



platform for the implementation of NAIADES

# Report about the second Training Workshop on integrated IWT Planning (15-16 September 2009 in Ruse/ Bulgaria)

Grant Agreement:	<b>TREN/FP7/TR/218362</b>
(Sub)Work Package:	<b>SWP5.3 Interdisciplinary dialogue on sustainable waterway development</b>
Deliverable No:	<b>D5.12 Training Seminars / IWT Planning Workshop Report (Task 5.3.3)</b>
Author:	<b>ICPDR</b>
Version (date):	<b>28/10/2009 (final)</b>





## Document history

Document version (date)	Comments (changes compared to previous version)	Authorised by
2009-10-09	First draft	Philip Weller
2009-10-28	Final draft	Philip Weller

## Authors of the document

Responsible organisation	Principal author
ICPDR	Alexander Zinke
Contributing organisation(s)	Contributing author(s)

**DISCLAIMER** PLATINA is funded by the Directorate General on Energy and Transport of the European Commission under the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development. The views expressed in the working papers, deliverables and reports are those of the project consortium partners. These views have not been adopted or approved by the Commission and should not be relied upon as a statement of the Commission's or its services' views. The European Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in the working papers and reports, nor does it accept responsibility for any use made thereof.

## Contents

<b>Part A Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
A.1 Background of the training workshop.....	3
A.2 Organisation and objectives of the workshop.....	3
<b>Part B Workshop results .....</b>	<b>5</b>
B.1 Main results of the workshop .....	5
B.1.1 Workshop presentations.....	5
B.1.2 Working Group results.....	9
B.2 Workshop conclusions.....	10
<b>Part C Annexes .....</b>	<b>11</b>
C.1 Annex 1 Final Programme .....	12
C.2 Annex 2 Information for Working Groups .....	13
C.3 Annex 3 Results of Working Groups .....	16

## PART A INTRODUCTION

### A.1 Background of the training workshop

Work Package 5 of the PLATINA Project deals with the **infrastructure** of the trans-European waterway networks. Within this work package, ICPDR (in cooperation with via donau, Boku University Vienna and INE) is coordinating in **Sub-work Package 5.3 Interdisciplinary dialogue on sustainable waterway development** three tasks:

- A *study on the hydro-morphological alterations* on the Danube (currently being finalised by BOKU; preliminary result presented in this workshop);
- A *contribution to a Manual on integrated waterway project planning* (a draft document was presented and discussed at the Zagreb workshop);
- *Three training workshops* for relevant IWT stakeholders about good practise examples that can illustrate and explain the Principles and Criteria of the *Joint Statement* (the first workshops to be executed on 9-10 June in Zagreb/Croatia; the 2nd on 15-16 September 2009 in Ruse/Bulgaria, the 3rd in 2011 to assess progress and experience made).

These tasks are a follow up of the process that led to the **Joint Statement on planning principles for IWT and environmental protection** (2007). Through the PLATINA activities, the SWP 5.3 project partners aim to illustrate and discuss good practise in integrated planning of IWT infrastructure projects by involving from the Danube basin the following types of participants:

- experts from the national *transport* authority (waterway development section);
- experts from the national *environment* authority (section dealing with the environment assessment of waterway development and maintenance projects);
- experts from the national waterway institution which deal with maintenance and new development projects on waterways.
- representatives from *international governmental and non-governmental institutions* from both the navigation and environmental sectors, including ICPDR, ISRBC (Sava Commission), Danube Commission and the European Commission.

### A.2 Organisation and objectives of the workshop

The workshop was organised by ICPDR together with the EAEMDR (Executive Agency for Exploration and Maintenance of the Danube River in Ruse) as a very supportive local host of the workshop and promoter of a waterway project. The venue was a hotel in Ruse which also provided accommodation and catering.

As can be seen from the programme ([Annex 1](#)), the workshop focused first on presenting and discussing the new sustainable waterway management policy in Germany and the related guidance for preparing integrated environmental impact assessments for IWT projects on German rivers, second on the planned IWT development along the Danube section between Romania and Bulgaria and third on presenting and discussing the new draft Manual on Good Practises in Sustainable Waterway Planning (PLATINA deliverable D5.8).

Three Working Groups were asked to assess and technically comment (in form of a virtual Danube IWT project) on the draft Manual which was circulated to participants prior to the workshop.

During a boat trip on the Danube, the workshop participants were shown the port of Ruse with its new winter camp and the Romanian banks at Giurgiu.

