



SUWANU EUROPE

Deliverable 2.5

Greek Regional Working Group Report

Contents

Executive summary.....	2
1 Introduction	3
2 Strategy for the engagement of the RWG	5
2.1 Functioning of the RWGs	5
2.2 Role and responsibilities of the project partner facilitator	5
2.3 Stakeholders engagement support tools.....	6
2.4 Engagement of stakeholders during RWGs	7
2.5 Communication with stakeholders after RWGs.....	7
2.6 Main themes raised in RWG activities	7
3 Discussion and participants in the RWG meetings/events.....	9
3.1 Greek Regional Working Group meetings	9
4 Conclusions for Thessaloniki (Greece).....	14

Executive summary

In recent years, water scarcity has become a serious problem in Southern Europe and in some other EU Countries. In several EU Regions and territories are suffering from water shortage; even in some of them there is still a regime of drinking water use in the respective mayor cities.

In the light of these circumstances, finding alternatives is crucial for agriculture, agrifood industrial sites, daily life and the economy as a whole. In our SUWANU EUROPE view, the creation of a Regional Working Group is crucial to overcome the problems and to generate a Regional Action Plan to promote the use of reclaimed water in agriculture and in other uses.

The results and the experiences gained by the Regions here involved from the 8 Countries - France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Greece, Bulgaria, Flanders. Belgium – have been proven to be useful to spread in other sites of their countries.

But still there are also local peculiarities in the functioning of the administration, economy and interconnections with stakeholders, in particular farmers, authorities, NGOs and citizens, in different regions/countries.

The specifics of the organization of the relationships, the flow of information in the field of water reuse, as well as the main players, were clarified in WP 2 . Tasks 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and AKIS analysis.

In this regard, the establishment of a RWG for the different regions as in our task 2.5. was consistent with the involvement of a wide range of actors who play a key role in the design and coordination of the regional action plan.

Stakeholders from the administration, local authorities, universities and research institutes, farmers, NGOs and others were involved. Each group of these actors has an important contribution to play in drawing up the regional action plan, in task 2.6.

On the other hand, all of the selected representatives in the RWG are settled and located in the territories, which will ensure a very good coordination, too. The engaging of relevant stakeholders started since the beginning of the project.

This aim resulted in 18 meetings in various regional organizations and relevant institutions with the idea of involving competent organizations to participate in SuWaNu Europe project and goals, explaining the approach and objectives of the EU project and the role of each internal partnership and external organization into.

The 2.5. Report elaborated by Confagricoltura tries to identify the main activities and conclusions that RWGs offered to our partnership and our European stakeholders, with the strategy to contribute for the common interest of water reclamation and sustainable water use.

1 Introduction

The Regional Working Groups (RWGs) are the result of an intense contact with actors of the water and agriculture sectors in order to engage them in the SUWANU EUROPE project activities. These contacts started from the very beginning of the project in each region/country.

In the first stage the engagement consisted in sharing the information of the project objectives and foreseen activities. The organization of the participatory workshops in different regions pushed the consortium for a more intense contact. Several activities were organized to engage the stakeholders, such as sending the invitation letters, telephone calls, in some countries drafting a newsletter to disseminate the workshops, to extend the audience and to multiply the dissemination of the information.

The purpose of the work was to ensure a participatory process in the development of action plans and to guarantee an effective transfer of knowledge in the next project steps by the active participation of stakeholders.

Therefore, relevant actors have been involved in the process and engaged as RWG members in each region: farmers using or interested in reused water, regional and national authorities, wastewater treatment operators, rural development groups, researchers, agri-food industries, consumers associations, NGOs and private companies, engineers, advisory groups.

In terms of definition, Regional Working Groups are precisely groups of actors *out of the consortium* that have been engaged to participate and to provide feedbacks to the SUWANU EUROPE project and that have been involved in some relevant project activities such as the development of the Regional Action Plans of the task 2.6. The role of the Regional Working Group (RWG) in different regions is fundamental *to build the participatory actions and the Regional Action Plans*.

In different Regions, the Partners have defined a strategy and an implementation plan to involve the main actors, including the following activities:

- Initial contact with stakeholders
- Regional revision of key documents by key stakeholders
- Invitation of stakeholders through news/letter/phone call
- Regional meetings with RWG members
- Materials dissemination, documents, leaflets, summaries, power points
- Draft versions of the regional action plan to get feedback from RWG members
- Final version of the regional action plan for validation
- Presentation in a regional/national event/fair/conference, workshop etc.

