

---

# Navigation & Ecology: Process for Joint Statement



**icpdr ikسد**  
International  
Commission  
for the Protection  
of the Danube River  
Internationale  
Kommission  
zum Schutz  
der Donau

---

Proceedings of the Workshop III  
Zagreb, Croatia  
4-5 October, 2007

Document number: IC WD 308  
Version: final  
Date: 07-Oct-2007

//// Deutschland //// Österreich //// Česká republika //// Slovensko //// Magyarország //// Slovenija //// Hrvatska //// Bosna i Hercegovina //// Srbija //// Crna Gora //// România //// България //// Moldova ////

---

# 1 Protocol

---

## Day 1 (4 October 2007)

This Workshop was attended by over 50 representatives from governments (7 countries: AT, BA, DE, HR, HU, RS, RO, UA – BG, CZ, MD, SI and SK could not attend), international organisations (European Commission-DG TREN and DG ENV, Danube Commission, Danube Tourist Commission, ECMT, ICPDR, CEDA/Rijkswaterstaat, International Sava River Basin Commission, SECI/Stability Pact, TINA), NGOs (WWF, DEF – IAD could not attend), and other stakeholders (EBU, PIANC, via donau, Vienna university BoKu, national park Donau-Auen).

The workshop was organised by ICPDR Secretariat and the ICSR, who also generously supported it, including organising the transport between hotel and the workshop venue, the Croatian Ministry of Sea, Transport and Development.

The **objectives** of the workshop were to:

- *Remind the participants of the Workshop I+II results and introduce Workshop III objectives*
- *Present and discuss the draft 2 of the Joint Statement*
- *Assess critical issues of the draft Statement and discuss formulation of difficult Statement sections in Break-out Groups*
- *Agree on steps to finalise the drafting and future application of the Statement.*

### Introductory Statements

*Philip Weller (Executive Secretary, ICPDR)* welcomed all participants.

*Ms Rusica Dimic, Croatian Deputy Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management* expressed the strong Croatian government support for this process, as it is important for Croatia to follow international IWT guidelines. Croatia already joined various international agreements and is currently harmonising its water act with the WFD.

On behalf of *Mrs Lucia Ana Varga, ICPDR President 2007 and Secretary of State from the Romanian Ministry for Environment and Sustainable Development*, who was unable to come, *Mrs Ana Drapa* from the same Ministry expressed their wishes of success for this important process.

The co-hosts of this process, *Milovan Bozinovic, President of the Danube Commission, and Dejan Komatina, Executive Secretary of the International Sava River Basin Commission*, confirmed again their full support for this process and their satisfaction with the outcome of the first two workshops. Bozinovic praised the inspiring discussions and asked to now agree on and conclude a balanced document that then has to be signed. Mr Komatina stressed the importance of the Sava as the biggest Danube tributary and the good process concept (combining plenary and working group discussions).

All participants then briefly introduced themselves.

*Mr Weller* then reminded the participants the overall goal and objectives of the process to be achieved during three workshops and the results achieved so far:

- *The **first workshop** on 25-26 April in Orth/Austria focused on initial facts and views of the different stakeholders. It viewed at a concrete example project in the Upper Danube east of Vienna currently attempting to integrate local needs for ecological improvement and navigation interests.*
- *The **second workshop** in Romania focused on specifying and extending the already agreed common ground. More technical discussions and group work assessed solutions that bring improvements for navigation and for the hydro-morphological situation along the Danube. This workshop also visited and discussed the different problems in the lower Danube, notably of the ISPA Calarasi-Braila IWT project.*
- *This **third workshop** on 4-5 October focuses on finalising the draft Joint Statement, discussing the remaining critical issues and the follow-up work (editing, adoption, publication, application and future cooperation).*

[Link to Philip Weller: WSI and II & Introduction to WS III \(PPT\)](#)

### Presentation of the draft 2 of the Joint Statement

Weller informed about the drafting steps during summer (work of drafting group, dissemination of draft 1, working in of stakeholder comments into draft 2 circulated prior to Workshop III) and presented the concept how to discuss the identified critical issues at the workshop. He then presented the key points and changes of each chapter and asked for further comments.