The results of the workshop will be disseminated amongst all participants and used for the finalisation of the Manual in 2009 and the preparation of the 3rd workshop in 2011.

## PART B WORKSHOP RESULTS

### B.1 Main results of the workshop

The workshop was executed as planned and chaired by Philip Weller, Executive Secretary of the ICPDR. The workshop was started with several opening and introducing statements, followed up by a series of technical presentations and two working group sessions in 3 groups, before the joint closing session: All presentations and workshop results are available on <http://www.icpdr.org/icpdr-pages/navigation.htm>.

Welcome words were given by Mr Philip Weller (ICPDR) who first invited the local host to speak: Mr **Georgi Georgiev** (Executive Director of the Executive Agency for Exploration and Maintenance of the Danube River EAEMDR in Ruse): He welcomed the participants on behalf of the Minister of Transport, Information Technologies and Communications of Republic of Bulgaria and informed that the development of the Danube River as a European transport axis is one of the National policy priorities. This includes ensuring the recommended navigation parameters in the most critical sections of the Danube River, currently being planned together with the Republic of Romania. The participation in this PLATINA project is of great importance for Bulgaria and the hosting of this event a pleasant opportunity.

Mr **Olivier Baudelet** (DG REGIO) then informed about the new “*Danube Strategy*” that the EU Council recently asked DG REGIO to prepare until 2010. Based on a similar *Baltic Sea Strategy* (adopted in June 2009, Action Plan to be endorsed in October), the Danube Strategy will integrate all policy fields on three main pillars: environment, transport and energy as well as socio-economic development. During its current preparation, information and ideas will be collected from the EC, the Danube region and all stakeholders, and eventually reduced to some 150 strategic proposals. IWT (Inland Waterway Transport) will be one subject with some 4-5 actions. Based on the commitment of the EU Member States, it is expected that this strategy will result in a new momentum for this macro-region that will also ease financing. The EC will only coordinate and supervise the process, so for its implementation a new regional body may still be needed.

In his introductory presentation, Mr **Philip Weller** provided some information about the PLATINA project, the Joint Statement and the workshop objectives. He reminded the participants of the Zagreb workshop results and explained that the workshop objective is to determine how to ease and achieve integrated planning, i.e. how to best do things in terms of enabling navigation development and sustainable management of rivers. The workshop aims at results which will be of benefit also outside the Danube region.

#### B.1.1 Workshop presentations

Mrs **Dorothe Herpertz** (German Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs in Bonn) presented the “Framework conditions for a sustainable waterway management in Germany”: She is from the transport ministry’s rather new unit on „Climate Change, Environmental Protection, Hydrology of Waterways“. The government standpoint is



that rivers are multi-purpose landscapes where waterways contribute to economic growth but the transport sector has to integrate and cooperate with the other users (i.e. reach consensus). Their administrations are responsible for over 7,350 km waterways and supported by scientific institutes. The 7 Waterway and Shipping Directorates do not only upgrade and maintain waterways but need to consider environmental requirements: As new tasks, they have to care along their waterways about WFD-compliant water management, including preservation and restoration of the longitudinal connectivity (from 2010 on). Waterway management therefore has to balance navigational and environmental targets (as specified in water and nature management plans). This task is already based on gained practical experiences in many waterway sites but it also relates to transparent planning processes and stakeholder cooperation. Even if this requires time, know-how and resources and a will to compromise, it results in new opportunities and a reduction of conflicts.

A new publication on “Possibilities to improve the ecological status of Federal waterways in Germany – a collection of 13 case studies” (*BfG Mitteilungen Nr. 28*) was disseminated to workshop participants. It will be used in the PLATINA Manual.

Mrs **Monika Sommer** (German Federal Institute of Hydrology BfG in Koblenz) followed up in her talk by presenting the policy-related guidances for waterway administrations on environmental impacts assessments of waterway projects that her institute prepared over the last years. These are based on the European environmental directives (EIA, WFD, Birds, Habitats) and related national legislation. The German planning and approval procedure for waterway projects integrates all requirements and relevant concerns, and secures stakeholder participation. Already at the important scoping stage (anticipates the project success and helps to avoid delays of approval) all players are involved and contribute with their information and data. The plan drafting (design phase) requires close cooperation between civil engineers and environmental experts. All environmental studies must be available prior to plan the assessment by all relevant authorities: Before plan approval, accredited NGOs and private interests then discuss their comments and objections. German lessons include that participation from the beginning helps to minimise conflicts. Guidance that is project-type specific facilitates practical implementation.

