NWRM intervention?

Does the policy include an understanding of stakeholder interests and include conflict resolution mechanisms?

Is there an institutional framework for inclusive governance?

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

9. Does the policy document refer to NbS/NWRM equitably to balance trade-offs between achievement of their primary goal(s) and the continued provision of multiple benefits? (Please refer to [IUCN Global Standard](#) for Nature-based Solutions)

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

Are trade-offs identified and safeguards provided?

Is it clear whose trade-offs are being considered (as they differ between social groups)?

Does the policy use existing standards to ensure trade-offs are managed and what are those standards?

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

10. Does the policy document use evidence-based adaptive management of NbS/NWRM intervention? (Please refer to [IUCN Global Standard](#) for Nature-based Solutions)

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

Does the policy have a monitoring and evaluation or MRV (measurement, reporting and verification) framework for NbS/NWRM intervention?

Does the policy enable iterative learning throughout the intervention lifecycle?

Are there any indications that NbS/NWRM intervention can be adapted or changed based on the monitoring data?

Is the effect of NbS/NWRM on climate change adaptation measured?

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

11. Does the policy document refer to NbS/NWRM sustainability and mainstreaming within an appropriate jurisdictional context? (Please refer to [IUCN Global Standard](#) for Nature-based Solutions)

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

Does the policy refer to sharing lessons from NbS/NWRM implementations to trigger change?

Does the policy relate to global targets on human well-being, climate change, biodiversity and human rights, including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), IPCC and IPBES?

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

12. Does the policy document refer to financial resources needed for implementation, maintenance and monitoring of NbS/NWRM?

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

Are financing sources and specific purpose/cost defined?

Is there any special (renaturation) fund available? Are those funds already implemented in reality?

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

13. Does the policy document refer to staff training (staff included in water management) programmes in regard to climate change, water management or biodiversity loss?

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

How is it arranged?

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

14. Does the policy document refer to awareness-raising activities/programs in regards to climate change, water management and/or biodiversity loss and conservation?

- Check Yes/No/Partially in a [template document](#) (Gap analysis local/Gap analysis National)
- Answer:

If Yes or Partially

How is it arranged?

Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

If NO

Do you think this is relevant and should it be included in the policy document?

●.1.3. Template for other questions to be answered

Country:	Name of the country
-----------------	---------------------

1. Do legal procedures for NbS/NWRM implementation exist and who are the parties involved?

Description of steps and parties involved; roles and responsibilities; prerequisites needed for each step of the procedure. Please refer to your sources (e.g. legislation).

2. What is the procedure for NbS/NWRM implementation inside protected areas (Natura2000 and/or other) and outside (urban e.g.)?

Description of steps and parties involved; roles and responsibilities; prerequisites needed for each step of the procedure. Please refer to your sources (e.g. legislation).

3. Do existing (national and regional) spatial plans adopt NbS/NWRM?

If yes, in what capacity? Please refer to your sources.

●.1.4. Template for 3.1.2 Comparative analysis of policy environments-Harmonization analysis

Elaborate only for policies which are **PARTIALLY** or **NO** harmonized in [template document](#) (Harmonization 1-6). Continue with case no 2, case no 3 etc, if applicable.

Country:	Name of the country
-----------------	---------------------

1. CASE 1

a. Policy document 1

- i. Title of the policy document (Enter full official title of the policy)
- ii. Level: local; national

- iii. Type of policy document: strategic; management plan; other
- iv. Area covered by the policy document: water, climate, environment, other, combinations
- b. Policy document 2
 - i. Name of the policy document (Enter full official name of the policy & any abbreviations used in the document)
 - ii. Level: local; national
 - iii. Type of policy document: strategic; management plan; other
 - iv. Area covered by the policy document: water, climate, environment, other, combinations
- Elaboration:

●.1.5. [Template for quantitative analysis](#)

●.1.6. Template for D.3.1.3 (Sub) national policy recommendations

General questions about specific policy document:	
Country	
Title of the policy document: <i>(Enter full official title of the policy)</i>	
Level: local; national	
Type of policy document: strategic; management plan; other	
Area covered by the policy document: water, climate, environment, other, combinations	
When was the policy document first introduced?	
When was the last review of the policy document?	
What period does this policy document apply to?	
Is there any information about a review or revision of the policy document, and if so, when will this happen?	
Short summary of the main policy document objectives as stated in the policy	
Responsible authority - the main actors in the policy development, implementation and review. (These are the people we might want to share the draft findings - Network of supportive policy makers)	
List all the relevant recommendations for improvement of the specific policy document	Relevance at International/Macroregional Level (High/Medium/Low)
1.	
2.	
3.	

Other recommendations for improvement of policy environment and institutional capacities and framework:

1.

●.1.7. Template for D.3.2.2 International/macroregional policy recommendations

1. Introduction

- Purpose of this document: provide transnationally relevant recommendations for improving and harmonizing climate-adaptation and NWRM-related policies across the Danube Basin.
- Link to macroregional and EU *Comparative Analysis (D.3.1.2)* and *National Recommendations (D.3.1.3)*.
- Alignment with EU and macro-regional frameworks (WFD, FD, CAP, EU Climate Adaptation Strategy, EU Biodiversity Strategy, EUSDR, ICPDR, Carpathian Convention).