### Plenary Discussion

Various participants (*Cucu/RO, Bernabei/EC, Vorderwinkler/AT, Bratrich/WWF*) stressed the need to finalise this Statement at this workshop and to prevent further delays. Critical points that cannot be resolved should be assessed in the future on the base of the adopted Statement. It will be important to secure a commitment of state governments to utilise the principles and criteria of this document. Main condition will be to secure its adoption by the 3 Commissions (ICPDR; DC, ISRBC) as a guidance document.

*Beyer/DE* stressed that the expected ICPDR Resolution adopting this Statement will give it enough binding character.

### Chapter 1 Introduction

It was explained that the word “project” refers to any project aiming to improve or affecting waterway transport.

In order to give the Statement a more binding character (rather than just an appeal) it was agreed to add to the title the words “**Guiding Principles**” after the suggestion of the Danube Commission.

### Chapter 2.1 Legal Situation

It was agreed that some more legal instruments need to be indicated (Ramsar, Bern and Espoo Conventions) but, instead of longer footnotes, more related information should be moved into a **new Annex 1 Legal Background**. Ch. 2.1 will start with a general sentence on conventions and EU law.

### Chapter 2.2 Current situation of navigation in the DRB

In the sub-chapter *Current Economic Situation* the last sentence on door-to-door transport was deleted. As the degree of environment-friendliness of IWT is disputed (it is “more” friendly than road), IWT should in *paragraph 3* not be compared to rail but only to road transport. The promotion of multi-modal shifts should be stressed.

---

### Chapter 2.3 Current situation of riverine environment in the DRB

In the sub-chapter *Nature of Large River systems*, the longitudinal and habitat continuity was added in paragraph 3.

In sub-chapter *Effects of navigation on the riverine system* several effects listed in the Danube Basin Analysis should be mentioned here as well. ICPDR explained that different to hydro-morphological impacts, **pollution** will not be addressed in this Statement but in the Danube River Basin Management Plan 2009.

### Chapter 3 Balancing navigation and ecological needs

A long discussion was held about the imbalanced size of the 2 chapters 3.1. and 3.2. The result was agreed in the Breakout Group (see below).

#### Chapter 3.1 Prerequisites of IWT

The last paragraph on non-structural measures was moved ahead of this chapter.

*Bratrich/WWF* suggested that a new basic need (3<sup>rd</sup> bullet) should be the market situation.

*Bernabei/EC* asked that for fairway dimensions a “*continuity of availability of sustainable and efficient navigation conditions*” be added.

#### Chapter 3.2 Prerequisites of ecology

*Shenchenko/UA* suggested to adding here sewage and waste collection but as this is no hydro-morphology issue, this subject is addressed in ch. 2.3 (*Effects of navigation – other impacts*). A second UA proposal referred to a basin-wide monitoring based on national WFD-compliant monitoring was added at the end of this chapter.

#### Chapter 3.3 New integrated planning philosophy for a joint approach

With respect to the varying names and responsibilities of ministries in all countries, *Gjoreska/SECI* suggested that here (but also in other text parts) the reference to ministries should be issue-related but not to a name of the ministry (e.g. instead of Ministry for Transport better write ministry responsible for transport).

*WWF* asked to note at the end of par. 2 that the Vienna project is not the best practice in relation to SEA procedure, even if this is a good example for the planning approach.

*Nick (HR representative to the DC)* informed that IWT project no. 9 was endorsed by the presidents of Serbia and Croatia.

### Chapter 4 Recommendations

#### Chapter 4.1 Integrated planning approach for the DRB

*Brooke/PIANC* asked that at the end of the word “avoid” should be replaced by “minimise”.

#### Chapter 4.2 Integrated Planning Principles

A number of amendments were intensively discussed (e.g. delete “*common sense*” from the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet) but some were concluded only on Day 2 (e.g. a new principle “*Protect where-ever something is left to be protected*”, “*Ensure the comparability of alternatives and assess the feasibility*”, an amendment

regarding the Danube RBM Plan 2009, how to deal with structural/hydraulic engineering intervention (*avoid/minimise/optimize?*).