The guidances (though in German language only) can be downloaded from:  
[www.bafg.de/cln\\_007/nn\\_230076/U1/DE/03\\_Arbeitsbereiche/02\\_Arbeitshilfen/arbeitshilfen\\_node.html?](http://www.bafg.de/cln_007/nn_230076/U1/DE/03_Arbeitsbereiche/02_Arbeitshilfen/arbeitshilfen_node.html?)

Mr **Pavel Obrdlik** and Mrs **Lenka Tajmrová** (WELL Consulting, Brno/Czech Republic) informed about their draft proposal for a new guidance document that they prepared on behalf of the Czech government and will present at the EU Working Group on Rivers (2<sup>nd</sup> meeting on 2 October 2009 in Brussels). This group, initiated by DG TREN and DG ENV, plans to produce until 2010 a new EU guidance document on how to best ensure that activities related to IWT development are compatible with the EU nature conservation requirements. This work will not compete with but incorporate similar activities and experiences (Joint Statement, PLATINA outputs, the PIANC Working-With-Nature concept). Their proposal assesses the feasibility of certain IWT measures (navigation needs) on different types of water courses and the potential effects of measures on protected habitats and species, thus trying to identify which measures are generally most suitable for which type of waterway (i.e. before looking at the individual case).

In a comment from participants it was stated that this good proposal should also address EIA and WFD Directives.



Mr **Ivan Hristov** (WWF Danube Carpathian Programme – Office Sofia) briefly presented the NGO point of view for sustainable navigation in the Danube River Basin: Several NGOs have prepared a joint position that asks decision-makers to apply as guiding principle to preserve a “living river”. The *Joint Statement* and the PLATINA project are first steps towards sustainability but ecological principles and user limits (the Danube ecosystem also supports fisheries, drinking water, forestry) need to be better addressed: The proof, that project measures will not stop or significantly hamper ecosystem processes and that there is adaptive project management, has to be shown during the design phase of new projects. Soft measures (modern fleet, RIS) should be priority. Already prior to the EIA there must be dialogue with civil society organisations (CSO). Mr Hristov invited participants to attend the NGO workshop on 1-2 October 2009 in Ruse where this NGO position will be further discussed.

Mrs **Cristina Sandu** (IAD) added a few more concrete NGO points regarding the impacts of navigation on aquatic communities. She stressed that rivers have to serve several human and environmental functions, and that a sustainable waterway use must be balanced with environmental needs. There are various direct and indirect impacts on fish; this is why for sturgeons a new basin-wide action plan has recently been agreed on. On practical level this means that dredging measures must not be performed between March and November but only during the winter time when sturgeons are less active and vulnerable. By learning from previous mistakes in river channelisation there are options for good solutions, if governments, scientists and environmental organisations cooperate in sustainable waterway management.

Mrs **Cristina Cuc** (Romanian Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure) informed about the local IWT case, the EU ISPA II project aiming to improve the navigation conditions on the Romanian – Bulgarian common sector of the Lower Danube and its accompanying studies. She listed their integrated planning process since 2007, involving various stakeholders and legal requirements, the produced studies, design models and the applied planning principles. One of six engineering scenarios was chosen for further variant studies. Environmental impacts shall be reduced by special engineering timing and techniques. Mrs Cuc also presented the contents of the EIA report and the targeted environmental balance resulting from the chosen measures that is still being developed until end of 2009, parallel to the detail feasibility study. Results will be publicly presented and consulted in early 2010.

In the subsequent discussion Mrs Cuc informed that this project will be listed in the WFD RBMP, and that navigation and environmental costs will be accounted for. Mr Georgiev (EAEMDR) added that he considers other impacts worse than navigation, such as commercial sediment exploitation, illegal fisheries or the future Belene nuclear power plant. Mr Weller (ICPDR) commented that any water quality factor should be addressed in the RBMP and that the new Danube Strategy offers a good opportunity for integrated planning. Mr Baudalet (DG REGIO) recommended that a European Group of Cooperation be set up by public legal bodies of several states (horizontal and vertical levels); Mrs Cuc added that this step is foreseen for RO and BG in 2010. Mr Bernabei (DG TREN) reminded the EC-internal cooperation between environment and transport: Mrs Peijs (DG TREN) takes this role and their aim is to preserve as much river habitat and environment from the impacts of truck transport.