In particular every Regional Working Group, following the Agreement and the WP 2 task 2.5, *in the first beginning*, had to:

- Involve actively all the partners of the Consortium
- Ensure a stakeholders engagement through a deep analysis of the key actors and the accession to other relevant organizations to be involved
- Disseminate intensively at local and regional level using appropriate channels to reach the identified stakeholders
- Ensure a multi actor and a participatory approach that make regional actors feel part of the Suwanu Europe project, and the Suwanu Europe project activities.

The RWG *second step* had to:

- Contact the regional, national and european relevant associations such as Copa Cogeca, the farmers and agrocooperatives Umbrella confederation in Bruxelles and in each region/country, EURAU and ANECOOP with their wide regional/national networks:
 - ✓ to better align the Suwanu Europe project with their national and european objectives and cooperation actions and
 - ✓ to better identify national / regional memberships and reference organizations;
- Identify at least five members out of the Consortium
- Organize frequent meetings during the running of the Suwanu Europe project, at least five

The RWG *third last step* will:

- Elaborate together with the Consortium Partners the preparation and implementation of the Regional Action Plans, under task 2.6
- Facilitate the Implementation of water reuse solutions
- Seek new opportunities to perform collaborative/cooperative projects
- Seek also new opportunities to build operational groups in the framework of EIP Agri
- Consolidate the Regional Working Groups after the project ends
- Create therefore a permanent cluster in each region to adopt and disseminate water reuse solutions.

2 Strategy for the engagement of the RWG

The aim of this strategy at this stage of the project is to present a strategy for the engagement of the Regional Working Groups (RWGs) which will be applied throughout the second period of the project. Experiences and lessons learned emerging from first period RWGs has been taking into consideration keeping this a dynamic process that can be updated during the project.

This collection of information will be used to engage identified stakeholders in the RWGs and will be used to stimulate discussions within the RWGs. It will serve to promote the joint development of strategic thinking, the two-way exchange of ideas between the different stakeholders and will also feed with practical recommendations for the formulation of the Regional Action Plans (task 2.6).

2.1 Functioning of the RWGs

The facilitator from each RWG will enroll the stakeholders in the active participation in the meetings, preparing a set of topics to be discussed and the activities to be implemented following a multi-actor approach and a participatory approach. This can be done with the prior discussion with the members, so that there is a consensus on the topics to discuss during the meeting so to actively engage the stakeholders from the beginning.

It is vital that the objectives and the expected outcomes of the RWGs are perfectly clear to all members that take part in the meetings and that the roles of engagement are also clear. The members of the Regional Working Groups, following the Agreement and the WP 2 task 2.5, must among others to:

- Propose practical recommendations for the formulation of the Regional Action Plans (task 2.6)
- Disseminate intensively at local and regional level the SuWaNu Europe project results and outcomes, through their own communication channels;
- Be engaged in the implementation of reclaimed water use solutions;
- Seek new opportunities to perform cooperative projects and to build operational groups in the framework of EIP Agri.
- Create permanent clusters in each target region of the project, to adopt and disseminate reclaimed water use solutions.

2.2 Role and responsibilities of the project partner facilitator

The facilitator will be a project partner of each region and their main responsibilities are collected in the following table:

Table 1: Role of the project partner facilitator

Responsibility	Expected Contributions	Outputs
Setting-up of the RWG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invite and enroll active members (multi-actor approach) Prepare topics for discussion Plan activities (participatory approach) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invitation letter/email to potential members Prepare program of the meeting
Running the RWG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain the objectives and expected outcomes of the RWGs and members expected responsibilities Oversee the meeting runs as planned Ensure that all members actively participate in the discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report with practical recommendations for the formulation of the Regional Action Plans (task 2.6)
Communication and outreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organize and contribute to communication and dissemination activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Send inputs for the SuWaNu Europe website (brief description of the RWGs, members, calendar of events, scientific articles, news, etc.) Publish at least 1 social media post per RWG meeting (before, during or immediately after) Register RWGs members as followers of the SuWaNu Europe social media accounts and relay social media posts published by the central communication team to increase outreach

2.3 Stakeholders engagement support tools

In order to actively engage stakeholders during the meetings, there are several tools that follow a participatory methodology, and that facilitate effective engagement of target stakeholders. The activities aim at promoting the engagement of stakeholders, collaboration and in a participatory approach.