The requirement to inform the 3 Commissions was extended to “*other possibly affected countries*”.

#### Chapter 4.3 Criteria for river engineering

On Day 1 this chapter could only partly be discussed and only few points concluded. This refers in particular to bullet no. 2 (*fairway dimension* criterion).

#### **Breakout Groups on chapters 2 and 3**

In this session, all participants split into two rooms and actively participated in both groups.

#### **Group 1: Legal situation and development of inland waterway transport; economic aspects and future needs** (*referring to chapter 2*)

*Facilitator: Stephen Perkins, ECMT*

An introduction reminded the participants of the key questions:

- *Are there more legal requirements that should be included in Joint Statement?*
- *What additional information on economic IWT development is still missing?*
- *How to increase IWT regarding current waterway dimensions?*

#### **Results**

##### Legal situation

The group discussed the question of the adding and structuring of the various instruments and confirmed what was discussed in the plenary: First a general sentence, then the 3 Conventions, WFD (incl. Natura 2000) and the other environmental Conventions. Next come NAIADES, TEN (shortened) and AGN, the *Dangerous Goods Convention* and any *other shipping instruments* should be addressed in Annex 1 of the Joint Statement.

##### Current economic situation

Again, the plenary points were confirmed. The Statement is considered urgent in order to drive the funding of IWT projects.

##### Development of IWT

The following points should be taken up in the text:

- fleet innovation to be added beside infrastructure
- cut the sentence that follows 10% modal share
- shorten the paragraph on climate change, add a reference to the Kyoto targets.

#### **Group 2: Balancing the prerequisites of navigation and ecology; fairway development and maintenance** (*referring to chapter 3*)

*Facilitator: Birgit Vogel, ICPDR*

An introduction reminded the participants of the key questions:

- *Which are the minimum fairway requirements for the Danube*
  - Legal background (interpretations and implementation)
  - Development and maintenance – sustainability?
  - Technical basics/requirements
- *Case-by-case approaches for sustainable balance*
  - IWT (D & M) ensuring ecological requirements
  - Projects currently implemented and under planning
  - Case-by-case approach – what does it mean?
  - SEA (plans, programmes, policies) and EIA (projects)
- *Fairway management: Which guidelines and best environmental practices should be applied for construction and maintaining fairway structures?*
  - How to practically balance river engineering measures with ecological requirements (mitigation/compensation measures)?
  - Sediments: How should dredging be performed?
  - Different standards for upper and lower Danube?

## Results

The group found that the main title of chapter 3 referring to “needs” is not well reflected in the sub-chapters and therefore asked that their titles and content be corrected (i.e. replace “*prerequisites*” by “*need*”).

Also, the word “*ecology*” should be replaced by “*ecological integrity*”.

The two sub-chapters 3.1 and 3.2 were considered as balanced, there was no need found to change the (volume of) information. However, it was agreed that the bullets in 3.2 should be revised in their structure (not in content) which was then done by *Nood/EC* and *Vogel/ICPDR* and presented at the end of Day 2.

In 3.1 a new bullet was worded (*Proximity to market and connectivity to the wider transport network*).

Some discussion was also held over chapter 3.3, resulting in a better wording in line 1.

The group also asked that in chapter 4.1 the wording in the bullets be changed, i.e. both fairway development and ecological preservation/restoration *HAVE* effects.

## Plenary Report on group Results and concluding discussion:

After the presentations of both groups a short discussion was held.

Nick/HR presented an idea that ship owners should be required to pay a tax for the use of the waterway. This would be in line with the road pricing that trucks have to cover. The participants commented that such an issue could only be linked to the funding aspects addressed in chapters 4 and 5.

Ukraine proposed that a “*basin-wide, unified ecological monitoring on the base of existing national monitoring*” should be added to the list of bullets under 3.2.

---

## Wrap up of Day 1

*Weller/ICPDR* concluded that the workshop made good progress but that discussions on Chapters 4 and 5 have to be continued on Day 2.

Further, the planned Breakout Sessions will be conducted in the plenary, as requested by several participants.

Few corrections were given by participants to the ICPDR for amending the information in Annex 3 IWT Project List (by DE, HR, RO, UA); they will be incorporated in the final version.