After lunch, **Mr Alexander Zinke** (ICPDR) introduced the **draft PLATINA Manual on integrated planning**. This document, circulated to all participants already prior to the workshop, builds upon the draft Manual structure and target groups that were agreed at the first training workshop in Zagreb. The Manual aims at illustrating the Joint Statement with its principles and criteria and at providing a general guidance for integrated planning. The planned strategy is that this document is being consulted and commented at two PLATINA expert workshops in 2009. Their outcome will be used to produce a final draft until December 2009. The Manual application will be reviewed in a third workshop in Spring 2011. The proposed Manual focuses on an illustrated list of practical steps (*road map*) recommended for achieving a truly integrated planning. The document includes various background information on the complex legal and EIA process, and will present good examples of measures in- and outside the fairway, like those listed in the German document that was presented in Ruse.

As planned, this draft document became subject of a longer discussion and of the working group sessions. Apart from numerous positive comments the following improvements were recommended:

Mrs Sandu misses more reference to biology, other Conventions and the Lower Danube Green Corridor as a legal commitment. Mr Beyer wishes that the Manual be clear and concise (for certain background elements short texts are available).

Mrs Cuc asked about the BOKU map on the Danube hydromorphology status which she thinks comes to a different assessment than the RBMP: Mr Weller explained that the BOKU study provides a generic scientific assessment, while the RBMP assessment of Heavily Modified Water Bodies under the WFD requires a legal one for specific water bodies. Mrs Jäger (BOKU) announced to re-send Mrs Cuc their reference list.

Mr van Bockel (PLATINA) suggested that the Manual be straightforward and demonstrate how to do integrated planning, i.e. it should be an easy-to-understand much shorter main document. Mr Bernabei suggested that the legal part and the good practise examples all be annexed.

Mr **Zinke** then introduced the concept and contents of the **Working Groups**: All participants were sub-divided into three smaller groups which discussed separately the same questions: As specified in Annex 2 (handed out to all participants), the groups were asked to assess the applicability of the proposed integrated planning (i.e. the draft Road Map) by means of a very simplified planning exercise:

For a virtual IWT project with described technical, environmental and planning features, specific questions were posted related to important Road Map steps. The groups were meeting twice on workshop days 1 and 2, before presenting their results in the final plenary session.

After the first part of Working Group reflections, Day 1 then ended with further discussions about these PLATINA Manual subjects in small groups in the evening: First during the 2-hours boat trip on the Danube where the ports of Ruse were shown, including the new winter harbour (EAMRDR distributed a short written information), and then over dinner.

### B.1.2 Working Group results

Main topic of the Working Group discussions were the draft Manual on integrated planning. The objective was to gain comments from the diverse group of participants about the structure and orientation of the Manual.

All participants were split up into three working groups which were discussing the same questions for the given virtual IWT project on:

- the preparatory work of the integrated planning process
- the first planning steps
- the detail planning work

**WG 1 results** were presented by Mr Bernabei (see [Annex 3.1](#)) who was also its chair. Its participants stressed the need that the Ministry of Transport ensures the IPG budget and interdisciplinary work as well as early public consultations. During to the SEA/EIA process the choice of the best variant depends on balanced planning approach. Upon receipt of monitoring results, certain measures may have to be revisited.

WG 1 also produced some specific comments on the draft Manual: They suggest that the main parts on the Manual needs and legal steps will remain the same in the future while others (best practise, planning steps) may have to be updated sometimes.

In the [plenary discussion](#) Mrs van Nood (DG ENV) and Mrs Vogel (ICPDR) explained that for the monitoring (needed to start prior to the start of works) no big extra funds should be needed, as WFD monitoring (which is required since 2008) will cover most parameters, so that monitoring funds would be needed only for specific data gaps.

**WG 2 results** were presented by Mrs Tajmrova (see [Annex 3.2](#)). Their chair was Mrs van Nood on Day 1 and Mr Zinke on Day 2. This group discussed for a lengthy period the question of SEA vs. EIA and concluded that first a national IWT plan is needed (for which an SEA should be done) before starting to prepare the planning and EIA of a concrete IWT project. The composition of the IPG should allow that it can be changed if their members consider useful. NGOs can have two roles, technical experts of IPG or regularly informed stakeholders.

In the [plenary discussion](#) Mrs Tajmrova explained that planning effort should be to achieve win-win situation, i.e. IWT projects should also have positive ecology effects.