Such an example is the World Café method, that can be found in the <http://actioncatalogue.eu/method/7402>, which is a method for engaging groups, both within organizations and in the public sphere. This method is founded on the assumption that people have the capacity to work together, no matter who they are.

A World Café follows seven core design principles: (1) Set the Context; (2) Create Hospitable Space; (3) Explore Questions That Matter; (4) Encourage Everyone’s Contribution; (5) Cross-Pollinate and Connect Diverse Perspectives; (6) Listen Together for Patterns, Insights, and Deeper Questions; and (7) Harvest and Share Collective Discoveries.

World Cafés can create results to generate new ideas, to enable joint decision-making on key strategic issues, to discover new ways for collaboration, to reflect on the implications of a complex issue and in identifying specific step(s) for further exploration and implementation.

The recent events related with COVID-19, called for the need to use of online tools in the organization of initially predicted physical events. There are several online platforms that can be use, and that still allow the planning of dynamics as described before.

Tools such Zoom, Microsoft Teams, Cisco Webex meetings are just some examples.

2.4 Engagement of stakeholders during RWGs

Besides the different tools that can be used during the RWGs to promote participatory process and engagement of stakeholders, there are several methodologies that creates more interactive and collaborative formats.

- Initiate the meeting with an icebreaker to get things started in a good way. This is particularly important if the participants don't know each other or come from a different background. This can be achieved by asking participants to bring an object or to pick a word that can in some ways define them and, in this way, they can make a brief presentation of themselves.
- Promote participatory discussions, where tools like pinup.com can be a powerful tool promoting debate and discussion.
- Questionnaires using tools like *Mentimeter* or *Sli.do*, which are live interactive applications to get feedback from the participants, that allow to create polls and Q&As, among others experiences with the participants.
- Networking is a powerful tool for having during breaks for participants to get to know each other and to exchange ideas and experiences.

2.5 Communication with stakeholders after RWGs

After each RWGs it is important to make a follow up communication with the participants to keep them involved with the project and to get them to participate in the next RWGs.

This can be accomplished simply by:

- Send an email right after the meeting thanking the participants for attending the event;
- Send an email to participants who did not show or attended and share some of the outcomes of the meeting. This might compel them to participate next time;
- Once the major outcomes of the meeting are prepared, send an email with the major conclusions and results and if possible, an indication for the next RWG agenda.

2.6 Main themes raised in RWG activities

During RWGs meetings, the critical discussion points and the axes towards which the RWG activities that the RWG Groups should be focused on were the following:

- a) In terms of regional informations/data policies:
 - Incomplete or updated soil map
 - Irrigation water quality data monitoring systems and swap crops for irrigation water
 - Reference to indicators of consumption & quality. Quantities lost/quantities consumed
 - Measurable water saving elements.
 - Regional problems in water supply, water transport issues - open ducts
 - Basin Management Plans, how they were developed and how reliable they are
 - Reference to different water supply and irrigation networks
- b) In terms of harmonized methodologies/EU critical issues:
 - Reflections on difficulties in water volume management and services
 - Integration with main issues and subjects of the Regional Policy
 - Reference to the AKIS method, (and networking) what it is and how it works
 - EU guidelines/directive approved on reuse of treated water, costs and fines for non-compliance.

- The new Agricultural Policy has strict restrictions and measurable terms, with constant and strict scrutiny of residues.
- c) In terms of the farming systems/stakeholders/users:
- Information, behavior and irrigation systems
 - Farming systems/ habits of farmers.
 - Policing and controlling in agriculture.
 - Use of treated water in non-edible crops-concerns- difficulties
 - Industrial food processors water use/reuse
 - Environment-friendly policy.
 - Some proposals to facilitate farming/industrial reuse waters
- d) In terms of local/regional rules:
- Licenses and re-use licenses
 - Secondary treatment, effluent quality, and reuse of treated waste.
- e) In terms of the economy:
- Design and problems in water transportation and unit costs
 - Reliability of the processes of reuse.
 - Water recycling from drainage canals-advantages and disadvantages.
 - Water treatments costs/efficiency/piloting plants
- f) In terms of management/new skills/gaps:
- Competencies, development planning
 - key management issues, best practices to share
 - Reference to remote management and its importance
 - Cross-compliance of operators and consumers with irrigation processes.
 - Consumer/citizenship analysis/acceptance/willingness to buy