2. Key Transnational Challenges

Challenge	Scale (Danube/EU)	Description	Implications for NWRM
Example: Fragmented flood management policies	Danube basin	National approaches not harmonised	Limits basin-wide coordination and funding synergies

3. Collection of Good Practices

- Overview of exemplary policy instruments and approaches from partner countries or other transnational river basins.
- EU-level and international cases relevant for the Danube Region.
- Lessons on institutional cooperation, funding, and stakeholder engagement.

4. Conclusion

- Synthesis of the most important recommendations for the Danube Region.
- Expected impact: improved resilience to floods, droughts, and climate extremes through integrated NWRM policy implementation.

ANNEX (Mapping country-level recommendations against basin/EU-level priorities to ensure coherence.)

National Recommendation (from D.3.1.3)	Relevance at International/Macroregional Level	Integration Action
<i>Example: Introduce NWRM standards in national RBMP</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Harmonise with ICPDR Danube RBMP</i>

- **Alignment between National and International/Macroregional**

D.3.1.3 Section	Feeds into D.3.2.2 Section	How to Use
Barriers and gaps	Key transnational challenges	Identify common challenges across countries
Recommendations (harmonisation, implementation acts, institutional, financial, capacity)	Transnational recommendations (harmonisation, cooperation protocols, financing mechanisms, knowledge sharing)	National insights scaled up to basin/EU level

D.3.1.3 Section	Feeds into D.3.2.2 Section	How to Use
Prioritised roadmap	Transnational implementation roadmap	Aggregate actions into macro-regional priorities
Good practices & lessons	Collection of good practices	Highlight cases with replication potential across borders
Stakeholder validation	Stakeholder dialogue (EUSDR)	Ensure continuity from local/national to macro-regional dialogue

●.1.8. Template for D.3.2.3 Take-up strategy

- .1. Partners' joint actions
- .2. Partners' individual commitments
- .3. Supportive policy makers' action, if available
- .4. Separate chapters for each pilot location

Lessons learned (in terms of necessary policy related changes, needs) from

- .4.1. the comparative policy analysis ('rules of the game') to address the barriers and enablers identified in the current policy context.
- .4.2. the network of identified policy makers to build alliances: engage with key stakeholders and rights-holders to strengthen the position of NbS/NWRM uptake and implementation also identifying barriers to change.
- .4.3. the different recommendations and policy scenarios and good practices defined in this project to identify the related interventions.
- .4.4. Specific commitments for implementation, upscaling or replication after RESTORIVER.
- .4.5. Proposed follow-up interventions.

Commitment Type (Individual/Shared)	Who (Actors responsible)	What (Action/Recommendation)	Timeline	Goal	Advocacy Plan	Governance Level	Funding sources	Monitoring indicator
Individual	PP and Ministry of environment	Work with Ministry of Environment to include NWRM in the River Basin Management Plan	2026–2028	Legal recognition of NWRM in water planning	Policy dialogue workshops; input to ICPDR RBMP review; meetings with water authorities	National / Basin		
Shared	All partners	Advocate for the creation of a Danube-wide	2028	Secure sustainable financing	Joint advocacy via ICPDR and EUSDR;	Basin / EU	Cohesion Policy, EIB, LIFE	Fund created and

Commitment Type (Individual/Shared)	Who (Actors responsible)	What (Action/Recommendation)	Timeline	Goal	Advocacy Plan	Governance Level	Funding sources	Monitoring indicator
		<i>Renaturation Fund to co-finance NWRM implementation</i>		<i>for scaling NWRM</i>	<i>presentations at Embedding Weeks; policy briefs for EU institutions</i>			<i>operational</i>

●.1.9. Template for compiled/summarized and structured info from D.3.2.1 Network of supportive policy makers

Summary of the interaction with policy makers	
Country	
List of policy makers on subnational level	
Number of policy maker interaction of subnational level	
Ways/Methods of interactions on subnational level	
Topics discussed/policy documents covered	
Summary of main outputs of the interaction	
List of policy makers on national level	
Number of policy maker interaction of national level	
Ways/Methods of interactions on national level	
Topics discussed/policy documents covered	
Summary of main outputs of the interaction	
List of policy makers on international/macroeconomic level	
Number of policy maker interaction of international/macroeconomic level	
Ways/Methods of interactions on international/macroeconomic level	
Topics discussed/policy documents covered	
Summary of main outputs of the interaction	

OPPORTUNITIES FOR STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT			
Stakeholder/Institution	Position on NWRM	Barriers Identified	Opportunities for Engagement
<i>Ministry of Agriculture</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>CAP priorities focused on productivity</i>	<i>Advocate for eco-schemes rewarding riparian buffers</i>
<i>Municipalities</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>Lack of technical know-how</i>	<i>Provide training modules on NWRM in urban planning</i>

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT IN SPECIFIC POLICY IMPROVEMENT					
Stakeholder/institution	Name and title	Level of governance (subnational/national)	Position on NWRM	Policy document	Ways of engagement in policy document improvements