**WG 3 results** were presented by Mr Tögel (see [Annex 3.1](#)). Their chair was Mr Komatina. This group asked that the Manual explain the SEA application and how to set up the organisation of IPG work. For transboundary impacts, the Road Map should indicate the need to involve neighbors and respect the Espoo Convention. This WG stressed the comprehensive approach that is needed for doing the planning, for selecting criteria for variant comparison and for securing monitoring feedback into the IPG. The planning results should be presented by the Steering Committee and the IPG.

In the [plenary discussion](#) it was stressed that this practical planning process is different from the political and legal Espoo Convention process.

All presented results of the Working Groups are provided in [Annex 3](#).

## B.2 Workshop conclusions

Mr Weller wrapped up the workshop by thanking all participants for their active involvement that will be useful to improve the draft Manual. The lively discussions, also during the breaks and dinner, reflected the wide interest that many Danube basin stakeholders have in this subject.

Mr Weller indicated that there is opportunity to still send written comments about the Manual after the workshop (until 2 October 2009).

Further developing the physical layout of the Manual will be crucial and this will be discussed with INE. The revised manual will be available to participants (not before November) prior to its finalisation and submission to the PLATINA Secretariat. The Manual is to be completed by the end of 2009 and later on efforts are needed to translate it into Danube languages. The workshop summary and all presentations will be available via the ICPDR webpage.

Mr Bernabei asked that on 2 October 2009 the EU Working Group on Rivers will be informed about this PLATINA activity. The same should happen at the NGO workshop on 1-2 October in Ruse.

Regarding the *Joint Statement* process, Mrs Tomic informed that German and Russian versions are already available. Mr Weller informed that the next meeting is planned for February 2010.

Before closing Mr Weller thanked the EAEMDR for their multiple supports for executing this meeting and to the interpreters for their excellent job.



## PART C

## ANNEXES

Annex 1 Final Workshop Programme

Annex 2 Information for Working Groups

Annex 3 Results of the Workshop Working Groups 1 – 3

*(separate file)*

Annex 4 List of Participants



## C.1 Annex 1 Final Programme

### SWP 5.3.3 Training Workshop on integrated IWT Planning

**Time:** Tuesday 15 September – Wednesday 16 September 2009

**Venue:** Ruse/Bulgaria (<http://cosmopolitanhotelbg.com/>)

**Programme: Monday 14 September 2009**

pm Arrival (i.a. via shuttle buses from Bucharest airport and Sofia) at hotel in Ruse

**Tuesday 15 September**

- 09:30 Opening by ICPDR (P. Weller) and EAEMDR (G. Georgiev)  
Information about the new Danube Strategy (O. Baudelet, DG REGIO)
- 10:00 Introduction to workshop background and objectives (P. Weller, ICPDR)
- 10:15 Framework conditions for a sustainable waterway management in Germany (D. Herpertz, Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs)
- 10:45 The German guidance on EIAs for waterway projects (M. Sommer, Federal Institute of Hydrology)
- 11:15 *Coffee break*
- 11:45 Preparation of a new guidance document for the EU Working Group on Rivers (P. Obrdlík, Well Cons.)
- 12:00 The NGO position for waterway projects on a “living river” (I. Hristov, WWF-DCP & C. Sandu, IAD)
- 12:15 Improvement of navigation conditions on the Romanian – Bulgarian common sector of the Danube and accompanying studies (C. Cuc, RO Ministry of Transport)
- 13:00 *Lunch break (buffet)*
- 14:00 The draft Manual on Good Practises in sustainable waterway planning (A. Zinke, ICPDR)
- 15:00 *Coffee break*
- 15:30 Parallel Working Groups on integrated planning (comments and testing of the draft Manual)
- 17:30 end
- 18:00 Boat trip on the Danube (new winter harbour of EAEMDR)
- 20:00 Bus shuttle to joint dinner in a local restaurant: Small group discussions.

**Wednesday 16 September 2009**

- 9:00: Continuation of Working Groups
- 10:30 *Coffee break*
- 11:00 Presentation and discussion of WG results
- 12:00 Conclusions and outlook (P. Weller)
- 13:00 *Lunch (buffet)*
- 14:00 Departure of shuttle buses to airport Bucharest.



## C.2 Annex 2 Information for Working Groups

### SWP 5.3.3 Training Workshop Outline for Working Groups

Overall objective: Assess if the proposed concept of integrated planning (largely the draft Road Map) seems useful and applicable for participants (IWT stakeholders).

