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General remarks

WWF

- still strongly committed to participating in implementation on the basis of the agreed guidelines and procedures

- EU Danube strategy process poses certain risk in overwhelming existing framework of Joint Statement process and WFD/N2000 implementation
General remarks

WWF

- and IAD have convened an international workshop for NGOs on IWT in the Danube region (agreement on joint position)

- has commissioned a study on environmentally friendly ship design for the Danube River

- has continued in building up trust and communication with EC delegates
ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY INLAND WATERWAY SHIP DESIGN FOR THE DANUBE RIVER
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WWF‘s viewpoint on process up to date

• Still unsatisfactory progress with on-going projects regarding „integrated approach“ and „recommendations“ of JS
• Transparency and participation for interested and obligatory parties needs to be improved
• Base data and consequent application of environmental legislation (e.g. WFD) still weak or missing
WWF’s viewpoint on process up to date

- JS does still not yet cover all navigation development projects from big scale structural projects (i.e. Bistroe canal, Serbian Master plan) to maintenance works at local/regional level
- cooperation of key govt. institutions (e.g. MoTransport, MoEconomics, MoENV, MoRegDev) although progressed, still to be improved and made more transparent
WWF’s viewpoint on process up to date

- SEA application procedures still weak (e.g. Hungarian section)
- EIA application often without proper assessment of alternative options
- Transboundary issues often not sufficiently considered
WWF‘s viewpoint on process up to date

• opposite to what PLATINA Manual seems to suggest, there is no ‘best-practise‘ IWT project yet visible, at best just some components

• Some project design (e.g. ISPA II RO-BG) has been significantly improved, yet transparency and participation is quite limited

• Project planning time frames do not allow proper JS application
Sediment extraction and riverbed incision an urgent issue, postponement of sediment management issues to next RBMP cycle considered as critical
Perspectives for IWT from WWF’s viewpoint

- Danube waterway a major European route for IWT but not with one general minimum draught
- Future development requires better integration of all means of transport (see discussion on EC Danube Strategy conferences/forums)
- IWT project planning need to be better coordinated/integrated with other programmes (N2000 management plans, WFD POM)
Let´s make Joint Statement reasonably applied!

Thank you for your attention!