3 Discussion and participants in the RWG meetings/events

3.1 Greek Regional Working Group meetings

The province of Thessaloniki displayed a number of initiatives that were taken for re-use of treated effluent of wastewater treatment plants for irrigation purposes. Practical efforts to re-use the treated water were undertaken as early as the beginning of the 90's, by joint collaboration of the Thessaloniki Water Supply and Sewerage Company S.A. (EYAO A.E.) , the Local Land Reclamation Agency of "Chalastra –Kalohori" and the technical/scientific supervision of the currently named: Soil & Water Resources Institute (SWRI) which is a branch of the Hellenic Agricultural Organization "DEMETER" located at "Sindos" settlement.

Those hasty efforts were a response to acute drought problems that presented a serious threat to the vast irrigated crops at the Western plains of Thessaloniki (mainly rice, corn, cotton & sugar beets). The result of this early actions were the provision of infrastructure for utilizing the effluent of the Thessaloniki Waste Water Treatment Plant (approximately 150.000 m³ / day) after a mixture with water form river "Axios" at an analogy of 1 to 5 (1 portion of effluent mixed to 5 portions of river water). The quantities were sufficient to cover the irrigation needs of approximately 2500 ha of crops mainly rice, cotton & corn for a period of 5 years.

Previous consultation works and discussions at Thessaloniki area, on issues of better exploitation of the water resources, were done during the elaboration of the Management Plan of the River Basins of Central Macedonia River Basin District 10, which took place at 2014.

The actors that were targeted and called to participate to the Regional Working Group of Thessaloniki were:

1. Decentralized Region of Central Macedonia / Directorate-General for Development & Environment.
2. Decentralized Region of Central Macedonia / Directorate General for Environment & Water Resources.
3. Elected Region of Central Macedonia / Directorate of Water Resources.
4. Elected Region of Central Macedonia / Directorate of Planning & Environment
5. General Land Reclamation Agency of Thessaloniki & Langada plains (ΓΟΕΒ)
6. Thessaloniki Water Supply and Sewerage Company SA
7. Association of Agricultural Cooperatives of Thessaloniki - Langada
8. Municipal Water Supply and Sewerage Services.
9. Center for the Protection of Consumers in Thessaloniki
10. ANETH S.A

The above actors were selected and engaged to the Regional Working Group because of:

- ✓ they were actively involved in the design and implementation of water resources management and they have experience in open consultations and debate on the relative issues,
- ✓ the requested participants form a typical & well-balanced representative group of all the key players that influence/ shape the water resources management at the province,
- ✓ they represent local government schemes and associations that are familiar with the goals and actions that the host Local consortium partner (ANETH S.A.) is involved, starting from the bottom up approach consultations undertaken at the LEADER/CLLD initiative.

Table 2: Key actors

Key Actors	
1. Union of Agricultural Co-operatives (Thessaloniki-Lagada)	RTD
2. General Organization of Land Improvements in Thessaloniki - Lagada (GOEV)	ORGANIZATION
3. Local Organization of Land Improvements in Thessaloniki (TOEV)	ORGANIZATION
4. Municipality of Thessaloniki (Directorate of Panning and Technical Works)	AUTHORITY
5. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (Department of Geology)	UNIV
6. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (Laboratory of Agricultural Hydraulics)	UNIV
7. Public Water Supply-Sewerage Plant of Thessaloniki (Sewage Treatment Plant - DEYATH S.A.)	RTD
8. Consumers Association of Thessaloniki	ASSOCIATION
9. Regional Directorate of Water (Central Macedonia)	AUTHORITY
10. Institute of Land Improvements of Thessaloniki (ELGO)	RES
11. Inter-Balkan Environmental Centre	RES
12. National Center for Research and Technological Development (EKETA)	RES
13. Geotechnical Chamber of Greece	CHAMBER
14. Technical Chamber of Greece	CHAMBER
15. Development Agency of Eastern Thessaloniki' s Local Authorities (Anatoliki S.A.)	RTD

The contribution of the RWG members to the projects task and in particular to the task 2.6: elaboration of a Regional Action Plan for Thessaloniki province aiming to overcome the barriers for advocating the re-use of treated water to crops irrigation, is expected to be of critical importance. The members of the RWG represent a well harmonized group, offering equilibrium among key players on water resources management both from the administrators & implementer's perspectives.