Participants of the working groups are invited to do a very simplified planning exercise, i.e. agree on few key items on the base of the following information:

**You are key stakeholders** with various background involved in a process preparing an IWT project. Please draft some key elements needed for an integrated planning:

Background information (use on top of what you know about IWT and ecology)

The new virtual IWT project to be assessed is to be executed on a large river in the Danube basin with the following characteristics:

350 km long river section (lowland type with tributaries from mountain areas), subject to 20 bottlenecks (each 0.5 to 5 km long) that do not allow full navigability.

The river area includes 3 big cities, 1 medium-sized port, 3 nature reserves and 10 proposed SPAs and 5 SCIs along the river.

On the river, there are several industrial (old metallurgical plant) and recreational uses (stop of intl. cruise ships, fishing), large-scale poplar plantations and extended agricultural lands. There were some flood events, resulting in a new government concept to extend the inundation area.

The RBMP is still in its drafting process. 100 km are designated as HMWB (8 bottlenecks), the other 250 km have Good Status (12 bottlenecks).

There is a national waterway development plan which includes this project, in line with the AGN. There is various need of increasing the transport (e.g. new investment interests in the metallurgical plant and construction industry). A RIS is under installation.

Data exist already about river hydrology, navigability, water quality (chemical, micro-biology, fisheries) but not about morphology.

Fairway maintenance works were intensive until 1990. There was various – locally intense - sand and gravel mining on the river and at the mouths of tributaries.

**Please discuss in your working group the following points and present results on Wednesday in the plenary session:**

1. Preparatory work

- 1.1. What are the organisational and logistic needs to assure a relevant planning result?
- 1.2. Who should be the (type of) members of the Steering Group and of the integrated planning group?

2. First planning steps

- 2.1. What could be some concrete planning principles for this IWT project?
- 2.2. What could be the goals for IWT and for ecology?
- 2.3. Which steps do you suggest for the assessment of key aspects (transboundary impact, climate change)?
- 2.4. Which data are missing, and which are crucial for the planning work?

3. Detail planning work

- 3.1. What concrete information and data are needed to develop alternative variants; how much time is needed for this
- 3.2. What criteria are needed for comparing and ranking variants?
- 3.3. What monitoring is needed?
- 3.4. What stakeholder information shall be organised by who and when?
- 3.5. What could be the road map (incl. timeline) for this planning process?
- 3.6. Who should present and politically comment the planning results?

Venues:

*Working Group 1: at restaurant*

*Working Group 2: plenary room*

*Working Group 3: meeting room at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor*

## Allocation of Participants to Working Groups

Name		WG
Cesare BERNABEI	EC	1
Olivier BAUDELET	EC	3
Marieke VAN NOOD	EC	2
Ivana TOMIC	DC	2
Dejan KOMATINA	ISRBC	1
Gernot PAULI	CCNR	3
Robert TÖGEL	AUSTRIA	3
Markus SIMONER	AUSTRIA	1
Elisabeth JAEGER	AUSTRIA	2
Maria YANAKIEVA	BULGARIA	2
Violeta HINOVA	BULGARIA	1
Petar BENOVIĆ	BULGARIA	3
Ivelina GEORGIEVA	BULGARIA	1
Ludmil MIHAILOV	BULGARIA	2
Georgi GEORGIEV	BULGARIA	2
Desislava IVANOVA	BULGARIA	1
Tsvetelina PASTIR	BULGARIA	3
Veneta POPOVA	BULGARIA	1
Nikolaj KUTINCHEV	BULGARIA	2
Georgi IVANOV	BULGARIA	3
Zdenko TADIC	CROATIA	1
Ivan Radelejak	CROATIA	2
Miroslav ISTUK	CROATIA	2
Pavel OBRDLIK	CZECH REP.	1
Lenka TAJMROVA	CZECH REP.	2
Lubomir FOJTU	CZECH REP.	3
Knut BEYER	GERMANY	3
Dorothe HERPERTZ	GERMANY	2
Monika SOMMER	GERMANY	1
Peter KOVACS	HUNGARY	3
Cristina CUC	ROMANIA	2
Violanda ALAYAN	ROMANIA	1
Mihail COSTACHE	ROMANIA	2
Florin UZUMTOMA	ROMANIA	2
Ovidiu CRISTOLOVEANU	ROMANIA	3
Dusko ISAKOVIC	SERBIA	3
Roeland VAN BOCKEL	PLATINA	2
Cristina SANDU	IAD	1
Ivan HRISTOV	WWF	3
Phillip WELLER	ICPDR	3
Alexander ZINKE	ICPDR	2
Birgit VOGEL	ICPDR	1
Marko PAVLOVIC	ICPDR	2