The evening was concluded with a special dinner in a downtown restaurant on invitation of the International Sava Commission.

## Day 2 (5 October 2007)

### Opening remarks

*Weller/ICPDR* reminded that different to the planned agenda, the two group sessions will be held in the plenary. Effort will be made to print out and distribute before the workshop end the agreed revisions in a new “*final draft*” document.

### Plenary Session on Chapter 4 Recommendations

*Facilitator: Marieke van Nood, EC-DG ENV*

As an introduction, some results from the started discussions on this chapter of the previous day on chapter 4 *Planning Principles and Engineering Criteria* were reminded.

#### Chapter 4.1 Integrated planning Approach in the DRB

No comments were made here in addition to those from Day 1.

#### Chapter 4.2 Integrated Planning Principles

The facilitator first asked for a reflection of the different standpoints and expectations on this important chapter.

The first debate focused on the Planning Principle about the *Danube RBM Plan*. *Nood/EC* suggested a wording stressing that WFD obligations have to be respected in IWT project planning and implementation. *Bratrich/WWF* asked to stress the non-deterioration principle prior to the Plan adoption in 2009 (“*in the mean-time*”). After a number of new wordings were discussed, the acceptable formulation was eventually found in the afternoon.

Next intensive debate focused on the suggested *avoiding of structural/hydraulic engineering interventions*. Question by *Vorderwinkler/AT* was if “*avoid*” should be replaced by “*minimise*”, while *Vogel/ICPDR* stressed that “*avoid*” reflects the WFD needs. Also a splitting of this point was discussed. New wordings were proposed by *Brooke/PIANC*. It was eventually agreed to keep a reference to WFD art. 4.7.

#### 4.3 Criteria for River Engineering



It was agreed to move the suggested Criteria “*use of best practice measures to improve navigation*” and “*all measures need to take the issue of climate change into account*” to ch. 4.2 Planning Principles.

A long debate took place on the Criterion about “*implementation of minimum fairway*”: *Habersack/Boku* presented some slides to illustrate the issue (need of a case-by-case approach and of a scenario development). The drafted *definition of a minimum or of an optimum fairway* were rejected. *Rast/WWF* reminded that on the Rhine ship owners have adopted to lower fairways than are demanded for the Danube. *Bozinovic/DC* replied that for his organisation the agreed depth of 2.50 m cannot be questioned. *Beyer/DE* suggested the term “*adequate fairway*” and reminded that also the AGN provides many exemptions for the 2.50 m depth, so a case-by-case approach is reasonable. *Milkovic/SC* stressed that also the WFD provides exemptions. *Bernabei/EC* stated that IWT should be environment-friendly and foresee for certain waterways specific cases; this new, legally non-binding guideline should reflect the joint stakeholder voices. After the coffee break a new wording was suggested by the Facilitator, which after some further improvement was accepted.

The last criterion addressing *climate change* was deleted, as it is already addressed as a Planning Principle and cannot be applied by river engineers; it was further added to the follow-up research topics.

As a last point, *Rast/WWF* asked for a better wording of the 2<sup>nd</sup> last criterion (“reconnections cannot be restored”), which was agreed, and then he suggested a new Criterion “*Ensure that the project’s ecological objectives are achieved.*” After some discussion it was agreed to merge this with the last Planning Principle (*Monitor the effects of measures*) and not to keep it as an engineering criterion.

## Plenary Session on Chapter 5 Follow-up

Facilitator: *Cesare Bernabei, EC-DG TREN*

In his introduction, the Facilitator reminded from previous discussions that the new Joint Statement has no direct legally binding character but will depend on clear political commitment of all involved parties. So the question to answer in this chapter is how to achieve this commitment?

Further questions are how to ensure the wide implementation of the Joint Statement, how to monitor the implementation and success? Finally, for some of the suggested follow up tasks further specifications, the lead partner and the timing for implementation are still unclear.

In the first statement, *Manzano/Danube NP* identified the target audience (waterway authorities and funders) but stressed the need to develop a strategic plan for the entire Danube. *Simoner/viadonau* responded that within a new EC-funded project his company will set up a Danube-wide network of waterway administrations to share the working experience, which will be used to develop a manual of best practices.