Table 3: Participants of the 1st RWG meeting, 01/10/2019. (Thessaloniki)

Name	Organization that represents	Position to the organization	Description of the Organisation
Mr Drosos Achilleas	EASTH S.A.	Head of Study Dept.	Association of Agricultural Cooperatives of Thessaloniki
Dr Tsostolis Nicholas	General Directorate of Development and Environment/ RCM	Director	Environmental Protection and Development
Mr Mpextsoudis Eustratios	Dept. of Environment and Hydroeconomy/ RCM	Manager	Water resources Management
Mr Papatolios Konstantios	General Land Reclamation Agency of Thessaloniki & Langada plains	Employee	Water and Land Reclamation

Mr Papatolios Konstantinos	Region of Central Macedonia / Directorate of Water Resources	Employee	Water resources protection and Management
Dr Michailidis Anastasios	AUTH	Associate Professor	Agronomics
Mrs Patrikaki Olga	Region of Central Macedonia / Directorate of Water Resources	Employee	Water resources protection and Management
Mr Koparanis Theologos	General Land Reclamation Agency of Thessaloniki & Langada plains	Employee	Water and Land Reclamation
Mr Chatzipapas Vasilis	General Land Reclamation Agency of Thessaloniki & Langada plains	Employee	Water and Land Reclamation
Mr Kotoulas Konstantinos	EYATH S.A.	Director	Thessaloniki Water Supply and Sewerage Company SA
Mrs Pritsa Therodora	Elected Region of Central Macedonia / Directorate of Planning & Environment	Employee	Environmental Planning
Mr Seitaridis Thomas	Municipal Water Supply and Sewerage Services of Pylaia Chortiatis	Employee	Municipal Water Supply and Sewerage Services
Mr Papavasileiou Vasileios	ANETH S,A.	General Director	Development Company of Thessaloniki
Dr Tzanou Elena	ANETH S,A,	Company executive	Development Company of Thessaloniki
Mr Ziankas Georgios	ANETH S,A,	Company executive	Development Company of Thessaloniki
Mr Petridis Georgios	ANETH S,A,	Company executive	Development Company of Thessaloniki

The RWG members as a group epitomize the accumulated knowledge in all the critical issues concerning:

- Laws and administrative management of water resources
- Design and implementation of regional management plans
- Water treatment facilities, construction & maintenance & functional costs
- Irrigation networks construction & maintenance & functional costs
- Significance of the irrigation costs to the local agriculture production process
- Friction and social conflicts within the local community that revolve around water use rights
- Consumers' concerns and questions about the re-use of treated water in irrigation of crops

The RWG meetings provide an excellent opportunity for the members of the group to exchange opinions and make remarks on all the issues that the Local Regional Action Plan has to confront

and thus contribute in its formulation. The suitable members that would constitute a RWG that can meet the projects goals to have the optimal contribute to tasks 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 & 2.7 were detected during the work of the Task 1.2. A list of “candidates” was drawn containing their communication data.

The strategy for engaging the targeted members was based on the following frame:

- Communicating effectively the SuWaNu-Europe guiding principles for the positive avocation of treated water re-use
- Emphasizing on the need to create a long-term vision for the area, based on the “common destiny” concept
- Recognition of the diversity of the selected key players and adapting common and differentiated communication approaches
- Building up of trust and collaborative trend during the group’s discussions.
- Offering a full access to the project’s outputs and documentation

The second meeting took place at ANETH SA headquarters. The discussion continued at the same trajectory as in the first meeting of the SuWaNu Europe Project since the aspects and concerns are numerous and overly critical. In the second meeting the RWG focused mainly on more targeted issues on water reuse such as legislation, conflicts between stakeholders and managing authorities. Also, the General Action Plan was presented as formed by now.

The RWG members discussed the areas in which Greece and particularly the area of Thessaloniki should focus on to prepare a reliable and applicable Regional Action Plan and how the key players would communicate and disseminate the plan in order to be successful. The type of each questionnaire was discussed in order to come up with the most reliable and easily answered ones. The ANETH team was offered to prepare them and to present them to the next RWG. All members of the RWG will participate in the process of sharing the questionnaires to targeted groups and to the public. The results will then be evaluated by the ANETH and AUTH team and will be used as guidelines on the Regional Action Plan. The questionnaires have been presented in the third RWG meeting.