## C.3 Annex 3 Results of Working Groups

### 3.1. Result of Working Group 1

#### Prerequisite

**Budget** engagement ensured by National and International Authorities

#### ad 1 Preparatory Work:

##### Create a group of experts (IPG)

It is assumed that the Ministry of Transport will be in the driving seat being a navigation project; the composition of the expert group should include the following representatives:

1. Ministry of Transport
  2. Ministry of Environment
  3. Other Ministries as needed (Finances, Public Administration – it might be different according to the country)
  4. Water Management Authorities
  5. NGO (environmental, others)
  6. River Commission ( if any)
  7. Local Authorities and Local Communities
  8. European Commission (if international project)
- In 4. are also included professionals like: hydromorfologist, hydrologist, sediment transport expert, ecologist, biologist, geologist, chemist, navigation engineer, local port authority, landscape architects (physical planners), river engineers, River Basin Managers - plus: lawyers (national and international law), economists (cost-benefit-analysis), others..
  - In 5 are also included other countries affected (ESPOO)

Once a first draft of the project idea (with rough scenarios/variants) is compiled, a **Public Consultation** inviting all stakeholders is highly recommended.

#### ad 2 Initial Planning Steps:

- Definition of the impacts by the planned constructions/project;
- Identifying the problems with regard to the “reference” (to be defined), i.e. performing an analysis of environmental deficits;
- Establish a list of measures/tools how to avoid/mitigate the impacts;

### 2.1 Analysis of the status quo, including existing data and missing data

Following the existing legislation, an EIA is required for large projects.

- Bottlenecks for navigation purposes (location, nature and importance)
- Hydrology, Hydromorphology, Flood protection, bank constructions
- Sediment transport, erosion, deposition (modelling)
- Connectivity (longitudinal, lateral, vertical)
- Industrial sites: discharge and transport issues
- SEA
- Information on protected areas
- Information on protected species
- Local communities interests

## **2.2 Goals of IWT and ecology: Sustainability**

A sustainable development project balances ecology, social needs and economy, in a win-win situation at best. Specific attention must be given to protected areas. It must also respect and implement existing environmental laws and regulations (national and EU wide).

From a technical point of view “good/best practice” must be applied to make the project environmentally friendly and safe.

An effective and efficient planning and realization are beneficial for economy. A cost-benefit analysis should be performed.

Various scenarios or variants should be elucidated and selected according to feasibility.

The principle of environmental protection is:

- first: avoid impact if possible, by selecting the appropriate measures;
- second: mitigate impact as possible;
- third: if impact cannot be avoided, then provide alternatives/compensation of environmental measures, either nearby the construction or, if not possible, in similar ecosystems.

Monitoring must include the time before, during and after construction; it should have clear goals to achieve and be an instrument of success control. If success is not achieved, then the project responsible must adapt the project until the goals are being achieved.

Each of the proposed Variants should include

- Road map
- Timing
- Cost assessment
- impact assessment

## **2.3 Key aspects**

The key aspects of the project are affected parameters that determine ecosystem function. There are some external aspects that influence the project area and the ecosystem as well which cannot be directly managed by the project planner; these include climate change effects, water cycle, transboundary issues, etc., and must be respected in the planned project.

The spatial and temporal dimensions are key issues of ecosystem function and river basin management (such as: seasonal processes, migration behaviour, trophic food webs, surface water to groundwater connections, etc).

Modelling is needed to understand long-term and/or large scale processes; models must be calibrated with in situ data (provided by the EIA), and the model output must be subjected to an appropriate sensitivity analysis to estimate the precision of the prediction.

## **2.4 Missing basic data**

They should be provided by the EIA, including

- Category/type of data
- Ecological Status
- Gap analysis

## **ad 3. Detail planning work**

*(With reference to the given example)*

### **3.1. Information and data needed to develop alternative variants:**

See WFD 4.7 performance of economic study  
Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment SEA  
Environmental Impact Assessment EIA

- Different extension of bottlenecks indicate that a SEA is needed before approaching each bottleneck in details
- HMWB is important in the assessment, but it is not in the measure to take

### **3.2. Criteria needed for comparing and ranking variants**

- Article 4.7 of WFD
- EIA (including basic data collection). Within EIA it has to be investigated Variants. For each of the chosen ones a Monitoring Plan has to be associated.
- The choice of a Variant depends on balanced approach
- An iterative cycle can then adjust the process.