The *Bozinovic/DC* proposal (*first the 3 Commissions must accept this Statement*) was agreed to become the introductory sentence of this chapter. *Weller/ICPDR* announced that a respective resolution will be prepared for their Ordinary Meeting in early December 2007, and that then water managers should be activated to communicate with waterway managers about the implementation of this Statement. *Komatina/SC* announced that they plan to assess the adoption at their next SC meeting in January 2008.

*Nick/HR* expressed the Croatian support for the Statement’s implementation.

*Moisi/DEF* reminded that the Statement can only be effectively communicated if it will be interpreted in local languages and disseminated to local politicians and stakeholders. This proposal was supported by *Stadler/AT* and *Weller/ICPDR*.

*Stadler* was also concerned how to react if the Statement was not applied, while *WWF* and *Cucu/RO* expressed different standpoints from when on this Statement will have to be applied. *Weller/ICPDR*



replied that the Statement's guiding principles have no date to enter into force but require an active interest of relevant institutions, including the EC. *Bernabei/EC* responded that ongoing IWT projects cannot be reversed anymore but can still be addressed within the relevant Commissions (e.g. these can ask governments to take the Statement into account for ongoing projects). He underlined the urgency to adopt the Statement and proposed to organise soon after (i.e. in mid 2008) a special conference on how to ensure the application, monitoring and assessment of the Statement. This was accepted by the participants and added as a new task. Another new task is that the 3 regional Commissions should seek to adopt the Statement by January 2008 and then convene at the mid 2008 workshop, which for *Bernabei* could then become a kind of starting point for application.

The draft task that *IWT projects currently under implementation or planning should apply the Statement principles* was thus confirmed.

A special discussion was held if the document should be shortened (e.g. only chapter 3 and 4 to remain, while the rest be annexed) but it was eventually agreed to keep the entire document, and to rather produce a *2-page summary* (*Weller/ICPDR*).

*Moisi/DEF* stated that NGOs are very willing to support the Statement application and the follow-up process but will need financial support for this lobby work.

After the lunch break: the discussion was followed up:

*Weller/ICPDR* first reminded all participants of the pending text changes and explained that by the end of the workshop all participants should agree on this document, i.e. only minor grammatical corrections should be done afterwards.

Referring to another drafted task *Bozinovic/DC* confirmed the DC readiness to organise the proposed *workshop on river development and maintenance techniques* in late 2008 and appreciated the offered support of PIANC.

Several participants urged that now a *strategic vision* should be foreseen for developing IWT within ecological boundaries in the Danube region, but other participants expressed their rejection, as such work would overload the current process and go beyond the competence of some key stakeholders.

The drafted task to finalise a checklist on the Joint Statement (evaluation of the approval process and utilisation) was deleted but should be a subject of the mid 2008 follow-up workshop. It was also agreed that this workshop will assess the future timing and funding of next meetings.

*EBU* and *PIANC* expressed their readiness to assess the potential of non-structural measures to improve IWT in the Danube River Basin within the frame of a respective workshop, to take place by mid 2008.

*Rusche/EBU* indicated that the *Annex presenting possible measures* has still to be addressed somewhere in the main text (e.g. in chapter 3).

*Rusche* also asked that the last two proposed tasks addressing *funding of projects* have to be merged; this was promised by *Weller* to be done.

Regarding the annexes, *Weller/ICPDR* concluded that *Annex 3 IWT Project List* is ready, except for some small changes received during this workshop. The possible *Annexes "List of Bottlenecks"* and *"List of Sensitive River Sections"* were not yet delivered by DC and NGOs, regrettably, and are therefore hard to be incorporated. As a response, *Schwetz/TINA* and *Rast/WWF* promised to produce these lists in the near future, so that they can still be attached to the Statement. *Bozinovic/DC* stated that the bottleneck list still needs to be commented.

Regarding *Annex 4 List of possible measures*, *Babic/RS* and *Milkovic/SC* stated that some types of measures would not be acceptable, i.e. the list needs to be further developed. *WWF* asked that this

Annex remains included and, therefore, *Weller* offered that it could be called “*Preliminary list of possible measures*”.

