



University of Natural Resources and
Life Sciences, Vienna
Department of
Water, Atmosphere, and Environment

Summary, conclusions, lessons learned and potential future actions

Günter Langergraber
Institute of Sanitary Engineering and
Water Pollution Control

Rural Wastewater Treatment Workshop

19+20 January 2021

Summary

Day 1

- Session 1: Setting the scene
- Session 2: The enabling environment - national level

Day 2

- Session 3: Good practices at municipal level
- Session 4: Technical solutions and developments

Session 1: Setting the scene

- SDG 6 "Clean water and sanitation"
- EU Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive (UWWTD)
 - Regulations for < 2'000 PE very general
 - UWWTD currently under revision → stakeholder participation process
- Social dimension - affordability - ...

Session 2: The enabling environment - national level

- Rural areas:
 - high number of WWTPs required but only small part of total wastewater load
 - Decreasing rural population
 - Rural areas are often poor
- National implementation
 - National regulation often in place but financial support from EU for implementation required
 - Regional differences require different national action plans

Session 3: Good practices at municipal level

- Financing models for rural wastewater management
 - Subsidies are required
 - Regional differences
- Capacity of operating WWTPs needs to be built
 - Different O&M models, e.g. umbrella organisations
 - Training of operators

Session 4: Technical solutions and developments

- IAS - small WWTPs - DEWATS
- Technologies for rural areas must
 - be simple and robust and
 - have low O&M requirements and costs
- Design standards for decentralised systems facilitate their implementation
- Without O&M no technology works
 - capacity for O&M required

Conclusions 1

- Importance of rural wastewater management is widely neglected
- Policy framework for enabling and supporting rural wastewater management is lacking
- Clarity of EU legislation for agglomerations less than 2'000 PE is required (e.g. definition of agglomeration, use of IAS, adequate treatment levels for IAS)

Conclusions 2

- Local communities should be able to operate the systems
 - ⇒ Technologies that are simple and robust and that have low O&M requirements and costs
 - ⇒ nature-based solutions such as treatment wetlands are suitable solutions

Conclusions 2a

- There is a prejudice that treatment wetlands treat wastewater less effectively compared to technical solutions (such as activated sludge).
 - ⇒ Experience shows that treatment wetlands - if properly designed, constructed & operated - can achieve the same (if not better) treatment level as technical solutions

Conclusions 3

- Financial support for rural communities required (e.g. subsidies) ... affordability and social aspects
- However, O&M is never subsidised
 - ⇒ Development O&M models for rural areas (e.g. cooperations with umbrella organisations)
 - ⇒ including training programmes for operators
- Regional differences need to be considered



**University of Natural Resources and
Life Sciences, Vienna**

Department of
Water, Atmosphere, and Environment

Contact

Dr Günter Langergraber

University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna (BOKU University)
Department of Water, Atmosphere and Environment
Institute of Sanitary Engineering and Water Pollution Control

Muthgasse 18, A-1190 Vienna, Austria
Tel.: +43 (0)1 47654-81111
Email: guenter.langergraber@boku.ac.at