## 3.2. Result of Working Group 2

### 0. Pre-preparatory Work

The given project (350 km reach, 20 bottlenecks) can be far beyond a single project:

- > we need a plan/strategy first
- > this plan should be assessed by SEA
- Long WG discussion about SEA vs. EIA

We assumed that we have this plan (national waterway development plan).

### ad 1. Preparatory Work

1.1. Contact responsible parties, which have to be in the **Steering Group**.

- Ministries (depends on the MS - MoT, MoE, MoF, MoA, MoRD)
- Local authorities
- EC - in case EU funding is involved, in case it is a trans-boundary project
- Other finance institutions of the project

### 1.2. Integrated Planning Group

How to choose the right experts for the IPG?

- Choose several independent, confident experts according to the concrete issues,
- Let the IPG evolve – after first discussions, the experts decide if they need another member(s)

Criteria for choosing experts:      technical competence,  
    ability and willingness to communicate,  
    Experts with international experience are beneficial.

Problem how to finance the work of experts (tenders):

Possible (part)solution: involve at least some experts from the Government's responsible bodies.

NGOs – improved involvement needed

- NGOs to be regularly informed from the beginning of the project
- NGOs to be actively involved in project preparation:
  - Via consultant services of competent experts – technically competent experts can be part of IPG (must be paid);
  - Via Stakeholder's involvement.

### ad 2. First Planning Steps

#### 2.1 Concrete Planning Principles

- Precautionary principle
- No deterioration principle
- Win-win

- Respect RBMP
- Avoid disproportional costs (low cost solutions).
  - But do not aim at cheapest solutions
  - Include environmental costs into the cost assessment.

## 2.2. Goals

- Transport – improvement of the waterway
  - Safe navigation
  - Achieve AGN parameters
- Environment – improvement or at least maintenance of ecological conditions
  - secure natural dynamics of
    - morphology
    - hydrology
    - biology
  - working with nature, respect natural processes.

## 2.3. Transboundary Effects

- At technical level
  - Should be assessed from the early stages
    - To avoid problems
    - To be prepared to justify the chosen solution of the project
- At official (political) level
  - The legislation is clear
  - ESPOO convention provides the rules
  - Follow the procedures.

### Climate Change

Should be taken into account as much possible (some studies, predictions are available).  
But: Many uncertainties, different scenerios.

## 2.4. Missing Data

Data on morphology:

inventory of riverbed (esp. at the bottlenecks)  
data on sediment dynamics, quality, quantity

Data on habitats:

biological data are crucial

Data about land ownership and land use of the land that is possibly affected.

Data from studies concerning the broader area (whole catchment).

Info about flood protection measures (should be available).

*(the WG had no more time to discuss Questions 3!)*

### 3.3. Result of Working Group 3

The draft Manual's Road Map and the explanations of the tasks are already a good basis. We found some points to be improved / completed e.g. when is SEA needed.

**1.1 Organisation** – more advises on how to set up the organisation would be useful.  
Proper resources (time & money) to set up the project planning.  
Budget needed for the IPG work to be provided by the project owner.

**1.2 Steering Group** – should consists of representatives of all relevant ministries  
Integrated Planning Group – good that experts be contained in the organisational charts.  
IPG needs to be a core group  
Involvement of other experts if necessary/useful - budget can be limitation.

#### ad 2. First Planning Steps

**2.1/2.2** Respect the relevant legal framework

**2.3 Climate change** addressed in task 9 – useful.

**Transboundary impact** – task 10 – inform and consult international river commissions:  
Add the need to involve neighbours, respect ESPOO convention.

#### ad 3. Detail planning work

3.1 Check against the overall plan, the project has to fit in

3.2 Criteria not only for technical aspects but also cost-benefit analysis, social/political restrictions.

3.3 Do also monitoring of the planning process & physical monitoring.  
Feedback to IPG is crucial

3.4 Stakeholder information should be related to the organisation of the IPG – who is “internal”, who is “external”  
EIA is the instrument to involve the public.

3.5. The proposed Road Map is useful, planning horizon should be 2 years maximum.

3.6. Planning results should be presented by the Steering Committee (special role of the project leader, e.g. MoT), involve also experts of the IPG