The final *Annex List of Participating Organisations* will indicate only the participating stakeholders.

At the end of this session, all participants who were still present received a print out of the agreed Statement version (draft 3). A finalised Statement version with improved editing and pending agreed corrections will be circulated to all participants within one week, together with the *draft Workshop Minutes* for final comments.

### Concluding Remarks

*Komatina/SC* stated that the SC is very satisfied with the process and this workshop, with the work with the other two Commissions and the final “product”.

*Schwetz/TINA* stated that it was important to discuss this Statement and that he will present it for adoption to the Corridor VII Advisory Board, he also thanked for this process.

*Weller/ICPDR* expressed his wish that all desired modifications were incorporated and that the reviewed version will only be used for editorial remarks during an upcoming short commenting period. He expressed his satisfaction that all three commissions made a commitment to endorse the Statement, and his appreciation for the impressive involvement aiming to improve IWT in the Danube basin. This educational process and dialogue will continue in other fora and further reduce misunderstandings.

*Bozenovic/DC* found that the two days of complex issue discussions ended in a good synthesis of ideas and in important conclusions. He thanked the Croatian government and the Sava Commission for their hospitality, and Philip Weller and ICPDR for this achievement.

## 2 Agenda

The objectives of the workshop are to:

- *Remind the participants of the Workshop I+II results and introduce Workshop III objectives*
- *Present and discuss the draft 2 of the Joint Statement*
- *Assess critical issues of the draft Statement and discuss formulation of difficult Statement sections in Break-out Groups*
- *Agree on steps to finalise the drafting and future application of the Statement*

Wednesday, October 3: Arrival of participants in Zagreb

Thursday, October 4, Venue: Croatian Ministry of Sea, Transport and Development

10:00	<b>Welcome</b>	<i>Representative of ICPDR President Milovan Bozinovic President, Danube Commission Kemal Karkin President, International Sava River Basin Commission Representative of the Government of Croatia</i>
10:30	<b>Introduction to Workshop III</b> Summary of Workshop II and introduction to Workshop III	<i>Philip Weller Executive Secretary, ICPDR</i>
11:00	<b>Presentation of the Draft Joint Statement</b> Introduction Background Needs to be balanced Agreed recommendations Follow-up tasks Appendixes <b>Plenary discussion of current draft and identification of critical</b>	<i>Philip Weller Executive Secretary, ICPDR</i>
12:30	Lunch	
13:30	<b>Breakout Groups</b> <b>Group 1:</b> Legal situation and development of	<i>Facilitator: Stephen Perkins, ECMT</i>

	inland waterway transport; economic aspects and future needs (refer to chapter 2) <b>Group 2:</b> Balancing the prerequisites of navigation and ecology; fairway development and maintenance (refer to chapter 3)	<i>Facilitator: Birgit Vogel, ICPDR</i>
15:30	Coffee Break	
16:00	Report Back <b>Plenary discussion</b>	
17:30	Wrap-up for the Day	<i>Philip Weller Executive Secretary, ICPDR</i>
	Further work of Breakout Groups if necessary	
19:30	<i>Joint dinner</i>	

Friday, October 5

9:00	Wrap-up of day 1 and presentation of questions for workshop groups	<i>Philip Weller Executive Secretary, ICPDR</i>
9:30	Breakout Groups <b>Group 3:</b> Recommendations for an integrated planning approach: principles and criteria (refer to chapter 4) <b>Group 4:</b> Follow-up tasks: commitment for and implementation of the Joint Statement (refer to chapter 4)	<i>Facilitator: Marieke van Nood EC-DG ENV  Facilitator: Cesare Bernabei EC-DG TREN</i>
11:30	Coffee Break	
12:00	Report Back <b>Plenary discussion</b>	
13:00	Lunch	
14:00	Utilization of the Process Results	<i>Selected Statements: European Commission, Danube Commission, Sava Commission, ICPDR WWF, IAD, DEF, EBU, PIANC</i>
15:00	Next steps towards the Joint Statement	<i>Philip Weller Executive Secretary, ICPDR</i>
15:30	Presentation of Final Text	<i>Philip Weller Executive Secretary, ICPDR</i>
16:00	Closing comments	<i>ICPDR Danube Commission Sava Commission</i>
16:30	Closure of the Workshop	

