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Why is the project different?

• A natural area is created
• A wetland is created using an existing embanked zone
• There are about 400 landowners
Design Ciobarciu Wetland
Costuleni Wetland:

- Restoration of the flow in Old Jijia
- Land purchase
- Developing of the wetland:
  - design of the area
  - field works in the polders
  - management of the area
### Land Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRISACANI</th>
<th>COSTULENI</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchased</strong></td>
<td>125.61</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>129.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concession</strong></td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concession from Local Council</strong></td>
<td>31.02</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>34.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not purchased</strong></td>
<td>45.27</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>53.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>207.42</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>223.42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Involve stakeholders

Inform the county and locale authority
(Iasi County Council and Local Councilors from Costuleni and Prisacani)

Informed and consulted another stakeholders (AN-IF, Environmental Agency, farmers, Universities)

Informed local people (posters, articles, mass media and meetings)
The Al.I.Cuza University’s research on villagers’ perception: the facts

54 interviews in September 2006

Village:
50% in Costuleni,
50% in Prisecani

Gender:
50% women,
50% men

Relationship to project:
1/3 selling landowners,
1/3 non-selling landowners,
1/3 non-landowners

Main fact:
• 70% of interviewees has no income or an income below minimum!!!!
Demographic data

• The Costuleni community has 4860 inhabitants. Costuleni has 4 villages: Hilița (833 inhabitants), Cozia (1199 inhabitants), Covasna (1368 inhabitants) and Costuleni (1460 inhabitants).

• The Prisacani community has 3589 inhabitants in 3 villages: Prisacani (1887 inhabitants), Moreni (987 inhabitants) and Macarești (715 inhabitants).

• The main activity is agriculture and animal breeding.
Perception of result:

• International level: very good, but could be better.

• National level: very good: example ecological restoration and a team that knows how to do it.

• County level: good example for ecological reconstruction and public participation.
Perception of result: Village level:

- Most (especially authorities and staff):
  - good result
  - in restoration of nature
  - increased possibilities for fishing, hunting, recreation and horticulture along the Old Jijia.
- Others .... do not know.
Preliminary results “Al.I.Cuza” University research of villagers’ perception:

- appreciate the project (70%)
- not well informed
- sold the land because they needed money,
- but price was too low.
- did not see the effort the team made to clarify all land process.
- Some still do not know who now owns the land.
Villagers’ perception: information & involvement

How well informed?
• (very) well 40%
• So so/not at all 56%

Involvement in process:
• Not involved 69%
• Involved in discussions 31%
Villagers’ perception: reasons for selling/not selling

Selling:

- Need for money: 26%
- Village interest: 20%
- Poor productivity of land: 8%
- Lack of work resources: 8%
- Get other lands: 8%
- Can use after selling: 2%
- No answer: 28%

Not selling:

- Low price: 23%
- Preserve heritage: 19%
- Need of food for animals: 13%
- Only when swapped with other lands: 8%
- Unclear legal status: 6%
- No answer: 31%
Villagers’ perception: land ownership

Who owns the land in the project area?

- Community/people of the village: 60%
- No answer/don’t know: 18%
- Apele Romane: 15%
- The village council: 7%
Conclusions from the evaluation:

• Participation was an important part of the project;
• Together we have done and learned a lot!
• Participation could have been better, both at the county level and at the village level;
Main factors for the success of the project

- Appropriate location
- Co-operation of the responsible authorities
- Involvement of the local people, especially the local authorities
Advice for future projects:

• Make explicit room for participation

• Make a clear participation plan at the start

• Involve Romanian participation experts

• Do communicate a lot within the team and with stakeholders about participation
Thank you!