The third meeting took place at PORTO PALACE HOTEL, on the 5th of December, Thessaloniki, Greece. This meeting came as a post- process of the Regional Workshop (task 2.4) held the same day. After the end of works of the Regional workshop, the RWG discussed on the results of the workshop and evaluated the formed Questionnaires surveyed during the 2nd RWG.

At first the participants of the RWG discussed on the Workshop and evaluated its impact on the regional stakeholders. The second part of the RWG meeting focused on the evaluation of the results of the Questionnaires. All members answered all four questionnaires. Some corrections and adjustments were decided - all answers shall be given as a check box with a scale agreement to the statement of the question or by a yes/no answer. The type and final form of the questionnaires are uploaded to the SUWANU EUROPE project internal area - Greek Language. Results and their evaluation have been presented in the RWG meeting.

The participants in the 3rd Regional Working Group are listed (19 participants) from the same organizations above, apart the Ministry of Agricultural Development and the Geotechnical Chamber of Greece.

The core group of organizations within the participants of the RWG meetings/events and/or from the participatory workshops is as follows, roles and references:

- EASTH S.A. Dept. of Environment and Hydroeconomy/RCM, Farmers and Cooperatives point of view

- SWRI , Water resources analysis and proposals
- ANETH S,A, Territory needs and development experiences
- KEPKA, Local and Regional role in coordinating actions and initiatives
- AUTH, Researchers’ positions/collaboration an updating stakeholders
- EYATH S.A, General Directorate of Development and Environment/RCM. Environmental Agency Water Supply point of view.

A core group of 7 organizations has been selected within the participants of the RWG meetings/events and/or from the participatory workshops.

Table 4: Core group of SUWANU EUROPE Regional Working Group for Thessaloniki (Greece))

Name of main contact person	Organization that represents	Position to the organization	Role of RWG member during SUWANU EUROPE
Dr Tsostolis Nicholaos	General Directorate of Development and Environment/ RCM	Director	He is engaged to the use of water and wastewater in terms of regulation compliance in agriculture, participating in the elaboration of the national water policy
Mr Kotoulas Konstantinos	EYATH S.A.	Director	He is the coordinator in terms of treated wastewater effluent control, operated by the municipal wastewater treatment plan of the greater metropolitan area of Thessaloniki
Mrs Pritsa Therodora	Elected Region of Central Macedonia / Directorate of Planning & Environment	Employee	She is coordinating legal issues and compliance with the regulation in terms of reclaimed water reused in agriculture in the regional unit of Thessaloniki
Mr Koparanis Theologos	General Land Reclamation Agency of Thessaloniki & Langada plains	Employee	He represents the general land irrigation organisation of the region of Thessaloniki and is dealing with quality, quantity, demand and safety issues, getting feedback
Mr Drosos Achilleas	EASTH S.A.	Head of Study Dept.	He represents the farmers organisation and is responsible of contributing to the farmers change of opinions with other key actors, circulating and information from and to the RWG, getting feedback etc
Panoras Athanasios	SWRI	Former director, Sn Researcher	He coordinates the issues related to water resources in agriculture, pollution control and advisory methods to the agricultural sector and farmers,
Dr Tzanou Elena	ANETH S.A.	Company executive	She is the coordinator for the general function of the RWGs, responsible for the organisation of the meetings, thematics, distribution of minutes, information exchange etc.

4 Conclusions for Thessaloniki (Greece)

In Greece, the RWG established and covered all aspects of key players and stakeholders that deal with water and agriculture. The general opinion is that during the SUWANU EUROPE project it is the first serious attempt for the regional area of Thessaloniki to share knowledge and opinions on water reuse for agriculture:

- The area of Thessaloniki has little to show on water reuse, thus this is an opportunity to pass knowledge and experience to farmers and farming companies.
- Agriculture is the main water consumer in Thessaloniki and in Greece.
- Different organizations and authorities show different interests on water reuse.
- Consumers are reluctant to accept products irrigated by reclaimed water because of the lack of information.
- The cost of water reuse is not applicable in many cases in Greece.
- Participatory workshops, printed cross-thematic material, online information, production of digital information material such as e- learning project platform, audiovisual-video material, questionnaires etc, are some ways to inform on reclaimed water and its use and to enhance water reuse in agriculture.
- The RWG is willing to continue the effort and to form a Regional Action Plan that will be accepted and adopted by the authorities and key players of the water sector.