***This meeting was kindly supported by the Sava Commission***

### 3 List of Participants

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Ms BABIC-MLADENOVIC Marina	Jaroslav Cerni Institute, Serbia
Ms. BACHMANN Jasmine	International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR) - Secretariat
Mr BERENCSI Miklos	Ministry of Environment and Water / WFD Department
Mr. BACIC Branko	Ministry of the Sea, Tourism, Transport, Croatia
Mr BERNABEI Cesare	EC DG Energy and Transport
Mr BEYER Knut	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Germany
Mr. BEZDOLNY Bikter	Ministry of Transport and Communication, Ukraine
Mr BIONDIC Danko	Croatian Waters, Croatia
Mr BOZINOVIC Milovan	Danube Commission - Secretariat
Ms BRATRICH Christine	WWF International Danube-Carpathian Programme / Department for Freshwater
Ms BROOKE Jan	PIANC, UK
Ms CUC Cristina	Ministry of Transports / General Directorate of Naval Transport, Romania
Mr CUCU Alexandru Serban	Ministry of Transports / General Directorate of Naval Transport, Romania
Mr. DE BOER Pieter	CEDA/ Rijkswaterstaat, The Netherlands
Ms. DRAPA Ana	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Romania
Ms EREIFEJ Laurice	WWF Hungary
Mr GETSEVICH Yevgen	Ministry of Transport and Communication, Ukraine
Ms GJORESKA Alexandra	Southeast European Cooperative Initiative (SECI) / Stability Pact for SEE
Mr GRUBISIC Neven	Ministry of the Sea, Tourism, Transport and Development / Directorate for Inland Waterway Navigation, Croatia

Mr HABERSACK Helmut	University of Natural Resources and Applied Sciences, Vienna
Mr. HUTTER Oswald	Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe
Mr JUNGWIRTH Matthias	University of Natural Resources and Applied Sciences, Vienna
Mr KOMATINA Dejan	International Sava River Basin Commission (ISRBC) - Secretariat
Mr MANZANO Carl	National Park Donauauen, Austria
Ms MAMIC VUSIC Srecka	Ministry of the Sea, Tourism, Transport and Development / Directorate for Inland Waterway Navigation, Croatia
Ms MEHMEDOVSKI Senaida	Ministry of Communication and Transport, Bosnia and Herzegovina
Mr MILKOVIC Zeljko	International Sava River Basin Commission (ISRBC) - Secretariat
Ms MOISI Petruta	DEF Secretariat
Ms OSTOJIC BARJAKTAREVIC	Directory for Inland Waterways 'Plovput', Serbia
Mr PERKINS Stephen	International Transport Forum / former European Conference of Ministers of Transport (ECMT)
Mr RAST Georg	WWF Germany
Mr RUSCHE Joerg	European Barge Union
Mr SHEVCHENKO Igor	Ministry of Transport and Communication, Ukraine
Mr SCHRAMM Christian	via donau, Austria
Mr SCHWETZ Otto	Corridor VII, TINA Vienna Transport Strategies GmbH
Mr SIMONER Markus	via donau, Austria
Mr STADLER Richard	Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, Austria
Mr SUKALO Goran	International Sava River Basin Commission (ISRBC) - Secretariat
Mr TOEGEL Robert	via donau, Austria
Ms TOMIC Ivana	Danube Commission - Secretariat
Ms VAN NOOD Marieke	EC DG Environment – Unit Water & Marine Protection

---

Ms VOGEL Birgit	International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR) - Secretariat
Mr VORDERWINKLER Reinhard	Federal Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology, Austria
Mr WELLER Philip	International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR) - Secretariat
Mr ZINKE Alexander	ICPDR - Consultant (Zinke Environment Consulting for Central and Eastern Europe)
Mr ZIZANOVIC DAKIC Melita	International Sava River Basin Commission (ISRBC) - Secretariat

-end-